T.C.

ATILIM UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

ENGLISH CULTURE AND LITERATURE MASTER'S PROGRAMME

THE PORTRAYAL OF THE 'TURK' IN *TAMBURLAINE THE GREAT* AND *A CHRISTIAN TURNED TURK*

Master's Thesis

Esra Nur TOPÇU

Ankara-2022

GCPS

T.C.

ATILIM UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

ENGLISH CULTURE AND LITERATURE MASTER'S PROGRAMME

THE PORTRAYAL OF THE 'TURK' IN *TAMBURLAINE THE GREAT* AND *A CHRISTIAN TURNED TURK*

Master's Thesis

Esra Nur TOPÇU

Thesis Advisor

Asst. Prof. Dr. Sibel IZMIR

Ankara-2022

ACCEPTANCE AND APPROVAL

This is to certify that this thesis titled "The Portrayal of the 'Turk' in *Tamburlaine the Great* and *A Christian Turned Turk*" and prepared by Esra Nur Topçu meets with the committee's approval unanimously/by a majority vote as Master's Thesis in the field of English Language and Literature following the successful defence conducted on 24/05/2022.

Prof. Dr. Nüket Belgin ELBİR (Chair)

Asst. Prof. Dr. Sibel İZMİR (Advisor)

Asst. Prof. Dr. Selen AKTARİ SEVGİ (Member)

Doç. Dr. Şule TUZLUKAYA
Director

ETHICS DECLARATION

I accept and acknowledge that I have prepared this thesis study, prepared in line with the Thesis Writing Guidelines of Atılım University Graduate School of Social Sciences;

- within the framework of academic and ethical rules;
- presented the information, documents, evaluations, and results in a way that meets the rules of scientific ethics and morality,
- I have referenced each work from which I have benefited while preparing my thesis, and that
- I hereby present a unique study.

I hereby also understand that I shall accept any loss of rights against my behalf in cases otherwise.

24/05/2022

Esra Nur TOPÇU

ÖZ

TOPÇU, Esra Nur. *Tamburlaine the Great* and *A Christian Turned Turk* oyunlarında Türklük Kavramı, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara, 2022.

Tarihte Türkler güçlendikçe hem korku hem de merak uyandırmışlardır. Erken Modern Dönem İngiliz Dramasında yazılan pek çok oyunda "Türklük" kavramının işlendiği görülmektedir. Türklere yönelik bu algı ve merak, birçok oyun yazarının oyunlarında Türkleri yanlış tanıtmasına yol açmıştır.

Bu tez, 16. ve 17. yüzyıllarda İngiliz tiyatrosunda Türklerin nasıl tasvir edildiğini incelemektedir. Bu çalışmada seçilen iki eser, Christopher Marlowe'un *Tamburlaine the Great* ve Robert Daborne'nun *A Christian Turn'd Turk* oyunu, Erken Modern İngiliz oyunlarıdır ve her ikisi de Türk karakterlerini ve tarihi unsurları içerir. Söz konusu iki oyun, Türklerin ve genel olarak Türk tarihinin nasıl taraflı bir şekilde tasvir edildiğini göstermektedir.

Çalışmanın birinci bölümünde, Erken Modern İngiliz Tiyatrosunda Türklük algısının yanı sıra Osmanlı ve İngiliz İmparatorluklarının tarihsel geçmişleri ve aralarındaki etkileşimleri, ikinci ve üçüncü bölümlerde; *Tamburlaine the Great* ve *A Christian Turn'd Turk* adlı iki oyunun olay örgüleri ve ardından oyunların Türklerin nasıl ve hangi açılardan önyargı ile temsil edildikleri ele alınmaktadır.

Ayrıca, incelenen oyunlara esin kaynağı olan Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ve imparatorluğun fetih politikasının kültürel arka planı da ele alınmaktadır. Bunun yanı sıra bu tez, topraklarını ve vatandaşlarını başka bir imparatorluğa ve dine kaptırma korkusu yaşayan İngiltere'de söz konusu korkudan kaynaklanan çelişkilere de odaklanmaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Batılı Türk İmajı, Osmanlı İmpratorluğu, Erken Modern İngiltere Dönemi, Christopher Marlowe, Robert Daborne

ABSTRACT

Topçu, Esra Nur. The Portrayal of the ‘Turk' in *Tamburlaine the Great* and *A Christian Turned Turk*. Master Thesis, Ankara, 2022.

As the Turks grew stronger throughout history, they inspired both fear and curiosity. It is evident that the theme of "Turkishness" is utilized in numerous Early Modern Period English plays. This image and interest about Turks have prompted some playwrights to misrepresent Turks in their plays.

The purpose of this thesis was to examine the depiction of Turks in 16th- and 17th-century English drama. The two plays studied in this thesis are Christopher Marlowe's *Tamburlaine the Great* and Robert Daborne's *A Christian Turn'd Turk*, both of which contain Turkish characters and historical facts that have been distorted. These two plays illustrate the prejudiced portrayal of of Turks and Turkish history in general.

In the first section of this thesis, the historical background of the Ottoman and British Empires and their interconnections as well as the view of Turkishness in the Early Modern English theater and how it demonstrates misrepresentation and bias are explored. The second and the third sections give details about the plot structures of the two plays, *Tamburlaine the Great* and *A Christian Turn’d Turk*, and then deal with how the plays misrepresent and display prejudice towards Turks.

This thesis describes the cultural context that inspired the plots of these plays, namely the Ottoman Empire's conquest power and strategy. The study focuses on the contradictions that arose in British culture because of the fear of losing both their territory and their religious residents to another empire and religion.

Keywords: The Western image of the Turk, Ottoman Empire, Early Modern England Period, Christopher Marlowe, Robert Daborne.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere thanks to the people who have given me their unwavering support during this academic study. I would like first and foremost to express my deepest gratitude and appreciation to my advisor, Asst. Prof. Dr. Sibel İZMİR for her steadfast support and help with all my questions and problems, without which I could not have completed this work. I would also like to thank the Jury Chair Prof. Dr. Belgin ELBİR and Jury Member Asst. Prof. Dr. Selen AKTARİ SEVGİ for their guidance and explanations.

My special thanks to my director Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kadim ÖZTÜRK for his understanding and support. Thanks too, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Oktay ESER, Asst. Prof. Dr. Gülşah TIKIZ ERTÜRK and Asst. Prof. Dr Özge ÇETİN for their encouragement and guidance and also all my colleagues at the School of Foreign Languages at Amasya University.

My deepest and most meaningful "thank you" is to my husband Selçuk TOPÇU and my dear son Arda who have always been beside me with their endless love, support, patience, and belief. I also would like to thank my parents, Bahri ÖZDAĞ and Nuran ÖZDAĞ, for encouraging me, willing me on and being there for me in everything I set out to achieve.

Success is not accidental; it is related to belief and effort.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

England had international relationships and commerce with other cultures and countries during the last thirty years of the sixteenth century as well as the first thirty years of the seventeenth century, which helped to give the English self-knowledge vis-a-vis those from outside their country (Vitkus, *Turning Turk* 27). The confusion of the English about their identity and religious and moral codes often conflicted with their political and economic goals. The concept of "being English" is described with regards to geographic and religious boundaries. Moreover, a divided Europe due to religious beliefs heightened the fear among people about the possibility of being besieged due to a rapidly expanding Ottoman Empire. This prompted England to embark on a territorial expansion as they sought out foreign trade business partners to be more successful towards powerful Spanish and Ottoman competitors (O'Brien 2). Englishness became performative; the English were defined by their acts, and this active self-perception was dramatized on stage to underline the cultural and racial separateness and special quality of English identity. English writers gave voice to a developing sense of the English nation (Jowitt 2).

Plays such as Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta* or Kyd's *Soliman and Perseda*, which were written in the Renaissance Period, carry meaning besides entertainment for people and generally show the political and social events or perspectives in real life at that time. Anxieties aroused by the increased awareness of other civilisations and religious traditions, as well as the potential threat posed to England as an emerging world power, were expressed by playwrights in accounts of romance, violence, and conversion away from Christianity, staged in the setting of the contested Mediterranean. *Tamburlaine The Great* by Christopher Marlowe and *A Christian Turned Turk* by Robert Daborne, written in the Early Modern Period, are among the plays which demonstrate the general perspective in England in the late 1500s and the early 1600s towards Turkish people. These plays have bias for Turks. There are some questions to be asked in relation to the plays selected: Do these plays show real history and actual events correctly? How did English playwrights reflect the image of Turks in their plays? How was the English attitude towards Turks at that time? How was the relationship between Turks and English in that period? Why is there a persistently negative portrayal of "the Turk"? Is it the fear of a rival imperial power or simply the

presence in the Eastern Mediterranean of a rival religion? Many questions arise as to why Europeans seem to be obsessed with the Islamic world and the Turkish Ottoman Empire, which found its expression in the dramatic arts, and the process of this thesis will be an attempt to answer these questions.

This thesis attempts to show the misrepresentation and prejudices towards the Turks and the reasons for these misrepresentations in *Tamburlaine the Great* and *A Christian Turn'd Turk*. Although these plays have prejudiced perspectives about the Turkish image, they refer to specific historical periods, events, and real historical characters. By blending facts with fictitious accounts of confrontations between the Christian European as an adventurer and a bounty-seeking hero and the Muslim as corrupt reactionary, playwrights were "constructing notions of [English] national identity by means of an Orientalised, indeed Ottomanised, "other" (MacLean, *On Turning Turk* 226). In addition, this thesis aims to examine the themes of the anxieties of the early modern English and the image of Turkishness in which Turks - both fictional and actual - have been represented in English plays of the Early Modern Era. This discussion focuses on the playwrights' prejudiced perspectives toward Turks and other Muslims in the Ottoman Empire, as well as the reasons for such attitude, as well as their effects on playgoers at the period and, as a result, society in general.

Muslims were a popular subject in theatrical dramatizations of English professional plays. In addition to religious denominations such as Catholics, Protestants, and Puritans, English theatres also dealt with the theme of non-Christian characters' religious identities in the latter part of the sixteenth century and early part of the seventeenth century. Often, Muslim characters illustrated their religion by referring to Mohammed. Also, in general, the English and most Europeans used to refer to Muslims with the ethnic names with deliberate intent. Muslims are generally given the name of "Turks" (Lublin 142). This mainly refers to the most powerful and essential Muslims, but it was the same thing with the European idea to convert to Islam - "turned Turk" (B. Lewis, *Islam* 7).

Early modern depictions of the Ottoman Empire and Ottoman Sultans were generally portrayed in the drama of 1586 to 1611 in a way that illustrated the period when the English were threatened by Ottoman expansionism (Wann 166). European acquaintance with the Turks goes as far back as to the time of the crusades and back

further still to Medieval times (Moran 73), [1]although any information from those earlier periods' pre-dates the developments in theatre and dramatic representation which characterised the Early Modern era.

The portrayal of the existence and growth of dramatic theatre during Elizabeth's reign and the contemporary Ottoman power of the period assisted the illustration of this relationship and mutual recognition. Sources about the Ottomans began to be more accessible, however, these sources are misrepresented in the plays as lacking objectivity, therefore Ottomans are not correctly represented in the plays leading to playwrights' preferring misrepresentation and humiliation of the Ottoman. An example is the way that Ottoman Sultans were generally represented as cruel, lustful, and generally inferior to Westerners.

In the play *Tamburlaine the Great*, historical events or historical characters such as Sultans of the Ottoman Empire are misrepresented, sometimes it seems quite deliberately, with the presumable intention of influencing public opinion against the Ottomans. Such depictions of the Muslim "other" were taking place at a time when the Ottoman empire was at the high point of its power and therefore did indeed represent a threat to Christian Europe. At the same time, A Christian Turn'd Turk also demonstrate an almost neurotic need to demonise the Islamic world alongside an intense interest in and wish for understanding of Islam and how a Muslim Empire worked as a rival civilisation, as if English identity itself was threatened and challenged by it.

It is true that the history of Western prejudice towards the Turks is already well-documented. In essence, then, what this thesis will aim to explain is the historical background of the apparent prejudice towards Turks in particular, and how Turks, in their capacity as empire-builders and conquerors, came to typify and represent the Muslim world in general, attracting both the prurient curiosity and opprobrium of the Christian West.

[1] The translations of the sources that are originally in Turkish belong to me unless otherwise stated.

CHAPTER 1: LITERARY AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

1.1 British Renaissance Drama

From the earliest days of Christianity, Christians had a growing reaction to the excesses of Roman plays. In the fifth century, invasions occurred in Europe because of tribal migration, the decline of the central government, and the collapse of the Western Roman Empire. Theatre largely disappeared during the Dark Ages between the sixth and tenth centuries. However, in the 10th century, it was brought back to life by the church. In the tenth century, drama arose out of church-controlled rituals (Evans 129-30). With the addition of new scenes to the biblical stories portrayed by the clergy in churches, church plays gradually improved in the 11th century in England. At that period, England was a Catholic country, and many theatrical elements such as the magnificent décor of the churches, hundreds of candles, the costumes of the priests, music, and dialogue were already seen in Catholic religious ceremonies. Over time, additions were made to these, and the religious ceremonies turned into short plays. These plays were performed inside churches (Urgan 184). In time, the plays were performed outside of churches due to the inadequacy of the church facilities and ceased to be under the church's control.

The public and the shopkeepers became involved, and actors were no longer the clergy (Evans 130-31). Ordinary citizens replaced priests, and the mother tongue replaced Latin. In the 14th century, these plays that could be considered symbolic religious ceremonies disappeared, and new types of plays such as "Miracle Play," "Mystery Play," and "Morality Play" emerged. In the 15th century, another type of play emerged called "lnterlude" (intermediate play) (Urgan 185). Modern studies emphasize that the origins of Elizabethan drama can be found in the mystery plays cycles and the Morality plays that they later became. These played a central role in the Medieval town life of northern Europe (Moseley 13). Queen Elizabeth I’s ascession to the throne of England of in the year 1558 marks, for many scholars, the beginning of the Renaissance there (Yerli 78), and it was during her reign, "Elizabethan" drama emerged.

Renaissance means rebirth, starting as a cultural movement in Italy in the 14th century, centered around the city of Florence at its beginning and then spreading out

around Europe. During this period, Latin, Greek, and the accompanying works of the classical period were examined. As a result, there was a significant revival in science, philosophy, art, and literature, which replaced the scholastic thought that had dominated the Middle Ages (Yerli 77). Renaissance can be defined as the rebirth of art, literature, and ethical philosophy of the classical era, focusing on what it is to be human. With this understanding, a tendency towards art and emotions was seen. There was a break from the passive humility imposed on people by the Bible and from the church's pressure to question constantly as potentially criminal or amoral. In particular, Henry VIII's decision regarding religion made this break with the past much easier in England, as he denied the Roman Catholic Church's power over England.

Initially, Henry VIII of England was Catholic, and everything was under the influence of religion. However, after Henry VIII was denied a divorce from his first wife by the Pope in Rome, he defiantly broke with the Church of Rome and established the Church of England with himself as the head through the Act of Supremacy in 1534. He put Protestantism against Catholicism. During Henry VIII's thirteen years of reign, the theatre was often used to destroy Catholic values, humiliate the Pope, and thus spread Protestantism. For this purpose, Catholic plays were banned, and Protestant plays were performed instead (Çelik 37-40). Most of the English population was uneducated in the first half of the 16th century in England. However, through a religious transformation called 'The Act for the Advancement of True Religion' in 1543 and thanks to the educational policies by successive rulers, literacy was improved (Yamada xiii). King Henry VIII was succeeded by his son, Edward, who died after six years on the throne, and his eldest half-sister, Mary, reigned England with her husband, Philip II of Spain. After Mary's death, her half-sister, Elizabeth I, ascended to the throne (Levin 8-10). The Catholic Church had controlled government and culture up to the Reformation; after that time, the Church of England took on this role with the monarch as the head of the Church and the State. As a result of the establishment of the Church of England, ties were cut with Catholic Europe, and Renaissance in England began with the introduction of ideas such as 'reformation' and 'humanism' (Doğan 28-29).

Under the reign of Elizabeth I, English Literature was becoming more popular. This era has become known as the golden age of literature, and especially in drama. Famous early playwrights in English Drama used Greek and Roman tragedy as

inspiration. Examples of this are Attic drama, English miracle plays, morality plays, and Iiterludes (Khushboo 820-26). Ancient Theatre profoundly influenced Elizabethan Drama, where references to classical writers and actors can be found, for example, in *Hamlet* (Yıldırım 2). The primary forms of drama consisted of tragedy, comedy, and historical plays. Renaissance plays are based less on medieval tragedy where good fortune and luck dictate what happens and more on the Aristotelian idea where characters are tragically flawed, morally weak, and human errors cause the protagonist's downfall. With the accession of Queen Elizabeth I to the throne in 1558, the English Theatre began to abandon its medieval features. Under the influence of the new Protestantism, which now dominated the country, religious plays staged by the church began to fall out of favor. Instead, large theatre buildings were set up where all kinds of classic, comic, tragic, and historical plays written by theatrical enterprise were staged (Yerli 76).

Playhouses were constructed for performing drama, and the number of commercial playhouses increased in London from 1567 onwards. Between 1568 and 1580, fifty-two plays were staged at court superintended by the master of revels, crafted out of Italian stories, stereotyped classical themes, and events from old chronicles, some being the themes that Shakespeare used to create his masterpieces (O'Connor vi). The first public theatre in England was established in London in 1576 with "The Theatre" (Urgan 188). This theatre was very popular because the literacy level was deficient, and it was the only means of communicating with culture for the vast majority. Soon after, London was home to 'five public theatres,' and also there was a private location where plays could be performed. Almost two hundred professional actors lived in London, surrounding it at that period (O'Connor vi). Ten more theatres were built in London before 1616, the year Shakespeare died (Urgan 188). Theatres were a vehicle of entertainment for all people who belonged to all classes of society in the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods. Significantly, the last part of the Elizabethan period and the Jacobean period from the late 1580s to 1602 was the period of most significant activity and artistic achievement in English Drama.

The makers of Elizabethan theatres more or less followed the shape of inn courtyards (Hackett 4-5). The Elizabethan stage was bare and therefore flexible. There were no backdrops or other fixed scenery, only moveable items such as a chamber, with tables, stools, an altar and even a tomb (Bradbrook 7-11). The stage was a

partially covered platform that stretched almost to the middle of the theatre, at about the height of the audience's shoulders. In this way, not just one wall of the stage but three walls could be used simultaneously. There was no curtain on the stage, which was in the form of a platform open on three sides. In the gallery behind, however, there was a small "inner stage," covered with a curtain that could be opened at will and used by the actors when necessary. In Elizabethan theatres, there were no sets in the contemporary sense (Urgan 188-9). Actors were usually amateurs from the local community that the audience would recognize as their neighbours. The drama of salvation was therefore enacted on a world stage (Moseley 13). One of the most interesting features of Elizabethan theatre is that female roles were played by boys whose voices had not yet broken. Women were not permitted to perform on stage at that time, although they were allowed to be in the audience. Every theatre company was named after a high-ranking person and was under their protection: "the Society of the Lord Chamberlain," "the Lord Admiral Society," "the King's Company," and so on. (Urgan 189).

English theatre took a long time to develop and finally reached its height in the Elizabethan period. As time passed, masterpieces were being produced. Elizabethan drama is a unique type of drama because it was not influenced by Greek theatre in terms of essence and form. The Elizabethan drama did not adopt the classical unities of time, place, and action and the rule of not mixing tragedy with comedy (Urgan 191). However, the stoicism of Seneca, the model dramatist, influenced Elizabethan drama. Elizabethan playwrights were not deliberately or accidentally careless in their writing because there were no such standards of accuracy to which Elizabethan playwrights were held unless one takes the unities as a kind of standard (Bradbrook 31). Elizabethan drama reflects the products of an artistic understanding that establishes a strong connection with its audience. It was aimed not only at an elite audience but towards the entire English nation.

For this reason, a wide variety and unity are seen in the plays of the period, arising from the effort to meet the audience's expectations from almost all walks of life (Aksoy 10). Elizabethan playwrights did not place the same importance on narrative and characterization as the modern author. The play’s words or images provide a very direct moral guidance. The writers' aim was often primarily moral, and their methods were mainly rhetorical (Bradbrook 75).

The first proper comedy written by Nicholas Udall is *Ralph Roister Doister*, and the first proper tragedy of English drama is *Gorboduc*, written by Thomas Sackville and Thomas Norton. However, it is generally agreed that *Ralph Roister Doister* could not be described as a literary masterpiece. *Gorboduc* handled an early English history theme, and it is essential because it is the first dramatic work written with a blank verse, which Marlowe popularised. So, it is in many aspects an accomplished composition (O'Connor vi).

The popular themes were revenge, and supernatural forces, as people in this era were very superstitious (Khushboo 820). Many playwrights (as a verse) frequently used patterned speech, especially in revenge tragedy due to Kyd's frequent use (Bradbrook 98). One of the dramatic expectations of the era is that the theme of violence is processed to excite the audience and that horrible and even gruesome scenes are created. In the Elizabethan plays, as a part of the dramatic establishment, there are emotional and touching scenes with poetry, songs, music, word plays, humorous words, incredible and surprising adventures in the plays (Aksoy 10).

In conclusion, English Drama has a long process and tradition. However, it was during the reign of Elizabeth I that English drama flourished in such a way as to produce real advancement in the story of theatre around the world (Yerli 84).

1.2 Representation of Turks in Renaissance Drama

The way Ottoman Empire and Turks have been portrayed in Western literature reflects the Western point of view from earlier centuries. Although contact between the Turks and the British is considered to have begun with the 1st Crusades in the 11th century, Turkish interest in England started in the middle of the 16th Century (Moran 73). Turks had been the subjects of European and English literature for centuries. We can also see Turkish characters in the works of Medieval Europe. In the Middle Ages, English knowledge about Turks and the Orient was almost non-existent (Dereli 7). Muslims and Turks called ‘Saracen’ are frequently mentioned in Medieval English works. In *Le Morte D’arthur*, one of the most famous works of this age, the knights fought against the Romans and the Saracens and showed great heroism against them (Dereli 7).

Contrary to the treacherous, unreliable, and brutal Turkish characters in the Renaissance period, Turks in medieval romances are shown as brave, powerful people who put honour above all else. In these Medieval romances, Turks are defeated by Christians, but they are reflected as people who fight legitimately within the rules of chivalry (Aksoy 115-6). Other examples might be Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* and *The Book of the Duchesse* references to Turks. Hamit Dereli also mentions references about Turks and Prophet Muhammad in some miracle plays, which were the first kinds of drama in Britain, inspired by the lives of the Christian saints (8). People who lived in Medieval England obtained knowledge of Turks and Orient from Jean de Bourgogne's *The Travels of Sir John Mandeville* or *The Voyage of Plano de Carpini* by Johannes de Plano Carpini or *The Journal of Friar William de Rubruquis* by Guillaume de Rubruquis or *The Travels of Marco Polo* by Marco Polo which John Frampton translated. As Hamit Dereli states, the original version of *The Travels of Sir John Mandeville* appeared in the French language and was subsequently translated into Latin and English. This untruthful travel book significantly impacted the prejudiced works and did not reflect the truth about Turks in the Renaissance Period (8-9). Edward Said mentions about these travellers that ‘‘Altogether an internally structured archive is built up from the literature that belongs to these experiences’’ (*Orientalism* 58). These travel books were only the beginning of the relations between Europe and Asia (20).

However, after the conquest of Constantinople in 1453, Turks came to be seen as "barbarians," who posed a threat to high culture (Schwoebel, *Coexistence* 164), and in the European imagination, the "cruel Turk" and "lustful Turk" stereotypes were already becoming prevalent (Wheatcroft 7-8). Robert Schwoebel proposed that the capture of the city of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks, leading to an existential fear of a permanent threat to "the West" and to its Christian faith, and adds this fear was one of the main formations of the general concept of Turks in Western's point of view (*The Shadow* 10).

As Bernard Lewis remarked, for most Europeans, "the loss of Constantinople is a great historical disaster, a defeat for Christendom which has never been repaired" (*History Today*, 10 October 1953). In the Renaissance period, Turkish costumes, beliefs, and manners became a focus of European curiosity due to the difference in Turkish lifestyles. Ufuk Ege Uygur explained the treatment of Turkish characters in

Renaissance literature in her research: there was an influx of students from England to Italy, the source of the Renaissance movement, and the English studying at Italian universities carried the knowledge they had learned back to their homeland. English students learning Italian translated Italian works into English. This is how Turks first appeared in English literature (3).

For this reason, most of those who wrote about Turkish history in the 15th and 16th centuries and introduced the Turks to Europe were Venetians and Italians. Thus, anti-Islam propaganda of the Catholic Church in the works translated from Italian to English also affected Britain, and the British were instilled with Turkish hostility (Dereli 23-24). Moreover, Renaissance people were curious about anything different and exotic (from their point of view), such as the image of the Turk as the other. Christians were further challenged by Turkish dominion of a considerable share of the territories known to exist at the time and felt compelled to find out the reasons for this in order to overcome it. England's objective was probably to emulate the aging Ottoman Empire, and ultimately to take its place (Burian, *Interest of* 220).

In the 16th century, the attitude of the English towards the Turks changed due to the expansion of the Ottoman Empire and its emergence as a major threat to the Christian world. This was reflected in literary works throughout Europe, especially in drama since it was the most popular genre in the Elizabeth Period. Aslı Çırakman argues that the strength of the Ottoman Empire inspired both fear and interest in Christian Europe of the 16th and 17th centuries, resulting in diverse, paradoxical, and incoherent images of Turks (185). For instance, Orhan Burian mentioned that for Europeans in the Renaissance Period, Turks were known for their "cruelty, ferocity, pride, lust, deceit" and "Islam was synonymous in the West with the Ottoman" (*Interest of* 225). Uniquely among other "oriental races", who were deemed inferior, Turks appear in early modern literary works as a "grand evil" and a threat to Christendom that must first be halted and later eliminated. This is evidenced by the fact that prior to the 18th century, the English approach consisted of negative propaganda. The process of colonisation and takeover came after this (Şahiner, *The Oriental* 136).

Daniel J. Vitkus claims that supposedly Turkish characteristics like "aggression, lust, suspicion, murderous conspiracy, sudden cruelty masquerading as

justice, merciless violence rather than Christian charity, wrathful vengeance instead of turning the other cheek" (*Three Turk Plays* 2) allegedly "contaminated" Christians, causing them to convert to Islam. This was referred to as "turning Turk" (Vitkus, *Three Turk Plays* 2). Likewise, Orhan Burian quoted Warner G. Rice's claim in his essay, *Interest of the English in Turkey as Reflected in English Literature of the Renaissance*:

> Most Christians agreed of course, in believing these fearsome infidels to be not only inveterately hostile, but also completely depraved, and accordingly they freely employed the epithets 'Turk'... to denote cruelty, ferocity, pride, lust, deceit, and other forms of ini- quity (Rice cited in Burian 225).

However, at the same time, Ufuk Ege Uygur stated in her article Turks were seen as rich, different, splendid, luxurious, and also fear-inducing in British records (8), and Turks were also a source of bewilderment, fear, restlessness, Islamic revolt and threat for Christianity through the control of the world trade routes and conquest (2). Both the Ottoman Empire's proximity to Europe as well as its Muslim cultural and religious identity allowed the West to imagine the Ottoman Empire as the embodiment of the East (Öğünç 245). The externally visible aspects of Oriental life are demonstrated with a good deal of accuracy in Renaissance drama. Nevertheless, Renaissance dramatists often do not get the religious and cultural aspects right (Oueijan 15). Oriental life caught the attention of Elizabeth's audiences. The "Orient" came to be seen as a place of violence, power struggles up to and including fratricide, and as lecherous as it was duplicitous (Nicholson 73).

Islam, in Western and especially English thinking, came to be regarded as a key piece of the puzzle that defines the broader concept of the "Turk" (Şahiner, *The Oriental* 137). Gerald MacLean notices that in "Turk plays," the "East" is a place where Western and Christian norms no longer apply, and both religious and socially accepted practice is challenged (*On Turning Turk* 144). In addition, some critics in their works state that English people of the early modern world employed the terms "Moor" and "Turk" to refer to Muslims and people and things Islamic in general (McJannet, *Islam* 185). Jitka Malečková mentions in her book called *"The Turk" in the Czech Imagination (the 1870s-1923)* that according to Paula Sutter Fichtner, Turks slowly came to represent Muslims in general and were seen as idolaters who practiced a religion of self-indulgence, lustfulness, and polygamous marriage (28). Linda McJannet points out that some critics such as Warner G. Rice and Samuel C. Chew

tended to view the depiction of Muslim characters ‘‘as examples of monstrous cultural stereotyping’’ (*Islam* 183). Military attack and cultural rivalry between Christians and Muslims were the basis for the general concept of Islamic culture during the 16th and 17th centuries (Esen and Karakuzu 868). The West feared Turkish expansion, meaning that all Christian victories against Muslim forces at that time were regarded as a cause for joy (Vitkus, *Three Turk Plays* 7). That is why the prejudiced historians and travel writers of the period showed Turks as ‘cruel, deceitful, traitors and wicked people’ in their works, and that is why Renaissance writers described an expanding Ottoman Empire which was menacing and terrorizing Christian Europe.

When the plays written in the Elizabethan Age are reviewed, it can be observed that there is a great interest in Ottoman-Turkish history and Turks in this period. Many playwrights dealt with the subject of Turks in the 16th and early 17th centuries. Most of them wrote their plays with biased accounts stressing the villainy, deliberate ill-will and easy recourse to violence of the Turks with the intention of simultaneously frightening and titillating their publics (Moran 78). As Nazan Aksoy mentions, Turkish characters were chosen to represent the necessary negative values and evil forces for the stage during this period (12). Similarly, Joy Pasini conveys that:

> Protestant religious-historical texts such as John Foxe’s Acts and Monuments primed English playwrights to stage stories about family killing in the dramas that depict Islam. English playwrights used this idea of Muslim kin killing as the norm, either to disown or to highlight, the kin killing in their own history as well as to warn the English on a basic level not to be like a Turk (Pasini 230).

There are also comments about why this biased portrayal of the Turks was created in Renaissance Drama. Nabil Matar mentioned that the reason for anti-Muslim stereotypes and creating anti-Islamic images among the English was dramatic literature. In his view: ‘It was plays, masks, and pageants ... that developed in British culture the discourse about Muslim Otherness... Eleazar and Othello [became] the defining literary representation of the “Moor,” and Bajazeth, Ithamore, and Amureth of the “Turk”’ (*Islam* 13). Wann tries to excuse this seemingly deliberate casting of the Turks as permanently in the wrong, saying that the fault lies with the biases of historical recording and not with the playwrights themselves (438). Farhana Khan asserts that the deliberate misrepresentation of the Ottoman’s “despotism and cruelty’’ was a tool to render the “Oriental” less threatening (166). The steady and insistent

growth of the Ottoman Empire, with its attendant cultural and military accomplishments, had to be explained in a way that would soothe Western, Christian anxieties. Having had their attention drawn to the Princes, Bassas, and Soldans, English people combined fear with fascination (Khan 166-7), and this was natural, bearing in mind that the Ottoman Empire was the world's most powerful at the time (Wann 430). Turks became popular in Renaissance drama:

> Several causes, probably, led to the great popularity of the Turk ... on the Elizabethan stage. The constant menace to Europe of a Turkish invasion, with a resultant abnormal interest in the character and custom of the Turk, naturally suggested his person for dramatic representation. Furthermore, his darkened face and his strange Oriental costume, he gave the opportunity for an effective stage make-up; by his reputation for treachery and cruelty, he rendered plausible the bloodiest scenes; and with his pagan faith, he gave occasion, when set in opposition to a Christian hero or heroine, for abundant religious clap-trap (Adams cited in Burian, *Interest of* 219).

M.C. Bradbrook comments that Turks were mere foils for the action which centres on the Western, Christian hero, and as he mentions in his book, *Themes, and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy*, which focused on Marlowe's *Tamburlaine the Great*, Bajazeth the Turk is shown to be exactly such a foil (140). Turks were mentioned as an ornamental element that complimented the set of Elizabethan plays with their exotic clothes, but the use of the Turkish image is a non-vital, dramatically standard feature (Aksoy 12).

Unlike these authors, according to Louis Wann, the East is a serious issue for Elizabethan playwrights, and his research shows that the period between 1579-1642 was when English playwrights were most interested in the East and Turks. The primary evidence of Wann's claim was that plenty of plays were written about Turks or included Turkish characters, many plays were related to Ottoman history, or plots of plays were taken from Ottoman history, and Turkish characters were the carriers of the main action in the plays, and they were not inside roles, contrary to the views of other critics. So, he refutes the view that elements of Turkishness appear as an accessory in plays (Aksoy 14-5).

Edward Said in "*Orientalism*", separates Western Orientalist Discourse into two different periods: the first early modern period until the eighteenth century which regularly portrays the East as reactionary and barbaric; the second essentially ongoing and serving to justify Western attempts to exert political, economic, and cultural

control (Said cited in Şahiner, *The Oriental* 136). In this respect, 47 plays were produced from 1579, when the first oriental play was written, until the closure of English theatres in 1642 that included an oriental theme, although 13 have been lost. The most prolific period was from 1586 to 1611, which marked when the English were most concerned about Ottoman expansionism. Statistics show that the Turkish matter as a topic of plays was a tremendous interest of early modern English audiences among 47 works (Wann 166).

Shortly after the Ottoman Empire began to be ruled by Kanuni- Sultan Soliman (1520–1566), works about Turks were produced in England, and writers such as Paolo Giovius, Bartolomeo Georgievitz, and Antoine Geoffroy, who described Turkish history and customs, military organization, were translated into English during his reign (Moran 73). Also, Andrew Boorde and Sir Robert Shirley describe how the Ottomans rule "in peace and quiet" after they have occupied countries. In *Introduction of Knowledge* (1542), Andrew Boorde emphasizes that "Kanuni holds these lands with politics and kindness, and weapons" (12). When the army of Soliman the Magnificent turned against the gates of Vienna, the need to fight against the Turks began to be claimed, and thus an extensive propagandist literature emerged against Turks in Germany, but there was no European-scale publication on this subject in Britain. However, the general writings about Turks in England were especially those which investigated the secrets of the sudden access of Turks to the highest peaks of power and fame (Dereli 24). When diplomatic relations began between the Ottomans and the British in the 16th century, the British had the opportunity to come to Ottoman lands and live there and began to write literature. Based on the travelers' observations and research, this literature made intellectual contributions to Renaissance Europe, although information about the Ottomans sometimes contained prejudices and exaggerations (Ercan 7). High-quality, informative English travel books in England did not appear until the 1580s. It can be said that they followed the start of in person dealings between the Ottoman Empire and Britain. Therefore, the books from Europe introduced the British to general Turkish concepts (Burian, *Interest of* 228).

Images of Turkey were created through these travel documents with value judgments on the Islamic World, often violent. Accounts from Christian travellers to the Holy Land are notable for their persistent depiction of Turks in Europe and of

Muslims in general as devil's children and followers of a prophet who is an imposter (Aydın 42).

This anger and fear towards the Ottoman Empire, which is seen in the documents, create the anxiety of defeat by strong, warrior Turks who were seen as a threat to Christianity. For the British, who could not defeat the Ottoman Empire, the Turks were depicted as infidels and terrifying Islamic forces in the documents (U.E. Uygur 3.) Why did the Turks have such power? There were many books on this main idea written in English or translated into English. The Elizabethan library consisted of many sourcebooks for writers about Turkey, such as Hugh Gough's *The Offspring of the House of Ottomans (1553)*, Peter Aston's *A Short Treatise upon the Turks Chronicles (1564)*, and *The Policy of the Turkish Empire* (Al-Olaqi, *The Oriental* 36). *The Order of the great Turckes Courte, of hys men of warre and all his conquests with the summe of Mahumetes doctrine*, was translated into English from French, and it was the first work in English containing collective information on the Ottoman Empire (Dereli 25). The events and characters in the plays were presented as found in the sources by playwrights, but how reliable were these sources? For instance, Richard Knolles, one of the great British historians, demonstrated in his *General History of the Turks 1603* a considerable bias towards the Ottoman Empire. Knolles condemns the Ottomans in rather dramatic terms, calling them, "infidels", "heretics", "princes of darkness", claiming that they are enemies not only to whichever country they invade but also to Christianity as a religious tradition and faith community (Knolles quoted in Şenlen-Güvenç, *Richard Knolles'* 388).

On the other hand, Richmond Barbour's view about Knolles' work, *General History of the Turks 1603*, offers that "there was a fundamental enmity between Islam and Christendom" (*Before Orientalism* 17-18). Another hostile approach towards the Ottomans was shown in Sir Thomas Sherley's *Discourse of the Turks* (1617), where he spoke of the Turks as 'pagans, infidels, sodomites, liars, drunkards, proud, scornful and cruel' (Chew 178). Unlike Knolles, some travelers like John Sanderson wrote without bias towards Turks in his work, *Travels*, in which he mentioned the Ottoman's religious tolerance towards other religions although he was not accepted as a friend of the Turks (Burian, *Interest of* 215). As an example, the correspondence between Queen Elizabeth I and Sultan Murad III as reported in Richard Hakluyt's *The Principal Navigations, Voyages and Discoveries of the English Nation* can be seen "as the first

official exchange between England and the Ottoman Empire" and alludes to the conception of the Ottomans as equals both granting and deserving of respect (Burton, *Anglo-Ottoman* 130).

When literature and documents written in the 16th and early 17th centuries are analysed, it is evident that there was a fear of and an interest in Turks in England (Moran 73-74). It is clear that the source material for early modern playwrights were mostly histories whose reliability was in question. Wann's study confirms that Ottoman Turks were part of the subject matter; early modern period histories were often used as sources (432). Historical facts and theatrical portrayals often differ, and with the passing of time it has become apparent that inaccuracies were often embellished to serve a particular narrative. Therefore, plays and other works suffer from a lack of objectivity in portraying events and oriental characters. Louis Wann comments about this subject in *The Oriental in Elizabethan Drama*:

> Needless to say, history was not then written in the scientific spirit. Each historian copied from his predecessor, with or without acknowledgment, and felt no compunction in coloring the narrative to increase its interest, or in mingling legend with fact, with the result that his successor honestly accepted the whole as fact and so transmitted it to his successor with his own embellishments (434).

In the same source, Wann lays the blame for the negative portrayal of Turks on the historians from whom the playwrights presumably got their information (*The Oriental* 434). Critics pointed to various books and travel works as the possible inspiration for playwrights, but there was debate about the extent to which this was the case. For example, Schelling states in his book, *Elizabethan Drama II 1558-1642* that Knolles's *General History of the Turks, 1603* was the primary source of historical information on the Turks for English dramatists (496), however Louis Wann found this information 'certainly inaccurate' and added that six of the dozen or so plays which deal with Ottoman history predated Knolles' account, and that in fact only four plays would seem to have relied upon it as a source work (*The Oriental* 432).

Due to various commercial and cultural treaties, numerous people of different occupations visited the Ottoman Empire. They produced many works which describe "seraglio life, women in the Turkish harem, courtly life in general and other exotic aspects of non-European culture" (Aydın 46). The character of the Turkish Sultan was enthusiastically adopted into the imagination of the English playgoing audience.

Sultans are often shown dallying with European ladies in the Renaissance cultural artifacts and are heralded for their magnanimity (Chew 483). The reason for this might be the fights for the throne and the bloody events in Ottoman history, the real stories of the sultans who killed their brothers to become a sultan, or the sultans who strangled their brothers or sons to continue their reign, and similar issues added an element of violent reality to the plays. Most plots are not based on actual historical events. However, it can be seen that events such as Sultan Soliman's son Mustafa being strangled on his orders, the killing of Ibrahim Pasha, who was Sultan Soliman's best friend and grand vizier, and Mehmed III's execution of all his male siblings was represented time and again by Elizabethan writers as a "go-to" scene to create shock and horror in their tragedies (Aksoy 10-11).

Public demand, and that of theatre companies themselves, caused considerable pressure on playwrights to deal with the political issues of the day including to deal with the Ottoman Turks and Islam. Some plays contain a bias against Turks and Vitkus enumerates the most well-known of these plays as Robert Daborne's *A Christian Turned Turk*, Marlowe's *Tamburlaine, Parts I and II*, Thomas Heywood's *The Fair Maid of the West, Part I*, Thomas Dekker's *Lust's Dominion*, Thomas Goffe's *The Courageous Turk and The Raging Turk*, John Fletcher and Philip Massinger's *The Knight of Malta*, Philip Massinger's *The Renegado*, Thomas Middleton's and William Rowley's *All's Lost by Lust*, George Peele's *Battle of Alcazar, Soliman and Perseda*, Marlowe's *Jew of Malta*, Robert Greene's *The Comical Historie of Alphonsus, King of Arragon and his Selimus* (*Three Turk Plays* 2). In addition to Vitkus' list, Greville's play, *Mustapha* also includes Turkish history and Turkish characters.

For example, in Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta* (1591-1592), there are two types of Turkish characters. They are Selim Calymath, a son of the Ottoman Sultan, and Ithamore, who is Barabas' servant. Ithamore does many bad things on behalf of Barabas without questioning or without demur. The character of Ithamore represents Turks as evil, immoral, and dangerous. Ithamore enables Barabas to take revenge on the Christians by fulfilling his wishes. He poisons all the people living in a monastery apart from Barabas' daughter. As Nazan Aksoy mentions in her book, *Turks in Renaissance England*, Turkish servant, Ithamore is an accomplice who shares in all the evil deeds of his master (96).

Selim Calymath, however, is portrayed differently. He is depicted in the story as noble, honest, understanding, faithful to his word, and a kind person in the story. Although the story is the story of a Jew, at the heart of the play is a struggle between Christians and Muslims. At the end of the play, Selim Calymath is captured, and they do not have to pay taxes anymore. Hence, there is an absolute victory for the Christians, and the Turks are again defeated (Aksoy 102).

Another play, *Soliman, and Perseda*, written by Thomas Kyd and published in 1599, also depicted Turks. Kyd used the historical figure, the Ottoman Sultan, Sultan Soliman, in his play. Kyd uses Soliman and Perseda as devices to symbolize East and West. In the beginning, the Turkish image is reflected from the perspective of chivalry. However, Sultan Soliman's character changes in the second part of the play and Soliman is portrayed as a vain, bloodthirsty, and sexually incontinent tyrant. Another Turkish character in the play, Brusor, a Turkish chevalier, agitates against Erastes with Sultan Soliman and convinces him to take back Perseda. The Turks were portrayed with a 'betrayer Turkish' image via Brusor in the play.

Kyd also tries to demonstrate that the Ottoman Empire has an unjust and corrupt legal system with the character Erastus (Al-Olaqi, *The Oriental* 47). However, Sultan Soliman was known as both "the magnificent emperor of the East" and a "lawmaker" (Merriman 96). As in most Western dramas featuring Turks, the play implicitly embellishes the stereotyped image of Turks and shifts authorship of negative thoughts and actions to Turkish sultans (Esen and Karakuzu 869). Although the play deals with love, loyalty and infidelity alongside fortune, success and eventual death, the portrayal of the Turkish attack on Rhodes is cast as an evil act in a demonstration of pure political propaganda. Kyd accomplished connects with the Turkish threat in the minds of his audience in the play.

The Comical Historie of Alphonsus, King of Arragon, written in 1591 by Robert Greene, includes Turkish characters. The opponent of the play's hero is the Ottoman Sultan Amurack, and the writer was likely inspired by, as a minimum, two historical people: Murad II (reg. 1420–44and 1446–51), contemporary with King Alfonso V, and Murad III (reg. 1574–95), the Ottoman ruler at the time Greene wrote his play (Niayesh 11). When war breaks out between the Ottoman Sultan and Alphonsus, the Ottoman Sultan and the Ottoman Empire are portrayed in the play as

not so much power as known. Greene imitated the theme of the 'defeated Turk' in Marlowe's play, *Tamburlaine the Great* (Aksoy 113). It appears that Greene wanted to show 'defeated Turks' to his audiences. Selection of genre in the play also allows for the showcasing of "Islam" and "the Turks" (Niayesh 17).

Greene's *Selimus, Emperor of the Turks* or *The First Part of the Tragicall Reign of Selimus*, is based on Ottoman history (Vitkus, *Three Turk Plays* 16). Selimus, the Ottoman Sultan, is the protagonist of the play, who is a sanguine, atheistic ruffian. In the first scene of the play, Selimus starts to show his tyranny to the audience. Selimus massacres anyone who might threaten his claim to the Ottoman crown, including women and children. We are shown Selimus as a cruel and violent man who murders his brothers Acomat and Korkut and removes his father Beyazid from the throne before poisoning him on his path to power as Ottoman ruler (Esen and Karakuzu 869). After he takes the throne, he rules the country in fear. Selim, the Ottoman Sultan, becomes a classic illustration of this type of 'oriental despotism' due to his avarice and desire for power (Vitkus, *Three Turk Plays* 11). Selimus is portrayed as a follower of Satan. This further demonstrates how the image of "the Turk" was taking shape in the Western imagination as the incarnation of everything bad and undesirable (Şahiner, *The Oriental* 142).

However, the play misrepresents events in history. For example, Sultan Selim (Selimus) did not murder his father in real life, and the real-life Bayazid was not poisoned. It appears that the author has added these incidents to emphasize the point of "Turkish cruelty" (Esen and Karakuzu 869). Also, unlike his portrayal in the play, *Selimus, Emperor of the Turkes*, he was not an atheist or despiser of Islam. Obviously, Greene consulted historical documents, pamphlets, and legends as the sources for forming Selimus' character. In particular, the play's early modern English rendering of the character of Selimus lends weight to the presentation elsewhere of "the Turk" as a loathed and feared enemy force and the establishment and defence of nationalistic feelings among the English (Şahiner, *Hellish* 165).

Fulke Greville's *Mustapha* is also based on Ottoman history. Fulke Greville's *Mustapha* portrays the events at Soliman's palace just before he decides to execute his son Mustafa. Both in real life and the play, Soliman ordered the death of his son Mustapha. Greville concentrated on the dynastic events of the Mustapha's story

and depicted Roxelana as a pitiless political villain. Soliman, Rossa (Roxelana), and Rosten are depicted as enormous, brutal, and cruel as the story necessitates this, while other characters such as Mustapha, Achmat, and Camena are portrayed less negatively in the play. In the play, Soliman's arrogant behaviour and extravagant lifestyle caused his destruction.

Greville highlighted the Turks' inhumanity above everything else, portraying them as faithless, barbarians, and murderous, massacring innocent Christians without mercy. Seda Erkoç has pointed out that Greville paid close attention to English historical sources in his use of devices that appear repeatedly, portraying the Ottomans as an ongoing threat to the Christian world (267). According to Hamit Dereli, Greville's play *Mustapha* is not a tragedy, but rather a political play (28).

These playwrights portray the Turks in their plays through a prejudiced approach. According to Burton, English authors were influenced by both genuine Ottoman voices and Elizabeth I's interest in Ottoman (*Traffic* 52). So, they generally present the Turks and especially Turkish rulers as 'barbarous,' 'cruel,' and 'lustful.' Turks are reflected in a very biased way. These representations generally were frequently allusions that misrepresented and demeaned the Ottomans, and Ottoman rulers had little or no basis. Although they took their plots from actual historical events or historical characters mainly, they manipulated them to promote their agenda. Their plots mainly were not based on reality. Conjuring the figure of the "devilish Moor" or the "cruel Turk" sometimes lent support to the Christian argument that Islam was immoral, and that Muslims worked for the Devil (Vitkus, *Three Turk Plays* 15). However, the supposed cruelty, appears more often in interactions between Turks than in those which occur with people of other countries and faiths. Time and again, we are shown examples of parricide and fratricide, for example, in the Mustapha plays, Soliman and Perseda, Selimus, and others (Wann 440).

To sum up, there are some reasons for dealing with Turks from a prejudiced perspective in the British Renaissance Drama. As far as the West was concerned, the Ottoman Empire was not only an exotic other, but a rival power and this certainly sharpened the interest of the British Empire in particular. According to the general opinion, the most crucial reason behind the origin of the denigration of Turks was the fear that the Turks would conquer Europe or colonize European territories. Vitkus

mentions that even as the Christian kings of Europe were setting up their claims to territories in the New World, the threat posed by the Ottoman Turks was real and ongoing (*Three Turk Plays* 6-7). In addition to the fear of Ottoman conquest, there was also a great fear for their religion. Because the Ottoman Empire ruled the territories with religious tolerance and tolerance is defined as giving an interest to people for discovering or feeling sympathy for something. So, they had a great fear of conquest by the Ottoman Empire, the leader of the Islamic religion. Also, after English people dealt with international trade and interacted with Ottomans and Muslims, more people converted to Islam. Another reason for choosing 'Turkish characters' as subjects in the plays was that stories of Sultans' fondness for young European females attracted Elizabethan theatregoers (Al- Olaqi, *Uxoricide* 7). Vitkus claims that the evolution of 'the Great Turk' as Western bogeyman arose partly from dramatic tales of executions and inter-familial murder by various means in the Ottoman courts (*Three Turk Plays* 21). As a result, Early Modern Europeans, having received this instruction in prejudice towards Turks and Muslims, then displayed an eagerness to demonise this new "other" who refused to conform to the perceived Christian way. No surprise then that playwrights in turn produced works that exercised dramatic license with history and served as an early form of propaganda against religious and political rivals. The literary works of the period's purpose were to create a uniform opinion of Islam as the false religion and Turks as the general enemy (Esen and Karakuzu 872). They tried to show their superiority and to prove their case towards the Ottoman Empire with these plays. This device rewarded theatregoers with a sense of belonging, both to the theatre itself and a wider Christian community united against Islam's common enemy. The objective seems clear - the strengthening of commitment to the Christian faith.

1.3 The Ottoman Empire

During the 14th and 15th centuries, the Ottoman Empire became warriors to a major world power from a small marauding nation. It established new significant management systems provisioning resources for its new capital of Istanbul and for growing military. At the same time, the rulers directed the expansion of settlers and farms across the area (S. White 1). In the first half of the 15th century, a serious upward trend in national cultural consciousness began to show itself, and in this context, for example, the Ottoman Sultan adopted an old Turkish title, "Han"; The stamp of the

Kayı tribe, one of the Oghuz Turks, of which the dynasty was a member, took its place on the Ottoman coins as a Remiz; Oghuz legend, Turkish language and literature began to be processed; Towards the end of the century, a literary movement tending to write in pure and straightforward Turkish emerged, and a revival was observed in Turkish historical consciousness (G. Lewis 8-9).

In the 16th century, Sultan Soliman was a world emperor. He conquered many territories. The state and stance of the Great Turkish Kanuni, Sultan Soliman, who came with magnificence, reflects an unprecedented magnificence (Hakluyt *III:* 107). At the time when Elizabeth I assumed the English crown, Soliman the Magnificent was advancing towards Central Europe, having conquered Greece and the Balkans. Even in relatively distant England, this created the fear of invasion (Esen and Karakuzu). Kanun-ı Sultan Soliman captured Belgrade in 1521 and Rhodes the following year and besieged Hungary. He fought the Persians and annexed Erzurum into the Ottoman lands. Kanunı's admiral Barbarossa (Hayrettin Pasha) wins victory against the Venetian and Spanish navies (U.E. Uygur 4). However, although Sultan Soliman, the son of Selim I, tried to conquer Vienna in 1529, he did not succeed (Esen and Karakuzu 867). Christian Europe met with the Muslim Ottoman (U.E. Uygur 4). However, his military tactics and diplomatic strategies were ultimately successful against Hapsburg resistance, and Hungary joined the list of annexations in 1541 (Esen and Karakuzu 867). As the Ottomans maintained their expansion throughout the 16th century, especially under the rule of Sultan Soliman, European kingdoms' fears and anxieties increased.

On the other hand, the Ottoman population grew exponentially in the sixteenth century, and because of it, the landmass became smaller for people who lived there, and the resources became scarce. War and natural disasters made things worse and made peasant welfare worse. During the last decade of the 1500s, the ferocious cold and the longest Eastern Mediterranean drought caused many deaths and scarcity. Imperial conquest is expensive, however, and as the burden of taxation grew, so did discontent, resulting in the Celeli Rebellion in Central Anatolia, causing a long-lasting crisis in the Empire (S. White 1).

After Sultan Soliman's death, the son of Selim II, ascended the throne. Following the Turkish takeover of Cyprus in 1570, a Christian navy managed a solitary

victory at Lepanto in 1571 (Esen and Karakuzu 867). Then his son, Sultan III. Murad was at the head of the Ottoman Empire for 21 years, from 1574 to 1595. Meanwhile, Sultan III. Murat was busy in Asia, chiefly with Persia's long and hard-fought war (Esen and Karakuzu 867). In the time of Murad III, in 1583, a diplomatic and commercial relationship was established with England (Horniker 289).

In the early seventeenth century, the Ottoman Empire had many lands such as "Istanbul, the Balkans, Mesopotamia, Anatolia, North African shore, Greece, Egypt, Palestine, Hungary, Syria" (Esen and Karakuzu 867). However, the Ottomans did not have previous power. The fact that the Turks began to lose to the Persians in their war with the Persians also prepared the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. This gave hope to the Christian states, and the Christians began to appear more strongly in the seas. Christian states, on the one hand, revolted between the Janissaries and the peoples living in the lands ruled by the Turks while they were planning to defeat the Turks; on the other hand, they tried to weaken their loyalty to the Sultan by offering bribes to the Turkish officials and officers (U.E. Uygur 5). In the early 17th century, the Empire had its first assassination of a sultan with Osman II. Then, Murad IV. ascended, and that period was a brief revival for Ottoman Empire for 17 years (S. White 1).

The Ottomans started to lose their power, and when Mehmed IV was unsuccessful in a battle against Vienna in 1683 and lost the war at Zenta, the resulting Treaty of Karlowitz (1699) meant that the Ottomans were called upon to withdraw from Europe (Esen and Karakuzu 867). It is known that the Ottomans began to change their perception of Western culture after the Treaty of Karlowitz in 1699, gradually to discover the secrets of the strengthening of the West and to examine different aspects of Europe, from its political and social institutions to its lifestyles, with a special interest (Kenan 42-3). This is because the Ottoman Empire entered a period of decline with the Treaty of Karlowitz and tried to recover. Despite some signs of recovery over the next hundred years, the Empire never fully recovered from the crisis provoked by the pressures at home and abroad. Even in the early nineteenth century, it was loosely governed, and the land's population was thinning (S. White 1). The Ottoman Empire collapsed with Mustafa Kemal Ataturk's revolution in 1923 when the Sultanate was abolished (Esen and Karakuzu 867).

1.4 The British Empire

The New English Dictionary gives the meaning of the word 'empire,' at the time of Henry VIII who reigned 1509- 1547 and describes it as a country without any foreign superiors (Firth 185). King Henry VIII terminated the lengthy agreement with the Norman ruler, including between the monarchy and the church and between London and the baronial provinces. He took a country that his father, Henry VII, rescued from the ashes of civil war and put it under one sovereign king, ruler over both its civil and religious entities. Henry VIII was just seventeen when he became king (Jenkins 129).

Henry's desire to remarry by divorcing Catherine of Aragon, who did not give birth to a male heir, caused a conflict with the papacy (Gray 53-54). Relations broke up when the Pope disapproved of this divorce, and Henry declared himself head of the Church of England in 1534 and confiscated all church property (Garner 3). Thus, the domination of Protestantism in England began, although Henry, who was born and raised a Catholic, seems to have favoured Catholicism as the faith of the people (Hollander 16). Nevertheless, the economy was ruined because of the war and monetary depreciation during the reign of Henry VIII. In the reign of Edward VI, Henry VIII's son, there was a division among the nobles and unrest among the populace. After Edward VI's death, Mary the Queen ascended the English throne and reinstated the authority of the Pope, provoking religious conflict at home and military defeat abroad (Haigh 14).

After Marry’s death in 1558, Elizabeth I. ascended the throne and reigned in England from 1558 until 1603. She was twenty-five and went on to become one of England's most celebrated monarchs (Jenkins 151; Javed 67). It was with the ascendance of Elizabeth to the throne that the Renaissance truly began in England. (Woodward 17). This was a time of stability, socially, religiously, and politically (Khusboo 819). England had not hitherto been an imperial power, with its influence worldwide varying from one place to another (Burton, *Anglo-Ottoman* 129). The sixteenth century was the century when Britain was united as a single state and the British as a single nation in history, and Elizabeth is rightfully regarded as the founder of British unity (Burian, *Early Years* 1). The English living in the Elizabethan Age were entwined with each other in an ardent patriotism (Urgan 113). Catholicism and

Protestantism were the two branches of Christianity practised in England during the reign of Elizabeth I. Whereas Elizabeth I's older sister Queen Mary I, had favoured the Catholicism of her Spanish mother, Queen Elizabeth inclined towards the newer Protestant faith. Elizabeth established the Church of England as the church of the state (Javed 67) and, at the same time, refused to be drawn into religious disputes (Javed 62). The Elizabethan Religious Settlement established peace between Protestants and Catholics, and there was no challenge from a still not strong parliament (Javed 68).

Monarchy was the political system of the Elizabethan Period. Although she was the head of state and any law passed required her approval, she nevertheless ruled the country with the help of The Privy Council and the Parliament. The Privy Council included the advisors of Queen Elizabeth, who consulted her in politics. When new laws were needed, including the imposition of new taxes, the Monarch called Parliament to meet for this purpose (Royle 22). In other words, even though she could rule the country by herself, she needed help in some ways as she was a female ruler at that period. Being a woman was difficult at that time, but the more difficult still was being a female ruler. Although she was queen rather than a king, she was able to set her femininity aside and claim for herself full rights as head of state in the essentially patriarchal institution of the Monarchy (Allman 26). Elizabeth I had faced many difficulties in a male-dominated world. According to English society at that time, women were thought of as intellectually and morally men's inferiors and therefore unsuitable leaders. The monarchy was more suited for the male as they had physical strength, self-assertiveness, and conclusiveness. Queens should be as religious and kind as the king's wives (Royle 27).

Given the atmosphere of hopelessness during Elizabeth's rise to power, it is surprising that her early years rendered great success with the military. Thus, Elizabeth became one of the most renowned royals in English history, predominately after 1588, when the English overcame the Spanish Armada, that Spain dispatched to re-construct Catholicism and beat England (Javed 60). Patriotism, which had already taken root in England, was boosted by the sinking of nearly one hundred and thirty ships, which the Spaniards called the "Invincible Armada," who attempted to invade Great Britain in 1588 (Urgan 113).

Mediterranean piracy was practiced by natives of many European nations, including the English, the Spanish, the French, the Portuguese, and the Dutch. The Ottoman Turks also practiced it. The rulers of those nations all too often turned a blind eye to these activities, whether for the profits generated or for political aims (Mikyšková 13). Queen Elizabeth was no exception and made use of piracy as another form of politics. According to Barbara Fuchs, Anglo-Spanish rivalry in the 1570s and 1580s arose chiefly because of mutual attacks by these two nations on each other's vessels (Fuchs, *Faithless* 45).

This era of inner peace brought by the English Reformation did not last long because of the ongoing conflict between the Protestant and Catholic versions of the Christian faith power struggle between the Monarchy and an increasingly demanding Parliament. Those altercations would consume the seventeenth century (Javed 63). England opened itself to the outside world in the sixteenth century. The reign of Queen Elizabeth I began England's transformation into its own era of being the dominant imperial power in the world (Esen, Karakuzu 868). After the victory over the Spaniards, the British turned to imperialism, not contenting themselves with their own small islands but setting their sights on other islands and the New World, which had only been plundered by the Spaniards (Urgan 113). It was a chance for England to expand its Empire. As British trade with other countries increased, the British appetite for contact and knowledge of other lands increased. Britain's navy gradually became dominant, and Queen Elizabeth was the first to permit trade-seeking voyages. With transatlantic trade came increased prosperity, while the crown also allowed the piracy against Spanish vessels and the establishment of colonies in the Americas and the West Indies. Since they were running their colonies, their trade was also well developed; a well-to-do middle class began to make itself heard in the prospering country (Urgan 113). English overseas exploration expanded during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, while at home, the transfers of power from Queen Elizabeth I to King James I and Charles I was still arousing disagreement over religion (O'Brien ii).

After Elizabeth died in 1603, James VI of Scotland ascended to the English throne in 1603, uniting the monarchies of the two countries (Cawthorne). The first Stuart monarch, James I, was a vain and talkative man, a lover of books but with little understanding of people and perhaps more importantly, a Scotsman with little or no

comprehension of the English people he now ruled (R.J. White 34). He was averse to violent action and had no maritime ambitions, and under his rule, the navy built up by his predecessors was allowed to fall into disrepair so that it was not strong enough to be taken seriously on the world stage as a challenger for power over the seas (R.J. White 34).

Furthermore, the practice of piracy which had been the unofficial means of gaining and holding power in the Mediterranean suffered a fall from favour under James I, who negotiated for peace with Spain and was acutely embarrassed by ongoing English piracy (Fuchs, *Faithless* 48). James went so far as to offer a royal amnesty in 1612, which allowed the pirates to keep their ill-gotten gains because they renounced their piratical ways (Vitkus, *Three Turk Plays* 31). This, however, infuriated English mariners and merchants and turned them against the house of Stuart. James was also involved in a battle for supremacy with his Parliament, which had peaked at the time of his death in 1625 and would ultimately lead to the history re-making civil war of that century, Oliver Cromwell's victory subsequent dictatorship (R.J. White 34). The war began in 1642, continued over seven years, and was divided into two phases. Not since have Englishmen taken up arms against each other. Even at the time, there was no eagerness for the fight, various attempts were made to negotiate peace while it went on, and peace was lasting when it was finally over. King Charles I was blamed for the war and executed in 1649, but the quarrelling continued (R.J. White 34).

Following the execution of Charles I, England and Scotland became a republic, with Oliver Cromwell as Lord Protector rather than Monarch. The new republic was named the “Commonwealth" (Mason and Salariya 115). Upon Cromwell's death in 1658 his son Richard Cromwell replaced him as Lord Protector but proved to be a weak leader unable to heal the divisions in the country, with the New Model Army being unable to agree with Parliament on how to govern. A solution was found when the Army was excluded, and Puritans and Royalists finally agreed in 1660 to restore the Monarchy (Cawthorne).

During this period, called the "Restoration," Charles II came to reign. Then James II reigned in 1685 and launched a violent purge against the Protestants to make the country Catholic. The Catholic convert James II did not fight his son-in-law William of Orange for the English crown, and when he left England to live in France,

William became king of England in 1689. William of Orange then ruled England with his wife Mary. These events became known as the 'Glorious Revolution' (Mason and Salariya 123).

After William and Mary died without heirs, Mary's sister came to throne in 1702 (Mason and Salariya 125). By the time of the peace of Utrecht in 1713 and the end of the war with Louis XIV, England had become Great Britain, three years after the Battle of Blenheim and two years on from the Battle of Ramillies, in The Act of Union between England and Scotland in 1707 (R.J. White 47). In 1707 made the two kingdoms into one, under the name of Great Britain, with Parliament remaining in Westminster (R.J. White 47).

The British Empire grew in power from the 18th to the 19th centuries, and in this period, the 19th century witnessing an expansion of English power along with renewed debate about the nature and importance of the Empire (Woodward 331). It was the 19th century which saw the British Empire as the one upon which "the sun never sets." However, for all its global reach, its relevance to domestic politics, economics, and culture was not as extensive. Nevertheless, it was sufficiently diverse to bring a variety of influences to bear on British life (Lloyd, *British Library Newspapers*).

When Queen Victoria died in 1901, Britain was in the middle of a war in South Africa, but even so, her death marked the end of a definitive historical period more clearly than that of any previous monarch (R.J. White 70). Following this upheaval came the First World War, with the loss of a generation of men and the entry of larger numbers of women into the workforce, and then the Great Depression (R.J. White 70).

These two crucial World Wars changed the rest of the world in the 19th century, notwithstanding the extent of previous British influence there. The world before 1939 was one which the British had played a large part in constructing, but after 1945 Britain found itself outflanked by the greater power of the United States and also that of the Soviet Union. England found itself weaker and poorer (R.J. White 73).

1.5 Turkish – British Relations in the Ottoman Period

The contact between the Turks and the English goes back to the Seljuk period (Karaca 11). The British, who were in the Byzantine royal guard, came upon the Seljuk

Turks. While King Richard I (1189-99) and Edward I (1272-1307) were in power, they marched in the Crusades and battled against the Turks (Karaca 11). Turkish victories created great fear in Europe; Central European states defeated by the Ottoman Empire sent permanent ambassadors to England and wanted to organize a crusade against the Turks (Reis and Vambery quoted in U.E. Uygur). The Turkish threat to Europe was followed with concern by the British in the Renaissance period because the Turks were shown among the primary enemies who would destroy England with the advance of the Ottomans to Europe (Crammer 99).

Beginning with the takeover of Constantinople (1453), Europe kept tabs on the Ottoman exploits in the east as the Empire quickly grew to reach the Hungarian plains. England was very similar in this respect. While in power, Elizabeth I and her Privy Council were given many alerts on Turkish troops and the capture of galley slaves, the results of campaigns and political stability on the Ottoman side including the Sultan's clan and authority; all leading up to a sort of early modern world intelligence-gathering system of for use by government (Roy 20). With the conquest of Hungary by the Ottoman Empire, there is a real fear in the Christian world that Europe would fall under the dominion of Islam (Easton 7-11). These events refined the ethnic, religious, and cultural separation and 'otherness' of the Ottoman Empire (Taşdelen 272).

In general, in the previous centuries before the 14th century, the relations of the British with the Turks were based on the Crusades, mercenary service for the gentlemen, love of Istanbul and the Palace, and visiting these places; however, in the 16th and 17th centuries Turkish-British (U.E. Uygur 3). The official relations of the Turks with the British took shape exceptionally slowly compared to other countries because the Kings of England saw Turks as enemies of Christianity for a long time (Karaca 12). It should be noted that attacks by Turkish pirates on English ships were also influential in confirming Henry's choice of approach (Talbot 19).

Although there was little knowledge about the trade activities in England, the Ottoman Turks preceding the Elizabethan era, English businessmen started to expand into the Mediterranean during the fifteenth century (Wood 1). British sailors also reached the Eastern Mediterranean, which they called the Levant, and started to trade with trade centres such as Crete, Cyprus, Tripoli, Chios, and Damascus (Talbot 19-20).

The English had therefore travelled to and traded in the Maghribian harbours considerably earlier than 1581, the year when commercial covenants were signed by Queen Elizabeth I and Sultan Murad III. These covenants were called ‘capitulations' by the English and ahid-name by the Ottomans (MacLean, *Of Pirates* 172). Contemporary printed material concerning Barbary pirates and the Ottoman Turks shows a heightened appetite for such news from this time (Hoenselaars 29). Earlier than the arrival of the Ottomans, English merchants had been carrying on their activities there. However, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, England strongly participated the trading in the Ottoman lands (MacLean, *Of pirates* 172).

The most important and one of the first documents belonging to the development period of Turkish-British relations is a concession document of 1553 given by Suleiman the Magnificent (Karaca 12). English traveller M. Anthony Jenkinson, who travelled to the Ottoman and East, meets Turks who were masters of maritime trade in 1546. Suleiman the Magnificent gave him the privilege of free movement in Turkish ports without being subject to any taxes, and he learned about maritime trade in this way (Jenkinson 36). In the document, a British merchant was given special rights, and it was stated that anyone who did not comply with the privileges would be punished horribly (Hakluyt *III:* 109-110). With the edict he received from Sultan Soliman, he got rid of his dependence on the Venetians and the French, gave them extra money, and gained the right to trade freely like them (Hakluyt *III*: 36-37). This concession created a limited source of contact between England and the Ottoman Empire

After 1580, Queen Elizabeth kept up the good relations with the Ottoman emperors like Sultan Selim II, Murad III, and Mehmed III or Great Viziers (Kurat, *Some* 25). However, Sultan Murad III's rising to power in 1574 was another pivotal incident in establishing Anglo-Ottoman relations (Burton, *Anglo-Ottoman* 131). As per Ottoman law, the enthronement of a new Sultan made it mandatory for all treaties and agreements to be upon review (Burton, *Anglo-Ottoman* 131). All foreign ships that came to the Ottoman territory were under the auspices of France (Burian, *Early Years* 3). The French sought to repeat their long-established right of consulage over much European shipping to Ottoman territory. However, the Empire lagged in granting the same (Burton, *Anglo-Ottoman* 131). England would now share in this gain. However,

the Ottoman Empire's policy of "we will be friends with anyone who is friendly to us" ended the French exclusivity (Burian, *Early Years* 3).

There was as much concern regarding establishing new trade associations since Spain had recently captured Portugal's overseas kingdom and shipping routes. This created harsh conditions for the export of woollen textiles that were crucial to the English economy. So, Britain needed to find a new trading era and new relationships with other countries (Fisher 151-61). Therefore, the only option for England's exchange with the Far East was the eastern route through the Ottoman Empire (Burian, *Early Years* 3). Consequently, the need for trade with Ottoman eastern Europe and India forced the British into relations with the Turks towards the end of the 16th century (Burian, *Early Years* 3).

The Ottomans were also interested in English raw materials and industrial products to gain essential materials like English stannum, slip, bullet, and also strike a deadly blow to the Venetian economy (İnalcık 366). The period between 1580 and 1650 was classified as a commercial venture with political and diplomatic benefits. However, it changed wholly, leading to far-reaching domestic and international consequences for England (Roy 1). Because of the result of the English Civil Wars, England was still included in the Mediterranean World, and its unmediated encounter with the Ottoman Empire and the Islamic World not only produced noteworthy changes in diplomacy and commerce but also gave way to an intense alteration in how the Ottomans and Islam were looked at by English society (Hodgson 59). For example, The British, who traded with the Ottoman Empire, emphasized that the Turks were excellent weavers and agricultural masters and praised their unique Turkish carpets, silk fabrics, cinnamon, pepper, saffron, sesame, olives, and grapes (Hakluyt *III:* 22-30). Also, the British learned how to make and dye clothes from the Turks through a kind of industrial espionage (U.E. Uygur 6).

The uncertainty of the pax "Turcica Anglo-Ottoman" alliance resulted from two objectives that were often conflicting with one another. England's quest to get hold of safety and profit in Ottoman territory is needed to reduce the recognizable threat of Turkish religious and military polluting through these incidents (Sohrawardy 22). In particular, the domestic and foreign policy followed by Queen Elizabeth I started a new era in Turkish-British relations; during this period, the Turks and the British were

united against the threat of Spain because both were under the threat of Spain (Karaca 12). For Britain to act as an independent state, Spain had to be neutralized. Queen Elizabeth, I needed strong allies from outside the Christian world to remove this threat. With the alliance with the world power of the 16th century, the Ottoman Empire, it would be possible to break through the Catholic siege (Karaca 12).

The Ottoman Empire was also under threat by the Catholic states in the Mediterranean. The Crusader Navy, which took action upon the conquest of Cyprus under the control of Venice in 1571, destroyed the Ottoman fleet in Lepanto in the same year (Karaca 13). In this case, it would be in her interest for the Ottoman Empire to cooperate with England against Spain (Karaca 12-3). In other words, rivalry with Spain had brought the two countries closer together, even though they were of different faiths. Already, Spain and Italy were suspicious of even an inkling of an Anglo-Ottoman alliance. This was perceived as a serious threat to Catholic supremacy in Europe (Brotton 8-9).

English businessmen attempted multiple times in the 1570s to acquire access to Ottoman traders directly (Skilliter 18-22). However, the English state's serious interest in Levantine trade started in 1578 when Sir Francis Walsingham, Elizabeth's main Secretary who considered the potential of trade with the Ottomans, wrote a "Memorandum on the Turkey Trada" (Burton, *Anglo-Ottoman* 132). Walsingham's memo fostered a relationship between England and the Ottoman Empire in a global and domestic contest. According to Walsingham, Anglo-Ottoman trade would continue to halt the demise of the English navy, which he and the Privy council regarded to be England's predominant line of defense for shielding the British Isles from catholic or outside attacks (Skilliter 28-30). Walsingham's message also provides a sharp awareness of the geopolitics of early present-day Europe. He discusses foreign policies and mercantile powers in-depth and illustrates how they may try to overcome England's efforts and become a player in the Mediterranean trading arena (Skilliter 28).

It was not the British state that came into contact with the Ottoman Empire, but a trade union called the Turkey Company (Burian, *Early Years* 4). After Jenkinson, direct trade with the Empire stopped again; for about twenty years, the British were again under the protection of a third state due to lack of organization (Burian, *Early*

Years 6). Nevertheless, two merchants from London, Edward Osborne, and Richard Stapler, sent their men, Joseph Clements and John Wight, to Istanbul. Clements and Wight returned to London after staying in Istanbul for a year and a half (Hakluyt *III:* 167-9). William Harborne, the British diplomat of the Ottoman Empire, went to Istanbul in 1578 as the agent of Edward Osborne and Richard Stapler (Burian, *Early Years* 6) and was assigned the first trading armistice between the Ottoman and Britain in 1580 (Sohrawardy 27) to oversee the business of Osborne and Staper in Istanbul (Hakluyt *III:* 167-9). Harborne came to Turkey dressed as a merchant since Queen Elizabethan failed to grant him official authorization to travel to the Ottoman Empire (Sohrawardy 28). Seventeenth-century English merchants persisted in currying favor with royalty. However, there was even a case of presenting this favor-seeking as a form of divine Protestant destiny. (MacLean, *Of Pirates* 174). The British started to appear more in cities such as Istanbul, Izmir, and Aleppo since the 17th century did not have any problems adapting to their environment, and according to the diary and travel notes of these merchants, they were positively affected by the Ottoman lifestyle and expressed by them (Kenan 35). In Daniel Goffman's works, we read that the views and narratives about the Ottoman world changed the perspective of Europe, especially England, towards this world to a certain extent (*Britons* 8-22).

The main objective of England's interest in Turkey was to obtain rights and privileges for trade-in Ottoman (Levante) (Kurat, *Some* 11). The official relations of England with the Ottoman Empire were shaped around the commercial activities of the Levant Company (Kurat, *The Beginning* 41-43). Edward Osborne and Richard Staper were allowed to find the Turkey Company on the 11th of September 1581 (Hakluyt *III:* 64-72). This union would have the right to hold trade with all the countries under the influence of the Ottoman sultan for seven years and to regulate it as it deems necessary (Burian, *Early Years* 17). Therefore, England's The Levant Company, a company created for the sole purpose of trading with the Turks, was established (Matar, *Islam* 45). Additionally, joining in with trade in the Near East would give England premium Mediterranean/Near Easter products, and English businessmen could offer these projects to mainland Europe (Skilliter 28). It is known that London merchants had serious wealth and capital by taking advantage of Ottoman privileges (Kenan 34).

Many English residents settled in the Ottoman Empire before Ambassador William Harborne came in late 1578 (Sohrawardy 27). Three applicants- Oliver and Nicholas Stile, along with Simon Lawrence, alleged that they had been trading in the Ottoman empire since 1563. So, they then asked for the same unique safeguards recently given to The Levant Company's members (Sohrawardy 28). These three men even claimed that that Edward Osborne and Richard Stapler, the company's owners, did not in fact discover trade in Mediterranean, and that it had been in thriving existence at least 50 years earlier (Skilliter 12). The Levant Company, previously known as the Turkey Company, was given a loyal license by Elizabeth in1581. English tradesmen had a trading monopoly with the Ottoman Empire, which created additional diplomatic agreements between England and the Ottomans (Vlami 2). Thus, starting from the 1580s, England became one of the states in contact with the Ottoman state (Burian, *Early Years* 3-4).

When Harborne reached Istanbul, he visited the Sultan and conveyed the Queen's good wishes, although it is not clear from Sultan Murat III. 's letter dated 1579 that the Queen sent any letter. On the contrary, there is a perception that wishes are communicated verbally (Hakluyt *III:* 169-71). Akdes Nimet Kurat evaluates that the Sultan's sending a letter without receiving any letter was not in accordance with the Ottoman diplomacy rules (*The Beginning* 15-6). The letter was sent by Sultan III. On the 15th of March 1579, Murat via Harborne was the first step in formalizing diplomatic relations between the two countries (Karaca 14).

Also, in the letter sent by Queen Elizabeth dated the 25th of October 1579, the original of which is in Latin, the Sultan is thanked for the letter he sent (Hakluyt *III:* 171-8). The Queen's letter was the most important development in the formalization of Turkish-British relations. The letters between Queen Elizabeth I and Murad III, which had considerable both on trade and on perceptions of the Muslim Empire, reveal that tolerance and approval were certainly achieved on the English side (Burton, *Traffic* 58).

Likewise, Elizabeth personalized her correspondence with Murad and dispersed with the standard formalities, beginning her letters as, "Elizabeth, by the grace of God, Queen of England, France and Ireland, defender of the faith, et cetera". Nowhere else did she write like this (Burton, *Anglo-Ottoman* 135).

In her writings, Elizabeth emphasizes that there is a likeness in both doctrinal and political management in Islam and Protestantism. By stressing "and yet singular," she underlines the Anglican concept of the Trinity as essentially monotheist. (Burton, *Anglo-Ottoman* 136). The two rulers have made the communication channels of the two countries open, albeit by correspondence (Karaca 14). After initial diplomatic contacts, Queen Elizabeth appointed William Harborne as England's ambassador to Turkey in 1582. In her decision to appoint, she stated:

> The most glorious and invincible Prince, the most powerful ruler of the country of Ottoman and the ruler of the Eastern Empire, Sultan Murat Khan III., we understand that Murat Khan has entered into an alliance and friendship with us and has given free movement to our subjects throughout his glorious Empire (Skilliter 25).

William Harborne went to Istanbul in 1583 with this order, and apart from the Sultan, he brought gifts to the grand vizier, the dome viziers, and the captain-pasha (Burian, *Early Years* 11) then the "official period" in Turkish-British relations began. According to Orhan Burian, the ambassador's duties had nothing to do with politics but with commerce (*Early Years* 10). However, this was related to commerce and politics because, with the support of Sadettin Efendi, he managed to prevent the agreement from being made in 1587. Thus, the Ottoman Empire supported Queen Elizabeth by continuing its struggle with Spain (Skilliter 14). The Ottoman navy, which kept the Spanish navy busy in the Mediterranean, gave England an advantage. In 1588, Spain suffered a significant defeat in the war between England and the Spanish navy, known as the "armada." This success also paved the way for England to become a great power on the seas (Martin and Parker 162-208).

Elizabeth, pointing out that this relationship will be beneficial for both sides, says that the exchange between them has made the intermediary countries rich until now and that if the Sultan gives free trade permission to the English merchant, both sides will lose their losses; In return, he promised to facilitate the Turkish merchant (Knolles 102) and to remain loyal to the Sultan in friendship (Burian, *Early Years*).

The production of Daborne's *A Christian Turn'd Turk* (1610) took place nineteen years after the founding of the Levant Company in 1581. Sir Robert Sherley praised the Turks' modernity and leadership in the world, as well as the characteristics which led to the fashion in Europe for all things Oriental (Chew 3). The subject of Europe's Islamization is a piece of the European concern of Turkey.

Since Harborne, the first British ambassador, was a devout Protestant Christian, he focuses on the religious hostility towards the Turks by all Christians at that time and rejoices in the shocks caused by the Iranian wars in Turkey, as it is clear from his letter; he even informs in one of his letters that if the Christian States unite, they can easily expel the Turks from Istanbul and that this would be possible during the war against Iran (Kurat, *Some* 5).

The two nations developed a friendly relationship, with England gaining commercial concessions. It was seen that Spain, which was politically and militarily a rival to both, was instrumental in the improvement of relations between the two countries. A serious moment in Anglo-Ottoman relations was Murad III's death. Most of Elizabeth's political and business relations with the Ottomans depended upon a genial personal relationship with Murad that went as far back as seventeen years, and in the recent past with Safiya Sultan, who after his passing was promoted to the title of Valide Sultan (Brotton 200-3).

After the Siege of Vienna in 1683, the relations between the two countries moved to a different dimension, with England playing a mediating role in ending the war against the Holy Alliance formed by Austria, Russia, Poland, and Venice, and with the signing of the Karlowitz Agreement (Heywood 33-42).

In the 18th century, observing Russia's efforts to reach the Mediterranean and its effect on the Balkans, Britain considered Russia a threat to its own economic and political power. By supporting the Ottoman Empire against Russia, England attempted to contain Russia to the north of the Black Sea (Karaca 19). England tried to shield the Ottoman Empire against the threat of Russian Tsardom, enabling the two countries to form a bond (Karaca 18). The first permanent Turkish ambassador in England was Yusuf Agah Efendi in 1793 (Kurat, *Some* 13). Members of the Conservative Party continued the conservation policy until the middle of the 19th century. This process started in 1875 and came out of the Liberal Party’s very negative propaganda campaign. At that time, both countries diverged from a foreign policy based on shared interests and moved to a diplomatic stance characterised by conflict (Karaca 19). Turkey's efforts to obtain lands in the Middle East and ultimately the First World War were where the two countries clashed. After establishing the Republic of Turkey, good relations have continued until today by returning to friendship from conflict (Karaca

28). Briefly, the Turkish-British diplomatic relationship that began in the 16th century has carried on into the present time (U.E. Uygur 3).

CHAPTER 2: *A CHRISTIAN TURN'D TURK*

The playwright Robert Daborne was born in 1580, probably in London (Longman). In 1610, he was one of the founders of the reformed 'Children of the Queen's Revels' (Cathcart 37). He attended in 1598 King's College, Cambridge (Eccles 29). In 1602 he married Anne Younger of Burlingham, Norfolk (Eccles 29). Not much is known of Robert Daborne, the playwright, but he constantly lacked the money needed for his craft (Bacon 345). So, maybe, he and his fellow playwright, John Mason, were arrested and brought to trial for stealing.

The history of his family contains a considerable number of lawsuits (Cathcart 37). Daborne's court documents illustrate the combative nature of the society in which he lived (Longman). For example, Daborne took his wife's parents and her six brothers to court over a lease they had promised him prior to his marriage (Phelps 6). Lawsuits against Daborne lodged in Chancery and letters exchanged between him and the entrepreneur Philip Henslowet provide us with much information in many accounts about Daborne's life in London at roughly the same time. (Longman). That is why it is possible to say that he was the author of several rather surprising letters addressed to Philip Henslowe over 1613 and 1614 (Cathcart 37).

Some of Daborne's letters tell of the play he was writing and when it would be given to Henslowe. One letter, in particular, was written by Nathan Field, who wants Henslow to save Philip Massinger and Robert Daborne from the jail where they were held and wants to ensure Henwslow that the following play's profits would surpass the initial investment of money. The letters given to Henslow illustrate how business transactions were conducted concerning buying scripts (Longman). However, Kaysar was the manager of the boy actors of Blackfriars and may have lent Daborne money to help with his playwriting, so an early connection is indicated (Eccles 29).

Daborne's role in theatre history predominantly derives from what is known about his personal life (Cathcart 37). Robert Daborne was a very dynamic playwright for a mere five years from 1611-around 1616. During that period, it was believed that he wrote a minimum of 6 plays (Longman). Of all Daborne's plays, only two printed versions remain: *A Christian Turn'd Turk* and *The Poor-Man's Comfort* (Bacon 345). The titles of the plays are known from Henslowe's letters (Longman). It seems that

there was the possibility of a play written jointly with Massinger and Field; however, a collaboration with Cyril Tourneur on *The Arraignment of London*, produced in late 1613, seems clear. It could be that this play was mentioned in Henslowe's letters as *The Bellman of London*. The three other plays named in the letters and produced between 1613 and 1614 were *Machiavel and the Devil*, *The Owl*, and *The She Saint*. None of the scripts survive (Longman). Daborne and William Rowley both wrote verses for John Taylor, The Nipping or Snipping of Abuses (1614) (Eccles 30). The two surviving plays of Daborne have, however, both recently been republished (Cathcart 37). Daborne comments in his own epistle to *A Christian Turned Turk* (1612) that he did work on other plays but received no formal credit for it (Eccles 29). Both the surviving plays involve complicated plots of marriage, sentences of death, pardons, scheming, and violent consequences, and both lead to a moral lesson at the end (Longman).

The Poor Man's Comfort, Daborne's second surviving play and one of his earlier ones, names the author as "Robert Dauborne Master of Arts" (Vitkus, *Three Turk Plays* 23). This is a Jacobean tragicomedy written around 1610-7 and printed in 1655. The play describes a nobleman who had his title, terrains, and wealth taken away. He lives with a shepherd, and he then takes the shepherd's daughter as his wife. However, he soon abandons her and the sheep he was entrusted to watch over when his wealth is returned. This causes immense suffering and leads up to death sentences and, after that, a royal pardon. There is a complex subplot involving matrimony, craziness, loss of ship, and treason (Longman). Wallace A. Bacon mentions that A.E.H. Swean could not find the source of *The Poor-Man's Comfort*, although he assumed that the play was based on an actual story and not made up by Daborne (345).

According to Wallace A. Bacon, Daborne's play's story is based on William Warner's *Syrinx*, which was firstly published as *Pan His Syrinx* to provide fuller information on events and flesh out the characters (345-7). In both Warner's and Daborne's versions, a previously exiled courtier receives a pardon with the return to power of a country's true ruler. Each version tells how the courtier has courted and won in marriage the daughter of a poor and honest fellow countryman, receiving the older man's accumulated money as a dower. However, when he returns from his period of exile, the courtier promptly leaves his wife and runs away with his father-in-law's money. Upon this, the older man goes to court to get justice for himself and his

daughter (Bacon 346). The secondary plot of Daborne's play, however, lacks the dynamic action of the primary (Bacon 348).

Daborne's sudden departure for Ireland around the end of 1616 or at the beginning of 1617, where he started a new life as a clergyman is worth noting as well (Longman). For the rest of his life, he never wrote another play. He died on March 23rd, 1628 (Longman).

There is a persistently negative portrayal of the 'Turk' in the plays written in the Early Modern English Period. There are some reasons for this negative portrayal such as being conquered by the Ottomans, fear of loss of territories and curiosity about the Ottomans' "exotic" life. In addition, the growing curiosity of British people towards all things regarding the Ottoman Turks and also their fear, prejudice, and anxieties about Islam inspired many leading Elizabethan playwriters to bring Turkish culture and the Islamic faith into their work, albeit from a hostile point of view.

People from the Western World were often encouraged to reject Islam through the anti-Islamic agenda of their rulers. In addition to this prejudice towards Ottoman Turks, another reason for displaying brutality to the Ottoman Turks in their plays is the fear of the Ottoman Empire in the Renaissance Period. Europeans increasingly feared the "Islamic bogeyman" (Vitkus, *Turning Turk in Othello* 147) as the Ottoman Empire moved westward. This is also partly because while Medieval Christianity treated the Islamic world as an anti-Christian other which had rejected Jesus as Messiah, the English were gradually widening their Mediterranean traffic and trade, and this meant that politicians and merchants alike were required to think more carefully about the old religious demons, if only for practical reasons (Bak 201). This led to a fear of Christians' conversion to Islam as Christians learned of the Ottoman Empire's tolerance policy towards non-Muslims. Hence the appearance of conversions from Christianity to Islam in the works of Elizabethan plays and the presentation by many Elizabethan playwrights of Islam as a threat and something to be feared. This was the reaction to the Anglo/Ottoman exchanges and their fear and anxiety towards Ottoman Turks during the Renaissance period. Scholars of London's West End theatres revived the general public's enthusiasm for the dramas based on "The Great Turk" and the exotic - by which was implied sexual - pleasures of "Eastern Promise" (MacLean, *On Turning Turk* 124).

In *A Christian Turn'd Turk*, Turks are therefore mostly portrayed negatively. This play clearly demonstrates the confusion around and bias against Turks, as representatives of a rival religion, found particularly in the England of Daborne's day. The play very clearly reflects the considerable prejudice towards Turks and also the English perspective of that time. The play has as its focus the idea that, with the power of the Ottoman Empire as great as it was at the time, conversion to Islam was in effect signing oneself over to a rival foreign power as well as to a rival foreign religion.

In his play *A Christian Turn'd Turk*, Daborne portrays how Islam has often been a focal point for discord and debate as Englishmen were fascinated by Turkish customs and costumes. He puts great emphasis on how becoming a convert became somewhat of an epidemic in Elizabethan times (Al-Olaqi, *The Fear* 1). His play, *A Christian Turn'd Turk*, not only charted the rise of the Ottoman Empire but also put it into its cultural context (MacLean, *On Turning Turk* 125), and the play exemplifies Islam from the understood view of Elizabethan Britain. The play's title has both religious and political implications, the phrase "turn'd Turk" was often being used to mean a false or unreliable person as well as one who had rejected the Christian faith (Şenlen-Güvenç, *A Foe to All Christians* 50). The play envisages fundamental English identity by building a framework in which any wish to convert to Islam is rejected on moral and patriotic grounds (MacLean, *On Turning Turk* 123) and functions as a rebuttal of any such temptation. Identities are blurred, and an erotic element creeps in with the addition of Islam to the mix in the play (Vitkus, *Three Turk Play* 37). In the play, the possibility of religious conversion is presented as a threat, along with the opportunities and ways of resisting the menace and holding firm to one's Christian faith and one's patriotic identity as an Englishman. Although Daborne dramatized the life of John Ward, the famous English pirate, and even shows some aspects of Ottoman life to be highly desirable, he nevertheless requires his audience ultimately to reject it (MacLean, *On Turning Turk* 123-4). Daborne's play effectively and publicly sensationalizes the fear prevalent at the time of such potential to convert.

Robert Daborne was working on his play at the time, *A Christian Turn'd Turk*, the story of Ward as a topic had already been made famous by other writers (MacLean, *On Turning Turk* 131), piracy being a popular subject to its effect on English trade (Vitkus, *Three Turk Plays* 28). *A Christian Turn'd Turk* bears the same similarity as a few early 17th century tragicomedies. These predominately affirm

Christian virtue by presenting the dominant adventurism and the savvy business atmosphere of the main Christian character, John Ward. The play has many specific differences as it focuses on an unredeemed criminal as the main storyline, in contrast to the other parts of the tale. This position leads up to the intensity of the shameful end of Ward himself, as he is left alone on foreign shores, his friends become enemies (Ellinghausen 179). Often, the narratives portrayed in these tragicomedies focus on the concepts of risk and redemption, rewarding the protagonist. However, Daborne's play chronicles a story with a fatal ending, in which the main character falls after his endeavours to achieve wealth and status abroad are unsuccessful (Ellinghausen 179).

Robert Daborne was inspired by two pamphlets: Andrew Barker's *A True and Certaine Report of the Beginning* and the anonymous *News from Sea* (Jo Ann 110). Both stories were published in 1609 and portrayed the adventures of two pirates who sailed around North Africa, which at the time, in the early 17th century, was part of the Ottoman Empire. In both Barker's pamphlet and *Newes from Sea*, we see Ward shown as an individual who is well-versed in naval war, supervision of crew, and the art of diplomacy and at the same time showing the negative side of his character, in particular his heavy drinking, his habit of sodomy and his atheism. Because much if not most of the written information from the time about Ward had as its source the *"Newes from the Sea"* which portrays Ward in a negative way (Şenlen-Güvenç, *A Foe to All Christians* 40).

Daborne made relatively liberal use of these sources, adding details not contained in the original's history (Vitkus, *Three Turk Plays* 26), such as punishing Ward for marrying the fictitious Muslim beauty Voada and then trying to murder her, while completely neglecting actual historical versions from the time, for example, Andrew Barker's *A True and Certaine Report of the Beginning*. Instead, Daborne concocts a story that permits him to portray the death of Ward as both necessary to the moral of the tale and as providing a sense of righteous vindication to its Western audience (MacLean, *On Turning Turk* 131). Daborne reworks Ward's real and actual biography to underpin his educational intention - woe betide not only men who attempt to murder women but also Western men who marry out. Not only this, but the audience would have understood Ward was alive and thriving at the time of the play's presentation and further aware of the irony of his dramatic "death" (Vitkus, *Three Turk Plays* 39).

According to Gerald MacLean, Daborne invokes the image of Othello, the jealous Moor, presumably in another attempt to distinguish "Englishness" as fact not a choice and quite distinct from the Muslim "other" (*On Turning Turk* 124). Daborne thus exploits both Shakespeare's play and the printed reports of Ward's life, which aimed to defend English naval dominion regardless of the hypocrisy of praising the piratical lifestyle (MacLean, *On Turning Turk* 128-29). In both Shakespeare's and Daborne's plays, the image of "Moors" has a great deal more to do with English perceptions than with Muslim realities (MacLean, *On Turning Turk* 127). In both plays, the characters marry out across racial and religious boundaries and end up murdering their wives. Both are duped by deceitful and rebellious subordinates, Iago and Gallop (MacLean, *On Turning Turk* 128). Daborne looks less deeply into psychology and instead shows us the consequences of "breaking ranks" culturally and religiously.

The play was first published in 1612 and and it was most likely created for Rosseter's Queen's Revels company to perform at the Whitefriars Hall theatre indoors (Vitkus, *Three Turk Plays* 24). The play consists of a prologue, 16 component scenes, and an epilogue. Although Daborne makes his dramatic intentions plain, there were some textual difficulties in his play, identified by intellectuals since that time, such as the difficulty in following the printed text of his work and the fact that his list of characters fails to match the actual characters of the play (MacLean, *On Turning Turk* 124). Fortunately for Daborne, Daniel Vitkus has provided us with a modernized version in his *Three Turk Plays*, which almost certainly saved this work from being forgotten (MacLean, *On Turning Turk* 124).

A Christian Turn'd Turk is about the destiny of English Captain Ward and his divine punishment for his crimes, including, the crime of 'turning Turk.' The play tells the dramatic tale of a man who puts romantic passion ahead of loyalty to the religion of his birth and only then fears the wrath of God, its principal themes are; religious conversion, Islam vs. Christianity, a nascent Orientalism, and the "Exotic" other, presented to us through a story of piracy. Daborne places someone much more familiar and identifiable in the title role, instead of an imaginary Moor or Venetian. The spectacle of English Captain Jack Ward seeking to convert to a foreign faith but discovering that his English national identity is stronger is then presented to the audience (MacLean, *On Turning Turk* 128)

Daborne portrays Ward as failing to identify with "English values" in his conversion to Islam, a cultural and spiritual misstep that cannot go unpunished. In the play, Ward's adventurous life in Tunis is mixed with historical inaccuracy and a hotchpotch of different ethnic and religious characters, with English Christian pirates Ward and Dansiker.

The author shifts societal anxiety about the "vagrancy" felt in the 17th century to a Mediterranean setting. This new geolocation with its social and economic differences leads to new social change possibilities for the most economically challenged English members in this area. Such was the case of John Ward and his men (Ellinghausen 180). The first five scenes are set at sea, and their main subject is the crime of piracy. The rest of the play is set in Tunis, and it is here, in this multicultural but Ottoman-controlled North African trade centre, that its religious element comes to the fore. Thus, the play's main focus is Ward's conversion to Islam from Christianity and his fictional dramatic end (Şenlen-Güvenç, *A Foe to All Christians* 50). Since the play's central premise is Ward's conversion, a great deal of it is devoted to the successful attempts to persuade and manipulate him into his decision to "turning Turk" (Vanwagoner 18). The play, therefore, emphasizes not only the desertion of one's culture and country but also the conversion of faith, which raises several questions.

Ward and his crew are pirates, and the opening scene of *A Christian Turn'd Turk* begins by showing the protagonist, Captain Ward, playing cards with French merchants in their ship off the coast of Ireland, talking about life and their various fortunes. When the French gentlemen Ferdinand and Albert understand that they are not merchants, that they have been betrayed. The Frenchmen are then quickly taken captive. Although Ferdinand offers them money in exchange for their freedom, Ward had different plans for them such as possessing (having) them in their vessel instead of their gold. However, Ferdinand rejects Ward's proposal to join him and clarifies his view of piracy's destructive effect on European economies. On the other hand, the merchant ship of Monsieur Davy tries to seek refuge on the ship captured by Ward's crew as it escapes from Dutch pirate crew who have pursued them for three days. Even though Ward was victorious, he appears in the scene "with a slain friend" in a depressed state. After fighting with Monsieur Davy’s, Ward's men end up seizing the ship. Ward brutally kills 20 people of the French crew and take Lemot, Ferdinand, Raymond, and his two sons whom they plan on selling on the slave market and. The

rival pirate ship's captain, Francisco and Ward are duelling because Francisco wants half of their money. However, several Ward's men and Gismund directed by a pirate named Gallop came up against him, left with the plunder and a seized little ship, and travelled towards Tunis. Ward and Francisco find themselves cheated, stop fighting, have decided on what should have been their shares, and agree to follow Gallop and Gismund to take back the plunder in Tunis.

The changing point of the plot comes when the setting changes from on board Ward's ship, at sea, to dry land in the city of Tunis. One of the important places in the play is the house of Benwash in Tunis, where a Jewish merchant serves as the financial front for the pirates engaged in the slave trade. Benwash, is portrayed as the ravenous, merciless Jew with no conscience. Gallop also has gone to Tunis, to Benwash's house and Ward has forgiven him. Gallop praises Voada's beauty, Agar's sister, to Ward and introduces Benwash's family, Agar, Voada, and their brother, Crosman, all Turks. The 7th scene starts in Ward's house in Tunis, and the Governor of Tunis appears. When Ward says, "I know no country I can call home" (7.1.13), Crosman offers his stay in Tunisia. Benwash then takes the opportunity of urging Ward to become a Muslim, saying that changing your religion does not mean anything. However, Ward is still unsure and mentions that if he changes his religion, it will be for money and good work; this will not be a real conversion. He is also not used to the settled life, especially in a foreign culture, so he is afraid. Ward explains his love exaggeratedly with lovely words, just like Romeo does. At first, she says she does not believe in him, at the end, he accepts the conversion, he is happy to marry such a beautiful woman.

Dansiker decides to burn all the pirates' ships and Benwash's house. In the 10th scene, Gallop and Agar appear together from the bedroom above. Benwash realises his wife's and Gallop's adultery. While Benwash's house has been burning, all the ships in the harbour have been burning too. Benwash wants revenge on his wife and Gallop for their adultery and wants Rabshake to kill them. Then, he kills all of them. Benwash then tells a false story. Talking about the pirates and Dansiker, Benwash realizes that Dansiker is amongst them and disguised. Then, Benwash points to Dansiker and calls him one of those who attacked his family which he did himself, as the audience knows. Dansiker attacks Benwash with the knife, and the others understand that he is Dansiker. By that time, Benwash is seriously injured and wants to confess his sins. He then says that Dansiker was right to attack him because of his

wicked deeds. He accepts that he killed three people because of their betrayals. Mufti tries to persuade him to accept Islam. However, he prefers to die instead of becoming Muslim (turning Turk).

On the other hand, as Voada loves Fidelio, who is Alizia, she shoots Raymond thinking he would come between them. Voada thinks that Ward killed Fidelio so she wants to take revenge on Ward and calls the Janissaries asking to be saved from this terrible man. A condition of Ward's conversion was that he give up weapons, by attacking Voada (Voada's slander) he has therefore broken that condition as well as being guilty of attempted murder. At the end, Ward lives an epiphany when the governor and his soldiers come to Ward's castle because after Dansiker takes all his wealth because without it, he is of no use to the Governor of Tunis. He is now an outsider both to the people of his birth and to his adopted people, like Benwash, the converted Jew (Shmygol 125). Voada wants Ward to go to prison and wants justice. Ward wants to understand her hatred for him after all he has done, having given up on everything he had. Voada sympathizes with his arguments, but her heartlessness wins out, and she mocks him with laughter. Ward, now enraged, stabs Voada. After stabbing Voada, Ward stabs himself too.

The Prologue of *A Christian Turn'd Turk* announces that the audience may enjoy the play but mentions that the play does not have a positive subject because innocent people will die. The audience are then shown a tale of reckless abandonment of one's own country and religious identity which leads inevitably to harm to self and others:

> Our subject's low, yet to your eyes presents
> Deeds high in blood, in blood of innocents;
> Transcends them low, and your invention calls
> To name the sin beyond this black deed falls.
> What heretofore set others' pens a work
> Was Ward turned pirate; ours is Ward turned Turk. (The Prologue 3-8)

The prologue's central theme is that Ward's turning "Turk" is a "low" decision which means it is a wrong decision. Daborne here states that he aims to change the already constituted conception of Pirate Ward and wrote about his becoming a pirate, with a new focal point on the 'Turk' Ward. In this way, Daborne alters our focus: Ward

the pirate, as a thief and a murderer, is bad enough, but Ward the 'Turk' who abandoned Christianity for Islam, sinks even lower and shows himself even worse as if that were possible. This enables Daborne to use the structure of a ballad written about Ward's life to couch his essentially political message in moral terms. We are invited to understand that Ward is already a "marked man" (MacLean, *On Turning Turk* 131).

When piracy was seen from a moral perspective, the Jacobean audience was not impressed much. It was not an original idea as piracy had always been slightly ambiguous, and the distinction between pirate and explorer was often blurred. Aside from this, people had a "sense of popular admiration" for pirates and adventurers (Vitkus, *Three Turk Plays* 30). Daborne knew this, so Ward was attributed with other degenerative characteristics aside from simple piracy, demonstrated throughout the play (Vitkus, *Three Turk Plays* 31)

Some critics comment on Daborne's perspective towards piracy related to the play. For example, Mark Hutchings points out Daborne's lack of interest in examining the possible reasons behind an individual's abandonment of his nation and faith (*Acting Pirates* 103). Unlike Hutchings, according to Laurie Ellinghausen, Daborne had a strong interest in the serious issues surrounding culture, social dynamics, and economic ideas. These elements create the interest in the pirates' story that manifests as the interactions between the characters. The tone illustrates the tensions and lack of power and control and the fresh opportunities that are now opened for English Seamen (*We are of the Sea* 192). Hence, Daborne's interest in piracy is seen in the play. Regarding the piracy element in the play, Daborne depicts a world that contains "oppression and poverty versus "freedom and equality" (Ellinghausen 195). Daborne also tries to corroborate his claim with the piracy elements in the play that turning Turk is worse than being a pirate.

From Ward's perception, "home" does not always have to be where a person begins his life. "Home" is a place that will nurture a person, a place where a person will be able to embrace his dreams and make them come true with "means equal unto their minds." (1.38) Ward and his crew often disassociate from England, and indeed in response to Davey's question about the pirates' country of origin, Gismund answers, "We are of the Sea" (2.2.35). "The Sea" is a multi-national web of illegal trade which turns the pirates into their own agents and provides them with "means equal unto their

minds." (1.31). Likewise, Ward informs the Governor of Tunis that "I know no country I can call home," (7.1.13), driving the point home that he is an alienated English subject torn apart from his native land to pursue more important things. This distance becomes the predominant basis for his identity that aligns with his gain (Ellinghausen 194). By abandoning both England and the Christian faith, Ward's demonstrates a need for seafaring people to forget where they came from (Shmygol 125). Ward reflects both the dangers of taking part in piracy and wandering out too far from his home (Shmygol 125).

Gismund, one of the Ward's men, refers to Wapping, a place in London where many pirates were hanged. Gismund alludes that these followers inevitably will have to pay "tribute" at Wapping once they are caught or punished. At the same time, Gismund's representation of Ward also foreshadows many opposing concepts central to the play: personal freedom on the one hand and finding oneself alone on the other. Furthermore, the contrast between concepts of manliness and Ward's eventual castration. The brutal anatomical change reflects the brutal tortures endured by the pirates at Wapping (Shmygol 126). Rather than labelling it as a permanent resting place, where his corps will remain for eternity, it is perceived Gismund as a temporary tribute that frees pirates because it only enslaves their bodies except their spirits, rather than labelling it as a permanent resting place, where his corps will remain for eternity. Ward's physical and spiritual elimination from nation and Christendom is foreshadowed once more. (Shmygol 126).

Although Robert Daborne's play, *A Christian Turn'd Turk*, includes real historical figures such as John Ward and Dansiker, it doesn't show real history and actual events correctly. In the play, John Ward is an English pirate who converts to Islam to marry a Turkish woman, Voada. But then, Ward, who converts from his religion for the Turks, is both betrayed by them and punished by losing everything and dies at the end of the play.

In real life, very differently from his fictional character, Ward achieves wealth, independence, and ultimately freedom. This hidden message is however buried under the fiction of failure and death (Ellinghausen 187). Therefore, it can be seen that although the main character of the play is based on the historical figure of John Ward, it is very different from the real man. In reality, John Ward, known by different names

such as 'Birdy,' 'Sharky,' and 'Sparrow' (Milton *John Ward*) was an essential and popular figure not only in Ottoman navy history but also in the Jacobean period (Şenlen-Güvenç, *A Foe to All Christians* 37). He was an essential English captain of the Elizabethan period who pirated in the seas around Catholic Spain's vessels (Fuchs, *Faithless Empires* 45) until King James I of England, who ascended the throne in 1603, put an end to the war with Spain in 1604. However, King James I issued a royal decree revoking permission to attack enemies, ending privateering. After that royal decree, John Ward became 'penniless' (Bak 10). That is why like John Ward, many British sailors had to find other backup revenue as they were banned from capturing enemy merchant vessels and seizing their goods (Şenlen-Güvenç, *A Foe to All Christians* 37). He started his piracy when, with many other sailors, he came upon a foreign ship and started attacking its merchants. In 1606, Ward and a local ruler Uthman Bey struck up an agreement to oversee operational base in Tunis, employed as "a Barbary Corsair"- a private citizen working on behalf of the Ottoman Empire (Bak 149). Then, he officially became a Muslim (Ellinghausen 183), and was the subject of the English writer Robert Daborne's play *A Christian Turn'd Turk*, which was staged in London in 1612. He took a Sicilian renegade as a second wife (Vitkus, *Three Turk Plays* 27). Quite differently from the character featured in the play *A Christian Turn'd Turk*, Ward survived to the age of 70 and therefore did not take his own life, unlike his fictionalized characterization in Daborne's play (Vitkus, *Three Turk Plays* 27). Andrew Barker also stated how Captain John Ward lived in real: "in a most princely and magnificent state" in Tunis, while dressed in "curious and costly" clothing (*A True* 16).

On the other hand, in the same play Dansiker regrets his earlier sins as a pirate and can die as a good Christian by rejecting the offer to ‘turning Turk’, even though he couldn’t take his pardon from the king and so could not be formally forgiven. However, looking at the historical veracity of these events, unlike the play, Dansiker really did receive a royal pardon and afterwards entered service as a privateer for the French and continued to rob ships that were under the Spanish and English flags (Vitkus, *Three Turk Plays* 31).

Daborne sets Dansiker up as a moral and patriotic man who is a foil to Ward's selfish pursuit of his ambitions and desires. Unlike the selfish, reckless Ward, Dansiker is portrayed as an honourable Christian man. The conflation of morality with nationalism by Daborne means that Ward is once again displaying his weaknesses

(MacLean, *On Turning* 132). They both were pirates, but Dansiker regrets his piracy and decides to work for his country's sake and also never gives up his identity and religion. Gerald MacLean sees this as Daborne's offering us another kind of European and Christian - to show that Ward's fate could have been different had he just kept to his faith (MacLean, *On Turning* 134). Dansiker's rejection of piracy in the play, as a foil to Ward's conversion, shows the audience those pirates can redeem themselves by working for the nation, not just for themselves (Shmygol 125). This scene demonstrates the comparison between the Dutchman's reform and Ward's resistance to his native English country (MacLean, *On Turning* 134).

If the concept of Turkishness is examined with regard to the play, it can be said that Turks are mostly portrayed as immoral and as 'bad' people. This is shown repeatedly during the play. There are three characters of Turkish origin: Crosman, and the siblings Agar and Voada. Crosman and the others (the Governor and Benwash) try to use Voada's female charms to manipulate Ward to stay in Tunis; this reflects badly on the character of Crosman which reveals itself as immoral and cunning. Through Crosman, the governor of Tunis and Voada, the audience is shown an image of the Turks' fondness for money and luxury because it is made clear also that the reason, they all want Ward to stay is that he is, at that point, wealthy.

The relationship between Crosman and Ward is based on self-interest: Crosman wants Ward to stay in Tunis because of his wealth and Ward wants to marry Voada, Crosman's sister. This self-interested relationship between them reflects the arrangements arrived at by Elizabethan England and the contemporary Ottoman Empire, because after the trade agreement between Elizabeth I and Murat III, it continued under the reign of Murat III and lasted smoothly until 1699 (Karaca 15). Trading was therefore based on the self-interest of both. On the other hand, the relationship of Benwash and Crosman is one of economics and ideology (Vitkus, *Three Turk Plays* 38). Another example of this can be the connection with the Muslim governor and Benwash in the play shows an awareness of the special relationships between the Jewish merchants and the Ottoman officials. Daborne's play goes further by connecting Jewishness to a rejection of religious and national ties in favour of the pursuit of profit (Streifer 30). At the time, this was the stereotypical attitude to Jews in Europe, and Daborbe's play draws heavily on this stereotype. To this European anti-Semitism is added the proposition that this rich Jewish merchant converts to Islam

ostensibly to shield his young from the Muslim men of Tunis (Vitkus, *Three Turk Play* 37). Jews featured prominently in the Ottoman Empire, and the play to some extent reflects this, albeit in a disparaging form (Vitkus, *Three Turk Play* 38). In this play and this chronological age, the economy depended on the Mediterranean economy, creating a meeting of cultures that favoured cultural relativism and diminishing differences, whether financial, social, or religious (Hutchings 97).

Turkish women are also generally portrayed in *A Christian Turn'd Turk*, through the characters of Agar and Voada, as immoral, as people not to fall in love with, lecherous, lustful, deceptive, greedy, lovers of money and self-seeking, people who do not keep their word, and untruthful. Turkish women are represented as immoral and lustful because Voada first likes Fidelio (Alizia) when she sees her, then after when she meets with Dansiker, she also flirts with him. While married to Ward, she continues flirting with Fidelio (Alizia). Daborne also shows the Muslim wife as not only lecherous and venal, but mean and cruel for good measure. We understand this after Voada learns of Ward's loss of wealth. She tells him: ‘‘But I hate thee more /Than all thy wealth made me love thee before’’ (11.23-4). Turkish women are further portrayed as liars and unreliable in the play when Voada, who first forced Ward to become a Muslim (turning Turk) for her own interests, states that her religion will not forgive him any more than she will. The charge sheet extends to murder when Voada kills innocent Raymond, fulfilling the prophecy of the Prologue that innocent people will die because of Ward's conversion.

Voada seems to represent a persistent Western stereotype of a Muslim woman as venal, lascivious, and personally difficult - Daborne has taken care to show us her character as shallow, lustful, and alternately crude and manipulative before Ward even meets her (Kahf 5). The casting of 'Turkish' women as sexually incontinent and the doubly cross-dressed boy actors as girls as boys fit perfectly into the framework (MacLean, *On Turning* 136). Once Ward has fallen for Voada, Ward improbably becomes an innocent patsy in her hands, brought low by a beautiful but shallow and false Eastern woman. His ambition to become a despotic Oriental turns to dust in the audience's eyes (MacLean, *On Turning* 137).

Just as Voada is unfaithful, at least in intention, to her husband, her sister Agar also betrays her husband with Gallop and here Daborne characterises Turkish women

again as adulterous. Agar is also portrayed as backstabbing and untrustworthy, because when Benwash wants help from her to take revenge on Gallop, despite her claim to love Gallop, she agrees to help Benwash to punish him. In addition, when Agar is confronted with Gallop, she says Gallop forced her into sexual intercourse, but she is lying, and by implication, Turks in general are painted as untruthful and liars.

On the other hand, virtuous Christian woman, Alizia, still disguised as a boy, wishes herself dead to protect her freedom and virginity. Gerald MacLean identifies this scene as Daborne's use of the dramatic/comic vehicle of "boy disguised as a girl disguised again as man," which was common at the time because women still did not perform on stage (MacLean, *On Turning* 133). With this scene, Daborne deliberately sets up Muslim or "Turk" women as overtly sensual, venal, and scheming and Christian women as virtuous and pure. Daborne also tries to show Christian women's purity and chastity. So, Daborne seems to work in a further theme of female duplicity in two forms: the virtuous European "damsel in distress" disguising herself as male, and the 'Turkish' female who openly lusts after and pursues men (MacLean, *On Turning* 132-3). In addition, the European men's lust for Muslim women betrays the shallowness of any attraction they may feel for the religion itself. Despite this, the Muslim woman is held to blame for her attractiveness, as if only a "pure" Christian woman has any such right in Daborne's world view (Lublin 157).

This play reveals the Early Modern English mentality concerning women in the other two Abrahamic religions which are originated with the Prophet Ibrahim, Jews and Christians. At that time, people saw women as weak and sexually incontinent unless strictly controlled by men. According to their perspective, women were not trusted. For example, Ferdinand explains that 'lust and women' lead to hell, and women cause men trouble. Here, Daborne shows all women as evil, not only the "Turk" ones. However, his focus in the play shows Turkish women as even worse.

This mentality would have almost certainly influenced Daborne because Muslim women and, in general, men in the play see women as second-class and not to be trusted. Daborne shows himself to be very much a part of the world he was born into. All the men represented in the play, whether Christians, Jews, or Muslims, make frequent insulting comments and approaches towards the women characters and refer insultingly to women in general, reflecting the period's mentality towards women.

In addition to the immorality of Turks are shown in the play, Turks are also described as unhealthy compared with Christians who live better:

> Altogether! What's the reason else that the Turk
> and Jew is troubled (for the most part) with gouty legs,
> and fiery nose? To express their heartburning.
> Whereas the Puritan is a man of upright calf, and clean nostril. (6.1.8-10)

Here, Rabshake compares Turks and Jews with Christians and prizes Dansiker, a Christian pirate, for his good health. Daborne continues to show Turks negatively, with Alizia who tries convincing to Ward not to convert to Islam. She says that Ward is turning Turk just for expedience, so that he can live in Tunis. So, she calls it "purchas [ing] a little shameful being here, your case'' (7.1.206), considering that Ward risked being hanged if he returned home. In the view of the author of this study, Ward's decision to convert is a practical one. Alizia is also saying that Turks also despise ''runagetes'' (7.1.214). No one appreciates thieves, so they need to escape being condemned to slavery by the Ottomans. She continues reject the idea of 'turning Turk' and asks Ward: ''How can he, being so near to hell?'' (7.1.223). So, for Alizia being Turkish / Muslim is very close to being in hell. Turks are also mentioned by Dansiker, who calls Turks ''pagan'' and "villain" (16.2.199). Ward goes so far as to describe the Turks as 'pitiful' (15.3.119), although this claim is in itself pitiful considering the trouble Ward is in - he is projecting about his own situation. He has lost all his wealth, his wife thinks he is the murderer of the "man" she loves, Fidelio (Alizia), and he is about to be arrested. Ward's situation is indeed pitiful.

There are many scenes in the play where Turks and Muslims are reflected in very negative ways through Benwash's words. For example, Benwash says: ''I sware as I was a Turk, and I will cut your throat as I am a Jew'' (16.1.69). Benwash breaks his oath "as a Turk", killing Agar, and through him Turks are portrayed as treacherous, liars and people who do not keep their promises. Benwash, again: ''To rob you as I am a Turk and cut your throat as I am a Jew'' (16.1.106), Turks here being, by implication, as thieves and villains. Just before he dies Benwash declares, "though I lived a Turk, I die a Jew" (16.2.181), namely as mean, unreliable, a liar, immoral, a backstabber, self-seeker, and a murderer, referring to the many wicked acts Benwash has committed under the Turkish identity. Here Jews come off slightly better than

Turks, although Benwash, like Ward, was neither true to his original faith or to his adopted one.

Daborne used the term "Turks" instead of Muslims because, in Daborne's time, Ottoman Empire was the greatest Muslim empire and controlled most of the Muslim territories. Hence "Turk" became synonymous with "Muslim" in European thinking. However, at the same time, to 'turn Turk' refers not only to conversion to Islam but also refers to the various ethnicities governed at the time by the Ottoman Empire as well as the 'naturall Turkes' (Schmuck 12). The phrase 'Turning Turk' converted into a euphemism for this change of religious identity. Any European who converted to Islam was referred to as having "turned Turk" (B. Lewis, *Islam* 7). At times when the Ottoman Turks were so powerful and conquering Europe and many places, so Europeans conflated Islam with Turks; thus, Darbone's use of the term "Turk" referred not only to people from Turkey but also refers to from any Muslim country due to the many Muslim countries and nations were under the rule of the Ottoman Empire. In addition, the trade with the Ottoman Empire in the Renaissance period, most Christians only know the Ottomans as Muslims, since at the time people's sources were too limited to learn more of life outside Britain. However, although Tunisia was under the rule of the Ottoman Empire at the time the play was written, the country was populated by people of Arab and Berber extraction. Daborne was almost certainly uninformed about this. So, he prefers to use ‘turning Turk’ in his play’s many scenes. For example, Benwash says:

> Tush, my wife, man! Thou hast forgot how dear
> I bought my liberty: renounced my law,
> The Law of Moses, turned Turk-- all to keep
> My bed free from these Mahometan dogs. (6.2.68-71)

Benwash relates that he chose his freedom through converting Islam and rejection of ‘‘the law of Moses’’. Benwash is in fact Jewish and is also an outlaw who claims that he converted to Islam to protect his wife from the supposedly more lustful Muslim men. Apart from Benwash and Ward, another character in the play has turned Turk, the governor of Tunis. Further use of the term ‘turning Turk’ instead of converting Islam comes from the Governor of Tunis: ‘‘What difference in me as I am a Turk and was a Christian?’’ (7.1.29-30) and ‘‘As we did-- turn Turk’’ (7.1.57). The

governor offers to increase Ward's status, and Crosman and Benwash try to convince him to convert to Islam as Ward is wealthy person. Benwash encourages Ward, mentioning the role of Ottoman Sultan's admiral: ''I live to see him the Sultan"s admiral'' (7.1.20). Benwash also praises Ward, using the term 'Turk' to refer to the Islamic religion: ''Christian or Turk, you are more wise, I know, Than with religion to confine your hopes'' (7.1.25-26). There are other examples of using the term 'turn Turk' to refer to changing religion. One is when Voada tries to convince Ward to convert, saying: ''Turn Turk-- I am yours'' (7.1.123). In another instance, Dansiker says: ''Ward turned Turk? It is not possible'' (9.1).

Crosman says that there is no obligation to be Turk to work in Tunis; foreigners may also work there: ''Why not as well as the great customer, My allied kinsman Governor, neither born Turks'' (7.1.21-22). In terms of ethnicity, the governor of Tunis is not a Turk, mentioned here. The Ottoman Janissary system conscripted boys from conquered Christian lands and trained them as an elite corps in the service of the Ottoman Empire. Daborne might be referring to this system.

However, at the end, Ward decides to convert both as he loves Voada and as he cannot go back home. In other words, this is not a real religious conversion but rather a matter of convenience for a stateless person (MacLean, *On Turning* 132). MacLean mentions that Daborne's Ward is ruined by his wish to combine conversion benefits without going through it. He rejects the idea of a higher authority, yet in Daborne's eyes, the rightful authority of Ward's King and country do trouble him (MacLean, *On Turning* 132). After Ward sees Voada, Ward rather untypically perhaps falls head over heels, oblivious to her venal motivations. This improbable event again serves as a vehicle for Daborne's insistence on the dangers of abandoning one's national loyalties (MacLean, *On Turning* 137). In the play, both Ward's and Benwash's decisions about the conversion show the relationships between sexual temptation and religion. Ward is clearly shown to being ruled by desire rather than by good sense (Vitkus, *Three Turk Plays* 38).

Before Ward's conversion ceremony, swears on her God. Prophet Muhammed is demonstrated as a God here; however, in Islam, Muhammed is not a god, only a prophet. Daborne evidently held traditional Christian prejudices to Islam. Daborne was confused about this subject - confusing Muhammad with the divinity of Jesus in

Christian belief. With these words, Ward begins to give the green light to Islam. Ward is confused and changes his mind very easily about leaving his religion and identity so, we see such characteristics as self-contradiction, uncertainty, unreliability, and deceitfulness typified as "feminine" and "Turkish" (MacLean, *On Turning* 132-3).

The 8th scene opens with the conversion ceremony of Ward. The Chorus says that everything Ward has done until now was ‘white’ including, presumably, selling people into slavery and murder and theft, and his conversion to Islam is ‘black’. Turning Turk is shown as the worst thing in the world because in many early scenes of the piracy is shown as a very cruel thing for innocent people. The pirates are presented as self-seeking and hard-hearted, ‘‘bloodthirsty monster’’ (1.86). In the play, a French merchant, Ferdinand mentions that pirates are criminals, stealing from widows and orphans. English pirates are portrayed not only by Ferdinand but also by Davy, a French shipmaster, as an "infection," an evil corrupting the essence and spirit of their country. Even Ferdinand and Raymond’s two sons, captured by Ward and sold as slaves, try to convince Ward not to convert. Ferdinand declares that if Ward refuses to convert to Islam, they will forget everything Ward has done to them: ‘‘We‟ll forgive all our wrongs, with patience row At the unwieldy oar: we will forget That we were sold by you’’ (7.2.256-8). He also adds ‘‘We willing will endure our slavery’’ (7.2.265) claiming that they will even be happy being a slave. Raymond's second son agrees with this, saying: ‘‘Our blood, our father "s blood--all is forgiven/ The bond of all thy sins is cancelled/ Keep but thy self from this.’’ (7.2.262-4) Again we are shown the horror in which Daborne holds conversion to Islam - worse than working as a slave in a ship's galley.

In any event, Daborne portrays pirates as choosing, by their admission, a life of thieving from their fellow countrymen and foreigners and of rejection of any loyalty to the nations that produced them. Pirates are monsters, thieves, barbarians, backstabbing, rapists, a race of thieves in the play. Hence, piracy is also shown as a wrong and a bad thing in the play because James I, the King of Daborne's time, was against it and issued a royal decree revoking permission to attack enemies, ending privateering. Hence, he corroborates the idea of turning Turk by mentioning firstly how a cruel thing being a pirate is. At the end however we see that, although piracy is a terrible thing, turning Turk is worse still. Daborne endeavours to show us that conversion to Islam (turning Turk) is worse than piracy, having painted the cruelty of

pirate life in the play's first scenes. In any case, Daborne shows us that even being a pirate is better than 'turning Turk.

On the other hand, there are only two descriptions of Turks which mention them positively: they are described as powerful and referred to as the 'great Turk' in the play: "My Captain, my man of war, speak the contrary; they are as safe as the great Turk" (4.1.18). The comparison of the French to "the great Turk" gets on Ward's nerves and causes them to be thrown into the sea. The Turks are represented here as 'Great Turk'. There is also another mention of the 'Turk' concerning the Ottoman Sultan as the 'great Turk' in reference to nationality when Dansiker and Ward meet: ''But you are not likely to surfeit on it. I"ll have a finger in the platter with you, were you the Great Turk"s self"' (6.7.349-50). Even if Ward were Ottoman Sultan himself, he would say I want my share. Here, the Ottoman Sultans are also mentioned as the 'Great Turk'.

After Ward decides to 'turning Turk', Ward's conversion ceremony is described in the play as:

> Enter two bearing half-moons, one with a Mahomet's head following. After them, the Mufti, or chief priest, two meaner priests bearing his train. The Mufti seated, a confused noise of music, with a shout. Enter two Turks, one bearing a turban with a half-moon in it, the other a robe, a sword: a third with a globe in one hand, an arrow in the other. Two knights follow. After them, Ward on an ass, in his Christian habit, bare-headed. With a low reverence, the two knights ascend, whisper the Mufti in the ear, draw their swords, and pull him off the Ass. He laid on his belly, the tables (by two inferior Priests) offered him, he lifts his hand, subscribes, is brought to his seat by the Mufti, who puts on his turban and robe, girds his sword, then swears him on the Mahomet's head, ungirds his sword, offers him a cup of wine by the hands of a Christian. He spurns at him, and throws away the cup, is mounted on the ass, which is richly clad, and with a shout. Exeunt (8.11-21).

To become Muslim, there is, in reality, no need such as wearing Mufti's "turban and robe" or girding on Mufti's "sword" or vowing on "the Mahomet's head," or "throw[ing] away the cup" of wine given "by the hands of a Christian" (8.18-20). In reality however, to become Muslim it is only necessary to testify and accept Allah and his prophet Muhammed. However, we are not in reality; we are in Daborne's fictitious world. Portrayed as "some trivial ceremony," Ward's conversion celebration is as cursory.

Daborne presents an official break from the play's other parts that focus on its fiction (Streifer 32). Ward's conversion scene demonstrates most effectively the meaning of the costume that the Turks wore on the English stage at that time. It

showcases every one of the clothing items, which, when portraying Ward's "Christian habit," illustrated his conversion and transformation into a Turk, a Muslim. This occurrence of clothing choice, which established the character's religious identity, cannot be stated enough. The Muslim attire robs Ward of his Christian identity and illustrates most effectively his conversion (Lublin 142). It also, ironically, reveals its superficiality. Ward's "Christian habit" most likely consisted of a doublet, pants, nether stock, and maybe a waistcoat, clothing items that were common in England during the 1600s. This pairing of clothing items would have effectively demonstrated the meaning of the scene, due to the fact that Turkish robes were often "worn over many layers of clothes" (Lublin 143). So, Ward's character would not spend more time changing his clothing between scenes in the play. It was rare for an Englishman to appear without a hat during this period (Lublin 143). However, Ward is mentioned in the play as having a "bare head." Ward is, therefore is accords with the most recognizable Muslim piece of clothing- the turban. Lastly, Ward is wearing a sword on his belt. The sword was most likely the kind curved distinctly that one the Turks referred to as the "scimitar or falchion" (Lubin 143). The only component absent from Ward's evident conversion from Christianity to Islam (Turk) is sensory hair. Englishmen in early modern England usually grew facial hair, but distinct mustaches, long and chiseled, were a distinguishing feature of the Turks which received much attention (Lublin 143). It seems, however, that the audience would have been surprised to see Ward portrayed as having Turkish-style facial hair in the play (Lublin 143-4). The robe, turban, and scimitar were signifiers enough for the period to create the image of a stereotypical "Turk" (Lublin 144). Here the representation of Islam as a religion is divorced from reality. There is Mufti, who is explained as the chief priest in the play. Although in a real acceptance of Islam as a faith, one might appear before the local Imam to say the Shahada, we have here in Daborne's ideas the Mufti as a priest - again a Christian concept. Ward's conversion scene is propaganda and a misrepresentation. However, this conversion is the play's centrepiece, which serves to stir up fears of apostasy (Burton, *Traffic* 93/5), even linked as it is to Ward's reasons, which are anything but religious. However, the Chorus is made aware that Ward cannot keep his sword (8.17–21) despite his conversion. It has connotations of violence and criminality, and his new people do not trust Ward. Turks are afraid that Ward might

use the sword against them. The curved sword also conjures up in the Western mind the image of the bloodthirsty Muslim invader (Lublin 150).

In scene 9, Dansiker and Sares are talking about Ward's conversion. Sares says about Ward: "I saw him Turk to the circumcision" (9.2). Sares claims that Ward only pretended to be circumcised, further compounding the emptiness of the whole conversion (Lublin 147). The idea of foreskin removal caused Christian's anxiety, says Vitkus, because they confused it with castration (*Three Turk Plays* 5). Forcible conversion to Islam became linked in the minds of Westerners with the terrors of forced castration (Lublin 147). Having "taken the turban," an English would not be able to be rid of it - like the castration it symbolized, "it could not be undone" (Lublin 148). Ward substitutes the tip of an 'ape's tail' (9.4) for his penis, unbelievable as this seems, and through this trickery makes it possible to return one day to being a Christian. This permits him to return to the Christian ideology of his birth later in the play (Lublin 148). Daborne never explicitly permits his complex protagonist to renounce his Christian religion, so that the audience is left in doubt and poses the question of whether he did genuinely "turn Turk".

After Ward's conversion, he thinks that the Turkish Muslim law will work for him as they do for Voada. '"I am a Turk, and I do crave the law" (16.3.208), claiming membership of a group that he does not in fact belong to. This may be Ward's attempt to defend both his conversion and his weak position, but the Governor is unconvinced (16.249). In fact, Daborne may be trying to intimidate his audience through Voada's claim that even though Ward became a Muslim, her religion would not forgive him either and Ward's conversion is meaningless because he has no defence under it: "We know you are a bloody murderer and are repaid /By our just Prophet that hates false runagates" (13.124-125). Similarly, the Janissary is contemptuous: ''Pack hence, false runagate! Slave, beggar!'' (13.12). Ward is described as a 'false runagate' by both his wife Voada and by the Janissary. However, the Janissary also speaks from experience as he also is a convert from Christianity and has greater insight into the sincerity - or otherwise - of religious conversion. He has also heard Ward threaten to blow up the castle-outright sedition from the point of view of the Ottoman authorities, but very much in keeping with what a foreign soldier or pirate might try to do (Mabie 307). So, his conversion to Islam has no meaning for them anymore. At the end, Ward bitterly regrets his conversion and says: "I loved that face so well, to purchase it I

exchanged my heaven with hell" (16.3.231), so either being a Turks or a Muslim is like hell, or he has endangered his immortal soul. Daborne might aim to show his audiences that although they changed their identity and religion by 'turning Turk', they won't be accepted by their adopted people and faith.

While Ward dies, he says these words:

You are slaves of Mahomet,
Ungrateful curs that have repaid me thus
For all the service that I have done for you.
He that hath brought more treasure to your shore
Than all Arabia yields!
He that hath shown you
The way to conquer Europe-- did first impart
What your forefathers knew not, the seaman "s art;
Which had they attained, this universe had been
One monarchy. May all your seed be damned!
The name of Ottoman be the only scorn
And by-word to all nations; may his own slaves
Tear out the bowels of the last remains
Unto his blood-propped throne; may be cut each other's" throats;
Or may, O may, the force of Christendom
Be reunited, and all at once requite
The lives of all that you have murdered,
Beating a path out to Jerusalem,
Over the bleeding breasts of you and yours. (16.3.263-280).

At the end of the play, Ward miraculously reclaims his nationality and patriotic fervour (Mabie 307). Here, Daborne might have a political message for Christianity. Ward hopes that Christians kill all Muslims, presumably referring to the Ottoman empire. He says that all Christians will unite, and they will defeat them. This is a time of conflict within Christianity itself. His message to his audience is that if all Christianity, no matter which denomination, unites, they can defeat the Ottoman Empire, one of the biggest threats to Britain and all Christianity in terms of their religion and lands. His last words mention that Turks convinced him to become

Muslim, but they wanted to kill and punish him. He says he hates all of them and living as a Muslim is "worse than slaves" (16.3.286), and he also conveniently says piracy is not good as well. He also talks about Turks' lifestyles: ''All you that live by theft and piracies/ That sell your lives and souls to purchase graves/ That die to hell, and live far worse than slaves'' (16.3.286). Ward mentions there that Turks profit from piracy by selling others into slavery and risk their immortal souls in hell.

Ward curses Ottoman ingratitude, saying that he brought them wealth and taught them about naval technology. Even so, Ward's suicide is not as heroic as Dansiker's. He commits murder then suicide, in religious terms, thus guaranteeing damnation. His dying curses provide an example and a warning (Vitkus, *Three Turk Plays* 39). However, although Ward's character is unredeemed, and although he fell for the charms of false Eastern beauty, he was never really tempted to make a serious conversion to Islam. Confessing his sins as he lies dying, Ward now claims that his true loyalty is to the country of his birth and accepts that he has damned himself through his own behaviour (Mabie 308). For Jonathan Burton, this means that Ward's conversion was never truly sincere as he would not really have risked his immortal soul in that way (*English Anxiety* 49).

The governor says that he should tear a "piecemeal," meaning his body torn limb from limb, and his remains thrown into the sea and also orders a brass tomb built for the Ward and the following sentences written on it "Ward sold his country, turned Turk, and died a slave" (16.3.293). We are reassured, then, that Ward's apostasy, although it caused him to commit treason and to deviate from the path of a true Christian -even though it is highly questionable that he was ever upon such a path- it was for show and so all comes right in the end. In Daborne's final summing up of the action of his play, Ward's apostasy, then, is not permanent, even though he has committed treason because of it. Dabome leaves Ward damned for apostasy- no question here - but at least in the cultural and national spheres he is redeemed (Mabie 308).

Here, Daborne warns the Christians that if they betray Christianity and their identity, they too will die like a slave just like Ward. Nabil Matar mentions that Ward "freely and willfully [chooses] to renounce his faith," and has "no redeeming quality" (Matar, *Islam* 57,6). Likewise, Lois Potter considers that the play's unpopularity may

come from the fact that people "simply object[ed] to the blasphemy of the scene in which Ward renounces Christianity" (*Pirates* 132). Even though Daborne obligingly gave his audience the death and misogynist violence they craved, carefully packaged within moral platitudes and national prejudice (MacLean, *On Turning* 131).

Critics such as Nabil Matar and Barbara Fuchs comment on Ward's tragic end in the play. Regarding Ward's fictional tragic end, Nabil Mater says that there was nothing in Ward's dramatised character to rescue him from the violent death that, in Western opinion, he deserved. He was torn to pieces and the pieces thrown into the sea (Matar, *The Renegade* 494-5). Similarly, Barbara Fuchs depicted Ward's tragic end in the play as the literary penalty for his cultural treason (Fuchs, *Mimesis* 125). Mark Hutchings and other critics consider that Ward's death must be violent, as Daborne cannot risk estranging his audience with anything less than a violent death, which, while tragic, is deserved. Failure to punish Ward for cultural treason would also risk offending the King, who subsequently rejected Ward's request for a pardon and made Ward the focus of his war on piracy (Ellinghausen 192). The true end of Ward's life versus his dramatic one as portrayed on the London stage bear this similarity: each ties the renegade to lack of ambition, but the outcome is changed in Daborne's version to an ignominious death.

Ward's dramatic death is meant to warn those tempted by the possibility of success and prosperity working for the Ottoman Empire. With this propagandistic motivation, we should also remember Daborne's view of Christianity as the only true religion, having surpassed Judaism, Muhammad's Islam being a fraud and an interloper in the divine scheme. Daborne is less afraid of the military threat posed by an Empire which borders Europe than he is of the possibility that Europeans may be tempted to join it and thus imperil their mortal souls (MacLean, *On Turning* 132). The different possible interpretations of Ward's life which are possible are reflected in the writings about him. Some admire his daring and success, while others condemn a man who turned his back on his own country and now made a living out of attacking Christian ships on behalf of his new paymasters (Şenlen-Güvenç, *A Foe to All Christians* 53).

Chew commented scathingly about the play, saying that even a broad-minded view does not alter the fact that it is a very poor effort indeed, substituting noise and crassness for a genuine storyline, which itself is badly constructed and confused

(*Crescent* 532). Claire Jowitt also agrees with Samuel Chew and gives her opinion of the play as seemingly deliberately vague. Daborne never really takes up a position in his presentation of Ward and his story, making it difficult to find fault with any one particular point (*Voyage Drama* 157). On the other hand, Gerald MacLean comments that in his view the play's use of nationalism as a form of morality was skilfully achieved by Daborne, giving voice to contemporary fears over the abandonment of the home country and its religious faith (*On Turning* 125).

Daborne's play also portrays a Christian moral order strongly based on Christian values. Under this premise and value system, Ward cannot and is not defined as somebody deserving of either admiration or pity, not even tragedy. Ward is damned in the play because he rejects Englishness and Christianity (MacLean, *On Turning* 128). Daborne punishes Ward through the play even as he was living his successful and contented life in Tunis. Moralistic circumlocutions notwithstanding, Daborne is punishing Ward for what he sees as Ward's affiliation with the Ottoman Turks and his rejection of his country and his religion (Şenlen-Güvenç, *A Foe to All Christians* 52).

Daborne is trying to warn those who could, at the time of the play and due to increasing trade around the Mediterranean, come into contact with Muslims, especially those under the rule of the Ottoman Empire because of trading to the Mediterranean. During his life, Daborne had a lot of debt, and he is trying to show himself loyal by defending Christianity against Islam and Judaism, perhaps to further his own cause.

Daborne's play focuses on the outcome when an English Christian of humble origins turns to piracy for the chance of fame and fortune, turning away from the culture and religion of his birth. Daborne wants us to believe that this conversion action can only lead to destruction. However, the play is a work of fiction because we know that the real John Ward was successful in his adopted home of Tunis, whether his conversion to Islam was sincere or not (MacLean, *On Turning* 132). One of the elements that shape Daborne's play is the idea, based on moral-nationalistic grounds, and the concept of owing oneself to a nation, that an Englishman cannot stop being an Englishman even if it seems attractive on the surface (MacLean, *On Turning* 124). Daborne's claim, through the play, is that a Protestant Englishman will be judged as such at the moment of his death and that there is no escape from this. The real Ward appears to have been less concerned (MacLean, *On Turning* 125). According to Laurie

Ellinghausen, Ward successfully challenges what Gerald MacLean terms the "moral nationalist scheme" is nevertheless condemned by Daborne, who ladles on the pain and woe for dramatic to deliver his overall message that Ward deserves his fate in the play (*We are of the Sea* 183). In other words, according to Daborne, there is a mismatch between Ward's well-deserved abject failure in the play and his successful career in Tunis in real life. We know that Ward's life there was fairly successful because the *Newes from Sea* tells us so. It would appear then that Ward was more complex a character than Daborne allows for, and his story more nuanced than is reflected in Daborne's play. A more understanding view of Ward's adventurous life is possible. (Ellinghausen 183).

CHAPTER 3: *TAMBURLAINE THE GREAT*

Christopher Marlowe was a contemporary of Ben Jonson and William Shakespeare, and he was one of the most significant early modern playwrights. His life and peculiar death have been a subject of intense speculation for some time (Smith and Bartels i). Christopher Marlowe was born in 1564 and baptized in Canterbury. He was the second child of a shoemaker John Marlowe (Smith and Bartels xv). He attended Petty School and Grammar School (Marlowe and Gibbons xxv). Marlowe was granted a scholarship at the King's School in Canterbury from 1579-80, and he also received another scholarship to Cambridge (Kuriyama 2). Those who gave him a scholarship probably hoped that he would become a clergyman in the future (Urgan 204). However, according to widespread rumours among his contemporaries, he was even irreligious. There are critics who claim that Marlowe was not in fact an atheist but rather a Unitarian; he was not denying God; he was denying the Trinity: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Being Unitarian at that time was no less dangerous than being an atheist: a Cambridge scholar of Marlowe's generation was sentenced to be burned alive for it (Urgan 204).

We are unable to confirm how he received each monetary financial award or if the two are related. We also lack the knowledge of the location of his education before he began his studies at the King's School (Kuriyama 2). Then, he began to study at Corpus Christi College in 1580 as an Archbishop Parker schola (Marlowe and Gibbons xxv). He was educated there in "Latin, rhetoric, grammar and logic" (Marlowe and Gibbons xxv). According to Constance Brown Kuriyama, both the Corpus Christi Audits and the Buttery Book about Christopher Marlowe's life are incomplete but used together can furnish a full picture of Marlowe's time at Cambridge (*Christopher Marlowe* 2). The Records give us great insight into Marlowe's attendance record, but they fail to tell of his location and purpose when he was away.

The documents may or may not be accurate and have often deterred scholars from taking a closer look at them (Kuriyama 2). He obtained his B.A. in 1584. From 1581-1586, he was periodically absent from classes at Cambridge, in London, or abroad to serve the government. In 1587, he graduated with a master’s degree from Cambridge University despite absenteeism thanks to the Privy Council, who wrote a letter stating "good service" for him. Some believed this to be espionage (Marlowe and

Gibbons xxv). The letter was written by The Privy Council to Cambridge authorities, which promoted the "Good service" of Marlowe and praised him to the Queen. They requested permission for him to complete his M.A. degree on schedule. One of Marlowe's bosses was Thomas Walsingham. Later the biographers of Marlowe concluded that he was absent from Cambridge over long periods because of his government service (Kuriyama 2). Constance Brown Kuriyama suggests that Christopher Marlowe spent much of his time doing what other students did when he was out of Cambridge (*Christopher Marlowe* 3). Marlowe was sent to prison along with the poet Thomas Watson on September 18th, 1589, in Newgate prison since he was seen as a suspect because of the murder of William Bradley, a gentleman. They released Marlowe on bail on October 1st, and charges were dropped on December 3rd. The policemen again arrested Marlowe in 1592 in Vlissingen in the Netherlands for counterfeiting. He was then moved to England, where he was released (Marlowe and Gibbons xxv). The issue was that Marlowe was only summoned for questioning rather than have complete imprisonment like his companion, playwright Thomas Kyd. This can be seen as a positive outcome demonstrated by Tucker Brokke, William Urry, and others rather than a negative one (Kuriyama 3). Marlowe passed away in 1593 and spent some of his last days at Sir Tomas Walsingham's house in Scadbury. Some people believe he may have been working with Walsingham on some secret affair. Marlowe was in much trouble at the time, and the authorities were looking for him in the weeks prior to his death (Marlowe and Gibbons xxv). Ultimately, he was murdered when he was 29, in 1593 (Urgan 204).

As writer, playwright, and poet, Christopher Marlowe was an example of a talented author who reflects the "Elizabethan Golden Age" (Kelly 1). According to M.C. Bradbrook, Marlowe considered the standard dramatic forms and verse of the day rigid and unadaptable. His drama provides us with the evolution of a far greater flexibility (Bradbrook 137). M.C. Bradbrook also mentions that he was influenced by his contemporary period, especially in the subject of the presentation (Bradbrook 137). Marlowe's irony frequently conceals a violent menace in the classical style and Elizabethan fashion (Marlowe and Gibbons ix). Marlowe was a supporter of the English state and a contemporary of Shakespeare, but reveals himself ambivalent, according to Mathew Dimmock, about the conflict between Christians and Ottomans and that this is reflected in his plays *Tamburlaine* and *The Jew of Malta* (Dimmock

168-9). He probably firstly wrote *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, together with Thomas Nashe (Smith and Bartels xv). Then, he wrote one of his most famous plays, *Tamburlaine Part I and II*, in 1587 and 1588, publishers in 1590, however his name remained exempt from the title page (Marlowe and Gibbons xxvi). He also wrote *Doctor Faustus* in1588 and *The Jew of Malta* in 1589. After a short time, he wrote *The Tragedy of Edward II* in 1591 and then *The Massacre at Paris* in 1593. In the plays *Dido* (1585-87) and *The Tragedy of Edward II* (1593), Marlowe's name first appears on title pages (Marlowe and Gibbons xxvi).

Marlowe varies the dramatic structure in each of his plays, employing different forms of theatre with each one. His innovation in black comedy and his command of spectacle, from subtle to horrifying (Marlowe and Gibbons ix) always ensured while the audience was included in the action, even in aspects of it that the characters themselves were not aware of, giving the audience a full view of the environment in which his characters found themselves (Marlowe and Gibbons x).

Parallel to the fact that publications about Turks started later in England than in other European countries, plays whose subjects were taken from Turkish history began to be written and staged at a later period (Aksoy 67). One of the important plays mentioned is Marlowe's *Tamburlaine the Great*, written in the Elizabethan era. U.M. Ellis-Fermor states that the first definitive record of the play's publication is from 1590, and the oldest record of its staging is from 1594, although there are various references to this work in some literary texts known to have been written before that period which indicate that the play was known of before (Ellis-Fermor quoted in Aksoy 69).

In 1590 *Tamburlaine the Great* was published without Marlowe’s name on the title page (Marlowe and Gibbons xxv). The play consists of two-parts and each part has 5 Acts over 168-pages (Türkmen 1). The first part of the play was staged in the winter of 1587-1588 and the second part at the beginning of the summer of 1588. The author probably wrote the second part after the play was well received by the London audience (Aksoy 68). It is highly likely that Marlowe’s intention was at least in part to pander to the contemporary fear and loathing of the Ottoman Turk, whose military conquests in Europe had become known as ‘the present Terror of the World’ (İ. Uygur 156).

Marlowe benefited from Ortelius' map of the world (Marlowe and Gibbons xi). The main historical sources of the work are Pedro Mexia's book "*Timur's Life*" written in Spanish and published in Seville. This work was later translated into Italian, French and English. Another useful source work may be *Magni Tamerlanus Scytharum imperatoris vita* by Petrus Perondimus, although Marlowe made up some names and historical events in his play (Türkmen 2).

At the time the plays were staged, Muslims and Jews could not live peacefully with their Christian counterparts together in Western Europe, and there were ongoing religious disputes between Protestants and Catholics that would continue until the 17th century (İ. Uygur 156). In the 16th century, the Ottoman Empire had many triumphs and few losses in their battles against the Europeans because they had an invincible and highly focused army. However, while some leading thinkers of this period commented on these losses, they preferred to ignore the historical realities and events. On the contrary, they preferred to adopt a certain train of thought to deal with the situation: God had taken the side of the Turks and was punishing the European Christians because of their wrongdoings. They thought the reason for this to be Christian reluctance to unite and become one body and soul (İ. Uygur 156).

Marlowe told the story of the centuries-old Muslim conqueror, Tamburlaine, in two parts of the *Tamburlaine the Great*, firstly from a business-oriented stance and secondly reflecting British political interest in Asian, Near-Eastern, and North African markets. It was a fact that, in the 1570s, English joint-stock companies had investigated trade possibilities mainly in the specific locations of North Africa and the Levant, but Marlowe also dealt with the anxieties caused by the resulting cultural exchanges and interactions (Burton, *Elizabeth's Turkish* 8). The socio-economic approach of the play was taken on board by the critics, who recognised these influences on early modern culture (Hutching 91). Anthony Parr has noted that the majority of interpretations of Christopher Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* works have assumed an attitude in Early Modern Europe of "an immovable stereotype of the raging and expansionist Turk" (*Three Renaissance Travel Plays* 11).

It is important to understand that the centrality of the figure of the Ottoman Turk in the culture of early modern Europe was not only "ambiguous", as critics attempting to downplay it have implied, but a formative part of the evolution of a

persistent anti-Islamic prejudice (Burton, *Anglo-Ottoman* 126). For Jonathan Burton, Marlowe's portrayal of Turkish strength was based on something very real, and the two Tamburlaine plays represent an attempt to address the Western reaction to this threatening force from the East. In Part Two of the play, which to some extent rewrites Part One, the audience's involvement with the main protagonist is intensified and made more complex, highlighting the theme of religious "otherness" (*Anglo-Ottoman* 127).

However, Vitkus mentions that if the English audience are drawn in at first by the character of Tamburlaine and remain uncritical of his actions, they subsequently begin to reject his excesses of pride, cruelty and blasphemy (*Turning Turk* 50). Marlowe's account of the Tamburlaine legend tells us less about his own opinions on the subject of Islam and Muslims than it does about early modern England, and its quest for a version of the story in which its own actions in dealings with a threateningly powerful "other" are justified (Burton, *Anglo-Ottoman* 129). Elsewhere, Jonathan Burton offers the idea that the story of Tamburlaine provided a conveniently distant setting for the playing out of conflicts, based around profit and loss and cultural confidence versus vulnerability, which were thrown up by English commercial ventures in countries outside of the Christian world. It is not that Marlowe was trying to justify dealings with Muslims rather that his plays highlight the manner in which the theme of religion could be manipulated in the interests of economic and political advancement (Burton, *Elizabeth's Turkish* 8-9). There is no supernatural element to the plays, although Biblical and Classical references are very much present and lend the plays and their central figure an epic character (Marlowe and Gibbons xi). The play makes evident the problems thrown up by romanticising historical figures from other geographical locations and cultural and religious traditions (Kolb 203). Both parts of the play lead the audience to casually divorce adherence to a particular faith from the concept of fidelity (Vitkus, *Turning Turk* 50). For instance, the Scythian identity of Tamburlaine permits the audience not only to sympathize with Tamburlaine's military victory over the Turk but also to separate themselves from Tamburlaine's brutality simply since he is non-Christian (Sohrawardy 89).

Marlowe's chosen hero, whom he calls Tamburlaine, was in fact Timur, the Turkic-Mongol warlord who founded the Timurid dynasty (Brotton 158). This real historical character cannot possibly be described as "classical" in the Western sense

since he was not a European. He was not Christian (Marlowe and Gibbons xi). Marlowe, however, needed a violent man of action in a post Graeco-Roman world where other, new rival powers - Tatars, Persians, and Turks - have global ambitions in competition with those of the Christian world. The character of Tamburlaine is carefully constructed with both noble and ruthless elements (Brotton 158). There are always references to historical events, Greek mythology and Greek history, and real wars that took place in the Greek empire in both parts of the play. *Tamburlaine the Great* based its plot on historical figures and historical events without truly reflecting either.

At the beginning of the play, Cosroe mocks his brother, the Persian king Mycetes' intelligence and military ability, saying he does not consider him worthy of the Persian kingdom. Mycetes wants to defeat Tamburlaine and sends his man Theridamas and his thousand horsemen to capture Tamburlaine. However, Ortygius and the others want to make Cosroe the king and crown him. On the other hand, while Tamburlaine is talking about the loot they have captured and that they are safe, Zenocrate, the princess of Egypt, wants to cross from Asia to Egypt, but Tamburlaine falls in love with her even though he learns that she is engaged. He takes Zenocrate and her companions captive, but says that if they join him, they can live supported finically by him. Zenocrate, who was very uncomfortable with this situation at first, then falls in love with Tamburlaine when confronted with his love. Meanwhile, a soldier says that the Persian king has sent a thousand horsemen after them, and Tamerlane is happy with this news in the hope that it will add wealth to his fortune. Tamburlaine decides to be friendly at first and Theridamas agrees to join Tamburlaine.

Later, Cosroe goes to the place where they are to see Theridamas and Tamburlaine. Cosroe's plan is to team up with Tamburlaine against his brother whom he refers to as mindless. Tamburlaine, on the other hand, is ready to fight against Mycetes, the Persian king, who came for them. However, although Tamburlaine later said that he would take Cosroe to power, the idea of sitting on the Persian throne was more tempting and he decided to change his plan. Tamburlaine himself succeeds to the Persian throne instead of Cosroe.

Later, the Ottoman Emperor, Bajazeth I, appears on the stage. He says that in accordance with Tamburlaine's wishes, the Tatars and their eastern bandits are

attempting to fight towards them. He also mentions that they (Tamburlaine and his people) want to lift the siege of Istanbul. Later, Bajazeth and Tamburlaine come face to face, and they fuel their own armies to fight. Bajazeth loses the war and he and his wife are taken prisoner by Tamburlaine. Tamburlaine gives the order to make Bajazeth's wife the maidservant of Zenocrate's maid, while humiliating Bajazeth in a small cage and denying him any means of suicide or of escape. Bajazeth smashes the bars of the cage with his head, and when Zabina, Bajazeth's wife, sees this, she also repeats this action, striking her head forcefully on the bars and dying. The sultan of Egypt is very disturbed to find that his daughter has become Tamburlaine's concubine, and requests her former fiance, the Arab King, to seek revenge on Tamburlaine. The Arab king then informs the Egyptian Sultan that Bajazeth and his wife were captured by Tamburlaine, but this makes no difference to the Sultan's desire for revenge. He fights with Tamburlaine, resulting in Tamburlaine's victory and his own death. Tamburlaine captures Zenocrate's father, but promises to grant him the throne of Egypt, making him even stronger politically. At the close of the play, Tamburlaine tells of his country's expansion and his plans to make peace with the whole world. The Arab king and the Turkish sultan and his wife are buried with suitably tasteful solemnities, and finally Tamburlaine and Zenocrate celebrate their wedding.

The second part of the play begins with a speech by the Anatolian king, Orcanes, summarising the current situation. He mentions he had left Anatolia and that the Hungarian king, Sigismond was waiting to make peace on the shores of the Danube. Orcanes emphasises the importance of making peace with the Christians against Tamburlaine, because all of Asia is under his command and his army is in the whole of Africa. Sigismond, the Hungarian king, advises Orcanes to either choose war and use the sword he gave him, or choose peace. In the end, Orcanes tells the Hungarian king that they should comply with what their ambassadors advised and compromise. Later, Sigismond and Orcanes swear on their gods.

On the other hand, Tamburlaine has captured Bajazeth I's son Callapine, but Callapine has fled from Tamburlaine with Almeda's help, who is under Callapine's command. Orcanes goes back to Anatolia with his army to support the kings of Syria and Jerusalem against the threat of Tamburlaine. However, the Christian kings, who take advantage of this situation, and betray their words, organising a campaign against

them to fight. In the end, because the Christians have betrayed their oaths, they finally are defeated by Turks.

Callipane marches on Tamburlaine to avenge his father's death, and they fight. Tamburlaine wins the war but does not forgive his son Calyphas, hiding in the tent during the war; Tamburlaine kills his own son by stabbing him. Later, Tamburlaine organizes an expedition to Babylon and orders all Babylonians to be killed, including women and children. He also rejects Islam and the Qur'an and gives the order to burn the Qur'an. Although the Turks were defeated by Tamburlaine again, Bajazeth's son Callpine escaped and, wanting revenge, declared war on Tamburlaine. Meanwhile, Tamburlaine becomes very ill, and the doctors cannot find a cure. Later, Tamburlaine realizes that he will die, and while he is alive, he transfers the throne and title to his son Amyras. He demands that Zenocrate's coffin be brought and that he be buried with her. The play ends with the beginning of the funeral ceremony and the carrying of the coffin of Zenocrate and Tamburlaine.

The first part of the play starts with the prologue, praising Tamburlaine. It sets the scene of the play as one that will deal with serious issues, rather than just providing generalised entertainment. The Marlovian stage invites its audience into a world of distant lands and hitherto unknown characters, as they are conducted to ‘‘to the stately tent of war’’ (Prologue 3), as the Persians move across Asia to reach Egypt and Africa (İ. Uygur 156).

When the concept of Turkishness is examined with regard to the play, it can be said that Turks are mostly portrayed as ‘cruel’ towards Christians. For example, as barbarians, with Cosroe’s words: ‘‘Now Turks and Tartars shake their swords at thee /Meaning to mangle all thy provinces’’ (1:1.1.16-17). Turks are clearly portrayed negatively by Bajazeth, as the aggressors: ‘‘Our Turkey blades shall glide through all their throats’’ (2:1.1.28). In addition, Turks are portrayed as people who enslave Christians: ‘Will first subdue the Turk, and then enlarge/ Those Christian captives which you keep as slaves,’’ (1:3.3.47-48), also who sink Christians’ ships ‘‘And hover in the Straits for Christians' wreck, Shall lie at anchor in the Isle Asant’’ (1:3.3.263-7). They are bloodthirsty killers of Christians: ‘‘We all are glutted with the Christians' blood’’ (2:1.1.12). a fairly clear piece of propaganda. Hence, judging by the portrayal of Bajazeth alone, it would seem that Turkish "cruelty" frightened Europeans more

than the prospect of Muslim rule. Marlowe confirms for us the stereotype of the "cruel Turk"(Tiryakioğlu 93).

In addition, Turkish emperor, Bajazeth, also is shown as a cruel sultan who does not care about his people and focuses on victory in the play: ‘‘Let thousands die; their slaughter'd carcasses/ Shall serve for walls and bulwarks to the rest’’ (1:3.3.146-147). All of these scenes try to show Turks’ cruelty in the play. Burton states that the figure of Sultan Bajazeth is the embodiment of every European anxiety about Turks and Islam (*Anglo-Ottoman* 141). McJannet also comments regarding Bajazeth that the historical Sultan Bajazeth was in fact a military commander and Sultan to whom no particular heroism or villainy attaches (*The Sultan Speaks* 65).

Marlowe continues to describe Turks negatively in the first part of the play, through Bajazeth and his wife Zabina they are described as "arrogant" through Bajazeth and his wife Zabina. In addition, Turks are described by Tamburlaine as ‘‘full of brags’’ (1:3.3.3) and ‘‘menace more than they can well perform’’ (1:3.3.4) implying Bajezeth’s words of praise for the Turks. Tamburlaine thinks that the power of the Turks is in words only. Also, the Turkish emperor and his wife are insulted and portrayed as weak and desperate in the first part of the play. This, and Tamburlaine's horrific torture of Bajazeth, are the most striking elements of these first five acts. After their capture, Tamburlaine puts Bajezeth and his wife into a cage as though they were wild animals. Tamburlaine and his wife treat Bajezeth and his wife as their slaves, humiliating them at every opportunity. Marlowe gives us a Bajazeth who is powerless and overwhelmed, obliged to eat leftovers for survival and used as a footstool by Tamburlaine as the latter mounts his horse (Elaskary and Khadawardi 17). Tamburlaine also tries to oblige Bajezeth to eat his own food as an attempt to humiliate him, but Bajezeth refuses. The captives are also starved, and Tamburlaine informs Bajezeth that if he can't stand the hunger any longer, he should eat his wife before she gets too weak. However, Bajezeth tries to be proud of Tamburlaine. Chew states that it was contemporary prejudice towards Turks that led Marlowe to cast the Sultan as "insolently boastful " prior to battle and then "impotently raging" after being taken prisoner (*The Crescent and the Rose* 472).

So, Tamburlaine's lack of respect for Bajazeth is made very clear. Bajezeth and his wife are both driven to suicide in the play, a clear showcasing of their

despair. Bajezeth smashes his head on the iron bars of the cage and his head splits in two and Zabina bangs her head on the iron bars with all her might and dies. This cataclysmic and humiliating scene for the Turkish emperor and his wife might reflect the anger of Marlowe and his times towards Turks. Laura Perille claims that many readers of the play have treated Bajezeth's punishment as fair, and it does seem that Marlowe was playing up to the stereotypical image of the "Turkish tyrant " (*A Mirror to Turke* 56).

However, the historical figures and also events in the play don't reflect reality. In real life, Tamburlaine showed respect to Bajezeth, although he was his captive. Further, Bajezeth did not commit suicide, but rather died from illness after being a prisoner for 7 months and 12 days (Türkmen 5). In the play, Bajezeth's son was captured by Tamburlaine (2:1.1.1-4). In reality, at Bajezeth's request, Tamburlaine had Bajezeth's missing son Musa found and forgave him with blessings. In addition, because Tamburlaine (Timur) did not touch his sons, the Ottoman Empire was able to continue with Mehmet Çelebi (Türkmen 4-5). It is clearly seen that historical reality is not reflected in Marlowe's play.

On the other hand, the historical character of Tamburlaine is also misrepresented in the play. In reality, Tamburlaine was a kind of aristocrat of his nomadic tribe, however he was never a tribal chief, nor was he descended from Cengiz Khan (Manz 2). However, Marlowe describes him as 'Scythian Tamburlaine' or 'Scythian shepherd' in the play. Zenocrate, Egyptian princess, refers to Tamburlaine as 'shepherd' (1:1.2.7). In the play, before Tamburlaine gained his power, he was described as a shepherd just like Ward's previous role as a fisherman in *A Christian Turn'ed Turk.* So, unlike play, Tamburlaine is aristocrat not shepherd. Also, in reality, since Tamburlaine (Timur) belongs to the Barlas tribe, he can be either Turk or Moghul used in the above sense; but not Scythian (Türkmen 2). So, again Marlowe misrepresented the historical figure's true identity. Then in return, Tamburlaine calls Bajezeth as ''thou Turk'' (1:3.3.75) using the term as an insult - a message to the English audience as much as to Bajezeth himself.

There are references to historically important events in the play. For example, in the first part of the play, Bajezeth, the Ottoman Sultan, mentions that Tamburlaine wanted them to stop Bajezeth's Istanbul siege, referring to the real historical siege of

Constantinople by Bajezeth (1:3.1.6). Here, Tamburlaine is portrayed as a defender of Christians. On the other hand, in history Tamburlaine managed to set back Beyazid's aim to conquer the Byzantine capital of Constantinople by around 50 years, but it fell to the Ottoman Turks in 1453. Due to his (temporary) thwarting of Ottoman ambitions however, Timur became something of a hero in the eyes of contemporary Europeans and an instrument of God in their ongoing battle against Muslim expansion and against Christian laxity in matters of faith (Elaskary and Khadawardi 19).

On the other hand, Turks are also portrayed positively in the play. The Turks' pride, courage, and their military skills are also hinted at in the play in some scenes. For example, Bajezeth and his wife prefer to die instead of being the slave of his enemy. Also, Zenocrate, Egypt princess, refers to the Turks as the 'mighty Turk' (1:1.2.7-14), noting that she and others could pass safely through the place controlled by the Turkish powerful army and got special sealed permission to go from Central Asia to Egypt. The Turkish Sultan is depicted by Arab King as ''Renowned, mighty and noble'' in the play (1:4.3.25-9) and referred to by Tamburlaine as the 'Great Turk' (1:5.1.541) even though he is defeated and died at the end of the first part of the play.

Marlowe firstly shows the Turks' as powerful in order to demonstrate that they can also be defeated at the end. Basso prizes Bajezeth as ''Most great and puissant monarch of the earth'' (1:3.1.44). In addition, the Turkish army's power is mentioned by the Turkish emperor:

> Tell him thy lord, the Turkish emperor,
> Dread lord of Afric, Europe, and Asia,
> Great king and conqueror of Graecia,
> The ocean, Terrene, and the Coal-black sea,
> The high and highest monarch of the world,
> Wills and commands, (for say not I entreat,).
> (1:3.1.23-30)

With Basso's words, Turkish emperor is shown as the most powerful emperor in the world. After Tamburlaine's answer, Basso talks about Bayazıd's current power with these words:

> My lord, the great commander of the world,
> Besides fifteen contributory kings,

Hath now in arms ten thousand janizaries,
Mounted on lusty Mauritanian steeds,
Brought to the war by men of Tripoly;
Two hundred thousand footmen that have serv'd
In two set battles fought in Graecia;
And for the expedition of this war,
If he think good, can from his garrisons
Withdraw as many more to follow him.

(1:3.3.13-22)

In the above sentences, Basso is trying to show the Ottoman Empire's power and their advantage over their enemies. But in next pages of the play, with these words, he tries to show the Turks as defeated although they have a lot of power and many opportunities.

At the end of the war, Bajezeth is defeated by Tamburlaine. So, Marlowe again communicates to his audiences that even 'great Turks' can be defeated. Marlowe may deliberately show this defeated emperor to his people because Turks were so powerful during that period and Christians were fearful to be conquered by the Ottomans. With this scene of the play, Marlowe tries to raise Christians' hopes for the defeat of the Ottoman Turks. After Bajezeth loses the war, he offers a ransom to Tamburlaine, however, Tamburlaine rejects Bajezeth's offer of ransom. Ward's character does something similar when he rejects Ferdinand's offer of money to free the merchants, a seemingly deliberate "nod" to Marlowe's play (Hutchings 95).

The real historical battle in Ankara in 1402 took place between the Ottomans led by Bayezid I (Bajezeth) (1369-1402), and the Persians commanded by Tamburlaine (Timur), who was a Timuri emperor. When Tamburlaine emerged victorious, Europeans were delighted, and the battle became a part of the English play *Tamburlaine* (Mikyšková 6-7). However, the figure of Timur from history did not influence the culture and history of England at the time of his life in the 15th century and would have been a largely unknown figure in England of the time of Marlowe's play over a century later (Burton, *Elizabeth's Turkish* 8).

Some critics have commented on this defeat of the Ottomans. For example, Chew argues that the Christian West, "invested with glory and romance the figure of

Timur [sic] the Tartar or Tamburlaine who had long since humbled the pride of the Turkish Sultan, Bajazet [sic] the First" (*The Crescent and the Rose* 469). For contemporary Europeans, Timur and Bajezeth were merciless invaders, but the Turks were to be feared more because, unlike the Persians, they were nearer to Europe and had at their disposal a powerful and well-trained army. In this way, conflict between the Ottomans and their Persian neighbours was seen as beneficial to Europe, as it kept the Sultan's armies occupied to the East, and his attention turned away from them (Elaskary and Khadawardi 19).

Although Marlowe emphasised the Ottoman Turks' power in many scenes through his Turkish characters, at the end Bajezeth is defeated and commits suicide with his wife. Marlowe has Zenocrate say, when she sees their dead bodies, ''Behold the Turk and his great emperess!'' (1:5.1.361). She also relates that as Ottoman Empire conquered territories without any mercy, the emperor of Turks' and his wife have suitably tragic ends. So, she prays for Tamburlaine:

> Pardon my love! O, pardon his contempt
> Of earthly fortune and respect of pity;
> And let not conquest, ruthlessly pursu'd,
> Be equally against his life incens'd
> In this great Turk and hapless emperess! (1:5.1.371-375)

Here, Marlowe's intention is to give moral lessons to his readers with the sad situation of Bayazid. He emphasizes that even a powerful emperor like Bayazid will end up like this. Here, Marlowe has mixed religious beliefs together. When he says what happened to the great Turk and his unfortunate wife, he may want to emphasize how great the Turks were at that time, but despite this, again he may also want to give a glimmer of hope to his society by showing that Christian society can be renewed.

The scenes in which Tamburlaine was thus portrayed were so pleasing to Queen Elizabeth and the British audience that Marlowe wrote the second part to the play (Türkmen 10). The Prologue of the second part of the play mentions that the second part was written because the previous Part I was very popular and that in this part Tamburlaine's glorious progress will end with his death, and it arouses the readers' curiosity about what will happen to Tamburlaine's wife, Zenocrate. All through Part II, the exaggerated violence of Tamburlaine and his sons horrifies the Turks (Perille

57). Tamburlaine is mentioned as a Muslim in the second part of the play, but Marlowe now allows him his religious identity while still denying him the distinctiveness of this identity in contrast to the Christian one. This is a psychologically complex approach which justifies Marlowe's second part almost on its own (Burton, *Anglo-Ottoman* 145).

Gazellus, the governor of Bryon, explains that Tamburlaine's aim is to ‘‘fire Turkey as he goes’’ (2:1.1.16) and the consequent importance of starting peace negotiations with Christians. Similarly with the first part of the play, in the second part of the play Tamburlaine is still portrayed as someone who really hates Turks even though he could himself be one of them in reality: ‘‘the towers and cities of these hateful Turks,’’ (2:3.2.151). When the scene in which Orcanes, the Anatolian King, and Sigismund, king of Hungary discusses the war, Marlowe again refers to a historical event: ‘the siege of Vienna’ carried out in the second part of the play by Orcanes:

> Stay, Sigismund: forgett'st thou I am he
> That with the cannon shook Vienna-walls,
> And made it dance upon the continent,
> As when the massy substance of the earth
> Quiver[s] about the axle-tree of heaven?
> Forgett'st thou that I sent a shower of darts,
> Mingled with powder'd shot and feather'd steel.
> (2:1.1.8693).

Here, Marlowe may have confused the time period of the historical events concerned or be deliberately pointing it out to his audiences. The first siege of Vienna by Suleiman the Magnificent took place in 1529 (McJannet, *The Sultan* 2). However, the play deals with the period of Tamburlaine’s (Timur) life between 1370-1405 so confusion may have arisen. In the second part of the play, we see echoes of the first part. We are in the presence of a conflict and Tamburlaine is not immediately present. The Ottoman threat still looms over Europe (Bruton, *Anglo-Ottoman* 145).

In the end, Orcanes agrees with Gazellus about peace because ‘‘the centre of our empery, Once lost, all Turkey would be overthrown’’ (2:1.1.51-52). Here, instead of Ottoman Empire, it is again mentioned as "Turkey". On the other hand, Frederick, Budin and the lord of Bohemia, mentions that they came from Europe with the intention of reconciliation, but that they were ready for war in case of rejection. On the

other hand, the Europeans appear wary of shedding yet more of their own blood (Burton, *Anglo-Ottoman* 127). At the end, they declared peace and Sigismond promises to help him. Then, everyone in the play swears according to their own religion and belief. Jonothan Burton comments that it is clear that the Turks and the Hungarians are not used to what he calls “friendly parle.” Also, the situation calls for diplomatic measures, and he points out that the Turks have had enough of bloodshed for the present time, being "glutted with the Christians’ blood’’ (*Anglo-Ottoman* 127).

As with Marlowe's treaty between Orcanes and Sigismund, the diplomatic relationship between Elizabeth I and Murad III reflected a growing need for a politics that took account of increasingly global trade. A diametrical opposition between the Christian and Muslim worlds no longer met that need. In the play, Tamburlaine is the offstage threat to the new agreement between Orcanes. In actuality, Elizabeth I and Murad III were also motivated by a third-party threat - Spain in the West, and Persia in the East. Turks might still be considered followers of an alien and wrong-headed religion by some in Elizabeth’s realm, but in diplomatic spheres a pragmatic alliance had taken the place of stubborn opposition (Burton, *Anglo-Ottoman* 128).

Although Sigismund, a king of Hungary and Frederick, lord of Buda and Bohemya, decide to make a peace with Turks, they rethink their agreement. Frederick describes Turks as ‘‘these heathenish Turks and pagans’’ (2:2.1.5) and wants to take revenge on them Turks because of their history of antagonism. Turks are further described negatively in the second part of the play, this time by Amyras, Tamburlaine's son refers Turks as ‘proud’ (2:4.1.2).

As the Turks go back to fight with Tamburlaine’s army, Frederick and Sigismund decide to break their vows and fight with the Turks. When Orcanes learns that the Christians have broken their vows and have joined to fight with them, he prays to Jesus instead of to his own God. If Jesus is real, he wants Jesus to help him (2:2.2.61-70). Thus, Marlowe makes his Muslim Turk character pray to Jesus in the play. At the end of the war, the Christians have lost. Sigusmond understand this when he says, ‘‘And God hath thunder'd vengeance from on high, For my accurs'd and hateful perjury’’ (2:2.3.2-3). Orcanes is portrayed as a better person than Christian hypocrites and better also than Tamburlaine and his sons. In this way, the audience sees that the greatest duplicity can come from a supposed Christian who claims himself to be the

enemy of the Turks (Perille 56-57). In addition, in both parts of Tamburlaine the Great, Turks are portrayed in subtle and varied ways. They are shown as suffering not only under Tamburlaine's violence but also from the double-dealing of the Christians, both of which serve to increase and validate Turkish authority (Perille 57).

This may also represent a moral lesson to his people that if they break their vows, negative consequences will be the result: then, he dies. In fact, Marlowe punishes Christians as they break their vows while also forcing Muslim characters to accept the power of the Christian God. He probably shows this scene on purpose to his audiences as a mark of Jesus' "puissance" and of his existence in any case. This is the first time that Marlowe allows his victorious Muslim characters to have their prayers accepted, but only to his own God, the Christian God, Jesus. It is possible that he is trying to show Turks' beliefs as wrong, and their swearing and praying as exaggerated nonsense. For example, when Bajezeth and his wife swear and pray to God and Mohammed, they are defeated by Tamburlaine. Whenever Turkish characters in the play pray or swear on their own God, they always lose. So, the Christian point of view casts Mohammed in the role of a God who doesn't help them.

Also, as well as some misrepresentation of historical figures and characters in the play, in *Tamburlaine the Great* as in *A Christian Turn'ed Turk*, Islam is misrepresented. In both plays, Muslim characters swear or pray upon Mohammed in a parody of Christianity; Zabina protests against Mohammed, rather than against God, when her husband, Bajezeth is defeated. Marlowe shows Muhammed as God in his play and ignores the different concept of prophets in Islam.

After Callapine, Bajezeth's son, runs away from Tamburlaine with Almeda's help, he meets with the kings of Trebizon and Syria, the kings of Anatolia and Jaruselam and various lords. They give a crown to Callapine and announce him as ''Emperor of Turkey' (2:3.1.12). Here, instead of Ottoman Empire, it is again mentioned as "Turkey". Beautiful 'Turkish concubines'' are also mentioned in the play by Calyphas, Tamburlaine's son, who also mentions them himself. (2:4.3.69). Marlowe was clearly aware of the stories about the private lives of the Ottoman Sultans.

Like first part of the play, the second part also contains positive approaches towards Turks although very few. For example, the Turkish captain of Balsera is

portrayed as someone who, while fighting Tamburlaine, would rather die fighting than surrender the castle to him (2:3.3). As a Turk character, Orcanes is also portrayed as a better person than Christian hypocrites. On the other hand, Balsera's captain's wife, Olympia is portrayed as a chaste and strong Turkish woman who could kill her son and herself rather than be captured by Tamburlaine after her husband died (2:3.4). Turkish woman is portrayed as moral person in the play unlike *A Christian Turn'd Turk*.

Unlike the first part, in the second part of the play *Tamburlaine* is shown as Muslim. This can be understood from his words: ''For I have sworn by sacred Mahomet'' (2:1.3.115). According to Jonathan Burton, the second part of the play *Tamburlaine the Great* breaks with established literary tradition by allowing his European characters to speak as their own interested agents. This may explain why Marlowe clearly flags up Tamburlaine's Muslim "otherness" in this second part, thereby alienating him from Western audiences (*Anglo-Ottoman* 147). As Tamburlaine grows more Islamic in Marlowe's second part of the play, so do his ideological aims become clearer and sharper in focus. When Marlowe had Tamburlaine as Europe's champion against the Ottomans, his Muslim identity is not emphasised. However, once the Ottomans are defeated and Europe reassured, Tamburlaine becomes both more Muslim and more ruthlessly violent. Marlowe therefore places very specific conditions on the way he portrays his central character, according to how useful he is to "us". This echoes the Elizabethan-Ottoman trade relations approach - the separate religious identity is tolerated when it is convenient to do so (Burton, *Anglo-Ottoman* 145).

At the end of the second part of play, Tamburlaine takes part in his boldest and most arguable act and sets the Qur'an on fire, claiming to be superior to any God. Tamburlaine denies and rebels against God and defies the Prophet of Islam in the play:

> Now, Casane, where's the Turkish Alcoran,
> And all the heaps of superstitious books
> Found in the temples of that Mahomet
> Whom I have thought a god? they shall be burnt.
> (2:5.1.155-8)

Again, Marlowe reflects the historical figure, Tamburlaine, wrongly: the Quran is shown as the holy book for Turks only, confusing the Muslim faith with Turkish identity. In addition, the historical Tamburlaine is again portrayed wrongly in the second part of the play as well. This is the scene of the second part of the play in which Tamburlaine burns the Quran. It bears no resemblance to reality as the historical Tamburlaine was a very religious Muslim (Turkmen 3).

Elizabethan audiences may or may not have been relatively little offended by this destructive and hostile action against the religion of Islam. Looking a little deeper however, this act of violence against his own faith occurs when Tamburlaine is out of control in his acts of cruelty: he has just ordered his men to "drown them all, man, woman, and child" (2:5.1.151). A subtle psychological message is sent: violence against the Islamic religion. However repellent violence towards Muslims may appear on the face of it, it is justified because that is how Muslims themselves behave. The Elizabethan audience watching the second play cannot fully accept Tamburlaine because of his violent acts, nor entirely reject him because of them, and yet Christianity still does not, somehow, emerge as claiming the moral high ground in the conflict between the two faiths (Burton, *Elizabeth's Turkish* 11). Tamburlaine's antisocial lack of principle is comparable to some of Ward's acts in *A Christian Turn'd Turk* (Hutchings 95). Then Tamburlaine adds these words:

> In vain, I see, men worship Mahomet:
> My sword hath sent millions of Turks to hell,
> Slew all his priests, his kinsmen, and his friends,
> And yet I live untouch'd by Mahomet. (2:5.1.?).

Here, Marlowe implies that there can be no Mohammed if he does not punish what Tamburlaine has done. When this punishment does not arrive, the implication again is that the divinity worshipped by Turks is wrong and empty. Tamburlaine gets sick but being sick doesn't make him feel like he's being punished for his actions in the play. At the end, when Tamburlaine dies from illness the play recounts: ''For Tamburlaine, the scourge of God, must die'' (2:5.3). Marlowe formerly implied that as Tamburlaine killed and defeated the Ottomans and ended their superiority over the Christians, in death Tamburlaine becomes the alien once more: 'the scourge of God'.

It is highly possible that at least some members of Marlowe's Christian audience could have been troubled by Tamburlaine's burning of the Koran (Marlowe and Gibbons xiv). It therefore appears to be Marlowe who gave his central character this mild reaction to his act of cultural and religious vandalism, because we also have the information that Tamburlaine died of natural causes, according to his doctors. Marlowe's audience must decide the answers to several questions - were the doctors right, and thinking otherwise just childish nonsense? Or was he punished for his act of anti-religious defiance? Or, alternatively, was Tamburlaine first the punisher of the enemies of the Christians, only to be punished for rejecting his own religious identity? We are left to consider all these possibilities (Marlowe and Gibbons xiv). Mina Urgan mentions that despite Tamburlaine's deification and defiance of fate, fate still strikes him twice: first, his wife, the only person he ever loved on earth, dies, and then he falls prey to a terminal illness (211). However, Marlowe does not convey this to the audience as a punishment. As Nazan Aksoy claims, Tamburlaine is drawn as a savior, not a tyrant to be punished (*Turks in Renaissance* 82).

Both parts of the play, *Tamburlaine the Great* mispresents Turkish characters, Ottoman Sultans and some Turkish history. While Marlowe was writing these two parts of the play, he had bias towards Turks and reflected this in his writing. Marlowe benefited from real historical figures such as Sultan Bayezid (Bajezeth) and Tamburlaine. He used historical events such as the 'Ankara battle' between Tamburlaine and Bajezeth I. In addition, he refers to historical events between Christians and Ottomans such as the siege of Vienna, possibly to increases his plays' reality and interest, and he appears to have achieved this because of the popularity of his plays at the time. In the opinion of the author of this play, he might have deliberately reflected Turkish characters and their aims negatively because of prejudice and to assuage his audience's fears of the Ottoman Empire and attract their interest at the same time. However, some critics such as M.C. Bradbrook disagree with this opinion. According to him, Bajezeth's only function as Tamburlaine's opponent is to further demonstrate Tamburlaine's strength, like his other opponents in the play (*Themes* 139). Unlike Bradbrook, Halide Edip Adıvar emphasised that a formidable opposing power was necessary for Marlowe, and the power that seemed invincible during his lifetime was the Ottoman state (Adıvar quoted in Aksoy 76). Europeans were afraid because Yıldırım Bajazeth I, defeated them in Nicopolis in 1396 (Aksoy

82). Nazan Aksoy mentions that perhaps the most appealing aspect of the story for the European audience is that Tamburlaine showed that the Turk, who was thought to be invincible in the West in the 16th century, was not invincible by defeating him in that previous century. As seen in the second part of the play, the Crusaders under the command of Sigismund could not defeat the Turks, so the story of the defeat in the east of the undefeated Turk in the west was likely a comforting subject for the audience (*Turks in Renaissance* 83).

CONCLUSION

During the Renaissance Period, many popular theatrical presentations were born from the historical, cultural, economic, and religious elements existent during that distinct time in history. The storylines of the plays, the characters that were created, the challenges, moral dilemmas, and decisions those characters made and the consequences of their actions, were all inspired by the world outside the theatre.

The characters brought to life by the playwrights of two plays in particular - *A Christian Turn'd Turk* and *Tamburlaine the Great*, share similar attitudes, beliefs, even emotions, as the people living in the times and geographic location where these plays were written and performed. A very dominate theme that was evident in these stage dramas was the concept of "Englishness" versus "Turkishness". The British and the Ottomans represented two different cultures and political entities, underpinned by two different belief systems. These two groups, at times, existed peacefully, fostering good relations when Queen Elizabeth of England and the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire had common interests involving trade on the Mediterranean Sea. They both profited from this trade revenue when they put their business interests before their personal feelings. Through open communication, they had mutual respect for each other and worked together for a common goal- to make the countries they were leading prosperous through trade.

Another core theme that was woven into the two plays was the conflict and struggle between Christianity and Islam. The Western world, including therefore the English, were Christian. On top of that threat, there was a temptation for some more worldly Britons to convert to Islam, a religion greatly feared by many in the Western world. The sheer power of the Ottoman Empire intimidated many Westerners. In addition, many thought that Islam would be forced upon them, and not just Islam - Shariah Law - following the conquest of their lands.

At the time these two plays were being performed in playhouses, people regarded plays as a form of entertainment. However, they were also a chief vehicle the playwrights used to incorporate some of the very real struggles between the Western world and the Ottoman Empire. There were many misunderstandings and misrepresentations of Turks at this time in history, and these ideas and themes became

part of the storylines: mistrust of Islam, fear of the Ottoman Empire. There were also other existent notions as well that were in contrast with the negative portrayal of the Turks, such as the amicable relations of the Queen and Sultan in trade relations and the temptation for some English travellers to give up Christianity and become Muslim.

Reflecting historical figures and events wrongly and the challenges of human experience melded together on stage. Turks were often portrayed in a negative light: in general, they are portrayed as untrustworthy along with other bad characteristics. Robert Daborne's, *A Christian Turn'd Turk*, was staged at the height of British curiosity with the Ottoman Turks, as well as their genuine fear of Islam. Daborne himself was born poor and struggled financially throughout his lifetime. This personal experience appears to give a callous flavor to his theatrical works, in which he illustrated the Turkish culture (way of life) as well as the Islamic faith.

There were elements that brought to the stage the very real anti-Islamic sentiments of the Western world, the hostility, fear-mongering propaganda derived from the minds and mouths of the rulers /leaders of the Western world.

In Daborne's, *A Christian Turn'd Turk*, the audience embraces the destiny of an English Captain, Ward, who is punished for converting to Islam. In the play, Ward chooses to reject his English roots both culturally and religiously and he finds there is a heavy price to pay for that betrayal. Ward finds himself in a predicament where he converts to Islam for a woman- Voada. He "turned Turk" for her; and afterwards, she rejects him and tells him that there will be no forgiveness for him in the Islamic religion, just as Christianity will not forgive him for converting to Islam. In this play, pirates are cold-hearted and shallow, Turkish women are loose and immoral and Turks in general unethical, immoral, lustful, dishonest murderers - even worse than the pirates.

Christopher Marlowe, playwright of *Tamburlaine the Great*, drew on his own religious beliefs and incorporated some of those concepts and ideas into his plays. Marlowe was known for violence in his plays, and he incorporated into his theatrical works the great fear of the British that their land would be taken over by the Turks and their loved ones would convert from Christianity to Islam. He also included in his play, the Englishman's curiosity about the Eastern way of life. In those times, international trade took off and many people - diplomats, soldiers, merchants, and even

pirates - were able to explore and learn about the Ottoman Empire. People had an opportunity to learn about a new culture and religion, and the possibility of conversion to the religion of Islam became a possibility, further assisted by the Ottomans' positive attitude, influenced by the politics and trade of the time, towards non-Muslims.

Some of the influence that is apparent in *Tamburlaine the Great* stems from the period of time in which it was written. During this time in history, Muslims and Jews could not live together peacefully with Christians in Western Europe. When Marlowe wrote the play, he was aware of the business relationship between the Queen of England and the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire. Marlowe tells the story of the Muslim conqueror from both business and political points of view. His play also portrayed the Turks as strong and forceful, a threatening force. He explores the Western reaction to the Ottomans' relentless quest for power. Marlowe's hero, Tamburlaine, actually represents Timur, a real-life historical person. However, some historical events were not completely accurate.

Tamburlaine was a violent man of action who was both to be revered and punished, for he was noble and ruthless. He was an aristocrat, a Muslim who adhered to Sharia Law. He was a great threat to any Christian or citizen of the Western world in general, however the play has a turning point when the Christians become optimistic as they defeat the Ottoman Turks. In the end, the protagonist is caged and humiliated as the Christians not only physically defeat one man, but symbolically overcome an entire religion, the one that they most feared.

As a conclusion, due to contemporary fears of the conquest of their lands by the Turks and the conversion of their people to Islam, Turkish characters the power of the Ottoman Empire and events in its history became common themes in their plays, appealing also to the abiding Western interest in the East and especially Ottoman lifestyles as culturally different from their own. Playwrights like Daborne and Marlowe therefore chose to use Turkish characters and their stories to attract their audiences with contemporary interests as well as fears.

From the representations of Turkishness in these two plays, it is possible to get a general idea about the cultural and literary context of Turkish-English relations in that period, as well as about the function of theatre and drama in the Early Modern period. It is therefore possible to conclude based on these two plays: *A Christian*

Turn'd Turk highlights the fear of outward conversion, *Tamburlaine the Great* highlights the fear of Ottoman conquest.

A Christian Turn'd Turk demonstrates very considerable bias and prejudice towards Turks who are mentioned in the play as 'unhealthy', 'villian', 'pagans', 'slaves of Mahomet and the Ottoman Empire', 'thieves', 'pirate', runagetes', 'hell', 'pitiful', and their lives are mentioned as 'worse than slaves'. The only positive is their power, represented by the 'Great Turk' mentioned twice in the play. Ward decries the Ottoman Empire's power with his dying words, although too late. He says that united Christians could overcome the Ottoman Empire, thus reflecting the Ottoman Empire's power but in a negative way. Apart from this, scene after scene shows the Turks' negative ways.

On the other hand, *Tamburlaine the Great* further tries to demonstrate that the Turks were not invincible, that their strength was overestimated, and their beliefs wrong. Turks are called 'cowards', 'betrayers', 'barbarians', 'heathens, 'pagans', 'bloodthirsty killers', 'cruel', 'aggressors', 'full of brags', 'arrogant', gamblers and 'full of talk rather than action'. On the other hand, there are some positive references. Turks are referred to as 'great Turks' and their military power, courage and pride are noted.

Unlike in *A Christian Turn'd Turk*, none of the Turks in *Tamburlaine the Great* are portrayed as having low morals, or as being lascivious, lying, backstabbing, or manipulative. Both Marlowe and Daborne however mostly misrepresent Turks and their history in these two plays.

WORKS CITED

Aksoy, Nazan. *Rönesans Ingilteresinde Türkler*. İstanbul Bilgi Universitesi, 2004

Allman, Eileen Jorge. *Jacobean Revenge Tragedy and the Politics of Virtue*. United States: University of Delaware Press, 1999.

Al-Olaqi, Fahd Mohammed Taleb. ‘‘The Fear of Conversion to Islam in Daborne’s A Christian Turn’d Turk (1609).’’ *Studies In Literature and Language*, 14.3, 2017, 1-12.

---. ‘‘The Oriental Other: Soliman the Magnificent in Kyd’s Soliman and Perseda.’’ *Trames*, 17.1, 2013, 35-54.

---. ‘‘The Uxoricide Legend of the Sultan and his European Wife in Elizabethan Drama.’’ *Arts and Social Sciences Journal*, 8.1, 2017, 1-8.

Aydın, Kamil. *Images Of Turkey İn Western Literature*. The British Council, 1999.

Bacon, Wallace A. “The Source of Robert Daborne’s the Poormans Comfort.” *Modern Language Notes*, vol. 57, no. 5, May 1942, pp. 345–48. EBSCOhost, https://doi.org/10.2307/2910162.

Bak, Greg. *Barbary Pirate: The Life and Crimes of John Ward*. The History Press, 2010. Internet Archive, https://archive.org/details/barbarypiratelif0000bakg/page/176/mode/2up?q=osman

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

Barker, Andrew. *A True and Certaine Report of the Beginning, Proceedings, Overthrowes, and Now Present Estate of Captaine Ward and Danseker*. London: William Hal, 1609.

Bartels, Emily C., and Emma Smith, editors. *Christopher Marlowe in Context*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Boorde, Andrew. *Introduction of Knowledge*. London: Courtauld Institute Records, 1542.

Bradbrook, M. C. *Themes and conventions of Elizabethan tragedy*. Cambridge University Press, 1980. Vol. 1.

Brotton, Jerry. *The Sultan and The Queen: The Untold Story of Elizabeth and Islam*. Penguin, 2017.

Burian, Orhan. "Interest of the English in Turkey as Reflected in English Literature of the Renaissance." *Oriens*, 5.2, 1952, 209-229.

---. ‘‘Türk-İngiliz Münasebetinin İlk Yılları.’’ *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil Ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*, vol.9, no.1-2, 1951, 1-41.

Burton, Jonathan. ‘‘Anglo-Ottoman Relations and The Image of The Turk in Tamburlaine.’’ *Journal Of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, vol.30, no.1, 2000, 125-156.

---. ‘‘Elizabeth’s Turkish Trade and Marlowe’s Tamburlaine Trap.’’ *Theatre for a New Audience 360° Series.* 2014. https://www.academia.edu/33850974/

---. ‘‘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.

---. *Traffic And Turning: Islam and English Drama, 1579-1624*. University Of Delaware Press, 2005.

Cathcart, Charles. ‘‘Robert Daborne’s Irish Critic.’’ *Medieval And Renaissance Drama in England*, vol.30, no.30, 2017, 37.

Cawthorne, Nigel. Kings & Queens of England: A Royal History From Egbert to Elizabeth II. Arcturus, 2009. EBSCOhost,

https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=sso&db=nlebk&AN=1009952&site=eds-live.

Çelik, Yavuz. *Toplumsal ve Tarihsel Boyutlarıyla İngiliz Tiyatrosunda Sansür*. 2005. Atatürk University, MA thesis.

Chew, Samuel C. *The Crescent and the Rose: Islam and England During the Renaissance*. Oxford University Press, 1937.

Colin, Martin, and Parker Geoffrey. *Spanish Armada*. W.W. Norton & Company, 1992.

Çırakman, Aslı. *From the" terror of the World" to the" sick Man of Europe": European Images of Ottoman Empire and Society from the Sixteenth Century to the Nineteenth*. Peter Lang Publishing, 2002.

Crammer, Thomas. *The Book of Homilies*. Courtauld Institute Records, 1547 – 1599.

Dereli, Hamit. *Kraliçe Elizabeth Devrinde Türkler ve İngilizler.* Anıl Matbaası, 1951.

Dimmock, Matthew. *New Turkes: Dramatizing Islam and The Ottomans in Early Modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.

Doğan, Evrim. *A New Historicist Account of Medieval/ Feudal Relations in English Drama During the Renaissance*. 2005. Ankara University, MA thesis.

Easton, T. *Homilies*. Courtauld Institute Records, 1605.

Eccles, Mark. "Robert Daborne." Studies in Philology, vol.79, no.4, 1982. EBSCOhost, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=sso&db=asn&AN=5233579&site=eds-live.

Elaskary, Mohamed, and Hesham Khadawardi. ''Marlowe's Tamburlaine: History and Fiction in Representing Islam and Muslims.'' *International Journal of Foreign Studies,* vol.9, no.1, 2016, 55-75.

Ellinghausen, Laurie. '''We are of the Sea!': Masterless Identity and Transnational Context in Daborne's A Christian Turned Turk.'' *Pirates, Traitors, and Apostates: Renegade Identities in Early Modern English Writing*. University of Toronto Press, 2019.

Ercan, Özge, A. *İngiliz Seyyah John Sanderson'ın Seyahatnamesi (1584-1602): Türkçe Çeviri ve İstanbul Gözlemlerinin Değerlendirilmesi*. 2014. İstanbul University, MA thesis.

Erkoç, Seda. ''Dealing With Tyranny: Fulke Greville's Mustapha in the Context of His Other Writings and of His View on Anglo-Ottoman Relations.'' *Osmanlı Araştırmaları,* vol.47, 2016, 265-290.

Esen, M. Fatih, and Melih Karakuzu. ‘‘Misrepresentations of Turks in early modern drama and motivations underlying this denigration.’’ *1st International Conference on Foreign Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, vol.5, no.7, 2011, 867-876.

Esra, Jo Ann. *The Shaping of'West Barbary': The Re/construction of Identity and West Country Barbary Captivity.* 2013. University of Exeter, Ph.D. dissertation.

Evans, Benjamin Ifor. *A short history of English drama*. MacGibbon & Kee, 1965.

Firth, C. H. “The British Empire.” *The Scottish Historical Review*, vol.15, no.59, 1918, 185–89, Http://Www.Jstor.Org/Stable/25519078.

Fisher, Frederick J. “London’s Export Trade in The Early Seventeenth Century,” *The Economic History Review*, 2nd Ser., vol.3, no.2, 1950, 151–61.

Fuchs, Barbara. ‘‘Faithless Empires: Pirates, Renegadoes, and the English Nation.’’ *The Johns Hopkins University Press*, vol.67, no.1, 2000, 45-69.

---. *Mimesis And Empire: The New World, Islam, And European İdentities*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Garner, Gary O. "Evolution of the English Reformation: Phase I (Henry VIII) and Phase 2 (Elizabeth I)." *Bible College of Queensland*, 2003, 2-16.

Goffman, Daniel. *Britons In the Ottoman Empire, 1642-1660*. University of Washington Press, 1998.

Gray, Jonathan. Oaths and the English Reformation. Cambridge University Press, 2013.EBSCOhost, https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=sso&db=nlebk&AN=494792&site=eds-live.

Greene, Robert. *Alphonsus, King of Aragon*. Good Press, 2018.

Greville, Fulke. *The Tragedy of Mustapha: The Selected Writings of Fulke Greville*. Ed. Joan Rees. Londra: Athlone Press, 1973.

Hackett, Helen. A Short History of English Renaissance Drama. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2012.

Haigh, Christopher. *The Reign of Elizabeth I.* Macmillan International Higher Education, 1984.

Hakluyt, Richard. *Principal Navigations Voyages Traffiques and Discoveries of The English Nation. Vol. Three.* Jm Dent and Sons Limited, 1927.

Heywood, C.J. "English Diplomatic Relations with Turkey, 1689-1698." In *Four Centuries of Turco-British Relations*, William Hale and Ali Ihsan Bagis, eds. North Humberside, UK: The Eothen Press, 1984.

Hodgson, Marshall GS. *The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in a World Civiliazation*. University of Chicago Press, 1974, vol.1.

Hoenselaars, A. J. ''The Elizabethans and the Turk at Constantinople.'' *Cahiers Élisabéthains,* vol.47, no.1, 1995, 29-42.

Hollander, Barbara Gottfried. Elizabeth I: Queen of England. Britannica Educational Publishing, 2017. EBSCOhost,

https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=sso&db=nlebk&AN=1508272&site=eds-live.

Horniker, Arthur Leon. ''William Harborne and the beginning of Anglo-Turkish diplomatic and commercial relations.'' *The Journal of Modern History*, vol.14, no.3, 1942, 289-316.

Hutchings, Mark. ''Acting Pirates: Converting A Christian Turned Turk.'' *Pirates? The Politics of Plunder, 1550–1650*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

İnalcık, Halil. *From Empire to Republic*. Gorgias Press, 2010.

Javed, Muhammad. "A Study of Elizabethan Period (1558-1603)." *International Journal Online Of Humanities*, vol.6, no.2, 2020, 60-80.

Jenkins, Simon. *A Short History of England*. Profile Books, 2012.

Jenkinson, A. *The Voyage of Jenkinson*. Courtauld Institute Records, 1561.

Jowitt, Claire. *Voyage drama and gender politics, 1589-1642: Real and Imagined Worlds*. Manchester University Press, 2003.

Kahf, Mohja. *Western Representations of the Muslim Woman: From Termagant to Odalisque*. University of Texas Press, 1999.

Karaca, Taha Niyazi. "Dostluktan Çatışmaya Osmanlı Dönemi Türk-İngiliz İlişkileri." *Journal Of Anglo-Turkish Relations,*1.1, 2020, 11-32.

Kelly, Michael J. "Christopher Marlowe and The Golden Age of England". *The Marlowe Society Research Journal,* vol.05, 2008.

Kenan, Seyfi. *Osmanlılar Ve Avrupa: Seyahat, Karşılaşma Ve Etkileşim/ The Ottomans and Europe - Travel, Encounter and Interaction.* İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi (ISAM), 2010.

Khan, Farhana Wazir. ''Mirrors of Governance: The Mighty Turkish Diadem'and English Drama (Selimus. Sc. xxvi. 2340).'' *Journal of European Studies,* vol.26, no.2-1, 2011.

Khushboo. ''Important Aspects of Elizabethan Era.'' *International Journal of Scientific Research and Review*, vol.7, no.6, 2019, 819-828.

Knolles, Richard. *The Generall Historie of the Turkes: From the First Beginning of that Nation to the Rising of the Othoman Familie: with All the Notable Expeditions of the Christian Princes Against Them. Together with the Lives and Conquests of the Othoman Kings and Emperours Unto the Yeare 1610*. A. Islip, 1610.

Kolb, Justin. "'In th'armor of a Pagan knight': Romance and Anachronism East of England in Book V of" The Faerie Queene" and" Tamburlaine"." *Early Theatre*, vol.12, no.2, 2009, 194-207.

Kurat, Akdes Nimet, *Türk-İngiliz Münasebetlerinin Başlangıcı Ve Gelişmesi (1553-1610)*. Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1953.

---. "Some Turkish Records and Materials in The Public Record Office (London) And English Libraries." *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*, 07.01, 1949, 025–027.

Kuriyama, Constance Brown. *Christopher Marlowe*. Cornell University Press, 2018.

Kyd, Thomas. *The tragedy of Soliman and Perseda*. Lulu.com, 2008.

Levin, Carole. *The Reign of Elizabeth 1*. Macmillan International Higher Education, 2001.

Lewis, Bernard. ‘’Europe and the Turks: The civilization of the Ottoman Empire’’. *History Today.* 1953.

---. *Islam and the West*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993. Internet resource.

Lewis, Geoffrey. *Modern Turkey*. Praeger, 1974.

Lloyd, Amy J. “The British Empire”. *British Library Newspapers*, 2007.

Longman, Stanley Vincent. “Robert Daborne.” *Salem Press Biographical Encyclopedia*, 2021.EBSCOhost,

search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=sso&db=ers&AN=89875600&site=eds-live.

Lublin, Robert I. *Costuming the Shakespearean Stage: Visual Codes of Representation in Early Modern Theatre and Culture*. Routledge, 2016.

Mabie, Joshua. “The Problem of the Prodigal in the Fair Maid of the West, a Christian Turned Turk, and the Renegado.” *Renascence*, 64.4, Summer 2012, 298–319. EBSCOhost,
https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=sso&db=asn&AN=77369878&site=eds-live.

MacLean, Gerald. "Of Pirates, Slaves, and Diplomats: Anglo-American Writing about the Maghrib in the Age of Empire." *Pirates? The Politics of Plunder, 1550–1650*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

---. "On Turning Turk or Trying To: National Identity in Robert Daborne's A Christian Turn'd Turke." *Explorations in Renaissance Culture*, vol.29, no.2, 2003, 225-252.

Malečková, Jitka. *The Turk” in the Czech Imagination (1870s-1923).* Brill, 2020. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004440791 Web.

Manz, Beatrice Forbes. “Tamerlane’s Career and Its Uses.” Journal of World History, vol. 13, no. 1, Spring 2002, 1-25.

EBSCOhost, https://doi.org/10.1353/jwh.2002.0017.

Marlowe, Christopher, and Brian Gibbons. *Christopher Marlowe: Four Plays: Tamburlaine, Parts One and Two, The Jew of Malta, Edward II and Dr Faustus*. Methuen Drama, 2014. EBSCOhost,

https://eds.p.ebscohost.com/eds/ebookviewer/ebook?sid=9e2fd6bd-bc65-4890-be36-6b432e83f4de%40redis&vid=3&rid=1&format=EB

Mason, Antony, and David Salariya. Kings & Queens: A Very Peculiar History: With Added Blue Blood. Andrews UK, 2011. EBSCOhost,

https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=sso&db=nlebk&AN=432976&site=eds-live.

Matar, Nabil. *Islam in Britain 1558-1685*. Cambridge UP, 1998.

---. "The Renegade in the English Seventeenth-Century Imagination." *Studies in English Literature* 1500-1900, 33, 1993, 489-505.

McJannet, Linda. "Islam and English drama: a critical history." *Early Theatre*, 12.2, 2009, 183-193.

---. *The Sultan Speaks: Dialogue in English Plays and Histories about the Ottoman Turks*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Merriman, Roger Bigelow. *Suleiman the Magnificent, 1520-1566*. Harvard University Press, 2013.

Mikyšková, Anna. *The Image of "Turkishness" in Two Jacobean Plays*. 2015. Masaryk University, Bachelor thesis.

Milton, Giles. "John Ward: the real Captain Jack Sparrow." *BBC History Revealed*, 2019.

Moran, Berna. "İngiliz Edebiyatında Fatih Sultan Mehmed Hakkında Piyesler." *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi*, vol.8, 1958, 73-83.

Moseley, Charles. *English Renaissance Drama: A Very Brief Introduction to Theatre and Theatres in Shakespeare's Time*. Humanities-Ebooks, 2010.

Niayesh, Ladan. *Three romances of Eastern conquest*. Manchester University Press, 2018.

Nicholson, Reynold A. *Literary history of the Arabs*. Routledge, 2014.

O'Brien, Tracy Ann. *Early Modern English Anxieties: English-Ottoman Encounters in the Fair Maid of The West Parts I & II, And The Renegado*. 2018. Memorial University of Newfoundland, M.A. thesis.

O'Connor, Joseph D. *Better English Pronunciation*. Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Oueijan, Naji B. ‘‘The Progress of an Image: The East in English Literature.’’ Peter Lang Verlag, 2021. < https://www.peterlang.com/document/1084181 >. Web. 1 Dec. 2021.

Öğünç, Banu. "Sources of Orientalism: Tracing Ottoman Empire in British Mind." *Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi,* vol.44, 2018, 245-257.

Parr, Anthony. "The Travels of the Three English Brothers in." *Three Renaissance Travel Plays,* vol.8, 1995.

Pasini, Joy. *Kin with Kin and Kind with Kind Confound: Pity, Justice, and Family Killing in Early Modern Dramas Depicting Islam*. 2012. Rice University, Ph.D. dissertation.

Perille, Laura. *“A Mirror to Turke”: “Turks” and the Making of Early Modern England.* 2015. Brown University, Ph.D. dissertation.

Phelps, Wayne H. "The Early Life of Robert Daborne." *Philological Quarterly*, vol.59, no.1, 1980.

Potter, Lois. "Pirates and ‘Turning Turk’ in Renaissance Drama." *Travel and Drama in Shakespeare’s Time,* 1996, 124-40.

Roy, Steven A. *The Anglo-Ottoman Encounter: Diplomacy, Commerce, and Popular Culture, 1580-1650*. 2012. California State University, MA thesis.

Royle, Wesley. *AQA GCSE History: Elizabethan England, C1568-1603*. Hodder Education Group, 2016. EBSCOhost,

https://eds.p.ebscohost.com/eds/ebookviewer/ebook?sid=bb88dcf2-1083-4e0a-9a9c-69e04fc9bd1f%40redis&vid=1&rid=1&format=EB

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. Vintage, 1979.

Schelling, F. Emmanuel. *Elizabethan Drama, 1558-1642: A History of the Drama in England from the Accession of Queen Elizabeth to the Closing of the Theaters, to which is Prefixed a Résumé of the Earlier Drama from Its Beginnings*. Vol. 2. Houghton Mifflin, 1908.

Schmuck, Stephan. *Politics of Anxiety: The iniago turci in early modern English prose, c. 1550-1620.* 2007. University of Wales, Ph.D. dissertation.

Schwoebel, Robert H. "Coexistence, Conversion, and the Crusade against the Turks." *Studies in the Renaissance*, vol.12, 1965, 164-187.

---. *The Shadow of the Crescent: The Renaissance Image of the Turk*. Brill, 1967.

Şahiner, Mustafa. "Hellish Discourses: Shakespeare's Richard III and Greene's Selimus." Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, vol.29, no.2, December 2012, 157-166.

---. "Oriental matter revisited: representations of the 'Turk'in Robert Greene's Selimus." Journal of Arts and Sciences, vol.10, December 2008, 135-144.

Şenlen-Güvenç, Sıla. "A Foe to All Christians: The Notorious English Corsair Captain and Ottoman Reis John Ward in Early Seventeenth Century English Literature.'' The Turkish Yearbook of Çanakkale Studies, vol.29, 2020, 35-54.

---. "Richard Knolles' The Generall Historie Of The Turkes As A Reflection Of Christian Historiography."Ankara Üniversitesi Osmanlı Tarihi Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Dergisi, vol. 18, 2005, 379-393.

Shmygol, Maria. A Sea-Change': Representations of The Marine In Jacobean Drama And Visual Culture. 2014. University of Liverpool, Ph.D. dissertation.

Skilliter, Susan A. William Harborne and The Trade with Turkey, 1578-1582: A Documentary Study of the First Anglo-Ottoman Relations. Oxford University Press, 1977.

Sohrawardy, Ameer. Trans-İmperial Mediations of The'turk': Early Modern Depictions of Ottoman Encounter in English Drama and Non-Fiction Prose. Rutgers University, 2010.

Streifer, Adriana. "Jewish Renegades and Renegade Jews in Robert Daborne's A Christian Turned Turk." European Judaism, vol.51, no.2, Autumn 2018, 30-35.

Talbot, Michael. British-Ottoman Relations, 1661-1807: Commerce and Diplomatic Practice in Eighteenth-Century Istanbul. Boydell & Brewer, 2017.

Taşdelen, Pınar. "The Ottomans and The Turks Within the Context of Medieval and The Elizabethan English Poetry." Hacettepe University Journal of Turkish Studies/Hütad Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Arastirmalari Dergisi, vol.22, 2015, 253-276.

Tiryakioglu, Nevsal Olcen. The Western Image of Turks from the Middle Ages to the 21st Century: The Myth of 'Terrible Turk'and 'Lustful Turk'. 2015. Nottingham Trent University (United Kingdom), Ph.D. dissertation.

Türkmen, Erkan. "Christopher Marlowe'a Göre Timur." *Erdem*, vol.15, no.43, 1-14.

Urgan, Mina. *İngiliz Edebiyatı Tarihi C. 2*. Altın Kitaplar Yay., 1989.

Uygur, Ufuk Ege. "Rönesans Dönemi İngiliz ve İtalyan Kayıt, Dua ve Seyahatnamelerinde Türk İmajına Epistemolojik Bakış." *Bitlis Eren Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, vol.1, no.7, June 2018, 1-12.

Uygur, Ipek. "Tamburlaine the Great: "The Scourge and Wrath of God." Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 158, December 2014, 155-159.

Vitkus, Daniel J. "Turning Turk in Othello: The conversion and damnation of the Moor." Shakespeare Quarterly, vol.48, no.2, 1997, 145-176.

---. "The English and the Early Modern Mediterranean: Theater, Commerce, and Identity." *Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570–1630*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2003. 25-44.

---. ed. *Three Turk Plays from Early Modern England: Selimus, Emperor of the Turks; a Christian Turned Turk; and the Renegado*. Columbia University Press, 2000.

Vlami, Despina. *Trading with the Ottomans: The Levant Company in the Middle East*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2014.

Wann, Louis. "The oriental in Elizabethan drama." *Modern Philology*, vol.12, no.7, 1915, 423-447.

Wheatcroft, Andrew. *The Ottomans*. London: Viking, 1993.

White, R. J. *England: A History*. New Word City, Inc.; 1st edition, 2015. Ebscohost, Search.Ebscohost.Com/Login.Aspx?Direct=True&Authtype=Sso&Db=Nlebk &AN=1421604&Site=Eds-Live.

White, Sam. *The Climate of Rebellion in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Wood, Alfred C. *A history of the Levant Company*. Routledge, 2013.

Woodward, William Harrison. *A Short History of The Expansion of The British Empire, 1500-1902*. Cambridge University Press, 1902.

Yamada, Akihiro. *Experiencing Drama in the English Renaissance: Readers and Audiences*. Routledge, 2017.

Yerli, Kenan. "Renaissance English Theatre as a Political Propaganda Instrument of the English Monarchy." Current Research in Social Sciences, vol.3, no.3, 2017, 76-85.

Yıldırım, Mehmet Salih. Experiencing the Ancient Theatre: A Perspective on Interpreting the Ancient Greek and Roman Theatre through Reflections from the Space of the Performer. 2013. Middle East Technical University, MA thesis.

TURNITIN REPORT

turnitin raporu

ORİJİNALLİK RAPORU

%4	%4	%3	%1
BENZERLİK ENDEKSİ	İNTERNET KAYNAKLARI	YAYINLAR	ÖĞRENCİ ÖDEVLERİ

BİRİNCİL KAYNAKLAR

1	crrs.ca İnternet Kaynağı	%1
2	ecommons.luc.edu İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
3	epdf.pub İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
4	irep.ntu.ac.uk İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
5	omeka.ibu.edu.ba İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
6	ikee.lib.auth.gr İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
7	www.acarindex.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
8	hdl.handle.net İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
9	ia802606.us.archive.org İnternet Kaynağı	<%1

10	Laurie Ellinghausen. "Pirates, Traitors, and Apostates", University of Toronto Press Inc. (UTPress), 2018 Yayın	<%1
11	acikbilim.yok.gov.tr İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
12	oaktrust.library.tamu.edu İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
13	orca.cf.ac.uk İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
14	"A Companion to the Global Renaissance", Wiley, 2021 Yayın	<%1
15	digitalcommons.wayne.edu İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
16	scholars.unh.edu İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
17	www.aessweb.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
18	Submitted to William Jewell College Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
19	archive.org İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
20	"A New Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture", Wiley, 2010	<%1

	Yayın	
21	www.cscanada.net İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
22	"A New Companion to Renaissance Drama", Wiley, 2017 Yayın	<%1
23	Daniel Vitkus. "Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570–1630", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2003 Yayın	<%1
24	Submitted to Istanbul Aydin University Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
25	Orhan Burian. "INTEREST OF THE ENGLISH IN TURKEY AS REFLECTED IN ENGLISH LITERATURE OF THE RENAISSANCE", Oriens, 1952 Yayın	<%1
26	Monica Matei-Chesnoiu. "Geoparsing Early Modern English Drama", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2015 Yayın	<%1
27	Submitted to University of Queensland Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
28	etheses.bham.ac.uk İnternet Kaynağı	<%1

29	media.proquest.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
30	preserve.lehigh.edu İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
31	driwancybermuseum.wordpress.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
32	en.wikibooks.org İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
33	www.enotes.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
34	Submitted to Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
35	Submitted to University of Birmingham Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
36	ir.lib.uwo.ca İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
37	mafiadoc.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
38	oll2.libertyfund.org İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
39	steindash5k.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
40	www.british-towns.net	

İnternet Kaynağı

<%1

41	Stephan Schmuck. "From Sermon to Play: Literary Representations of 'Turks' in Renaissance England 1550-1625", Literature Compass, 1/2005 Yayın	<%1
42	"Theatre Cultures within Globalising Empires", Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2018 Yayın	<%1
43	Submitted to Australian National University Öğrenci Ödevi	<%1
44	Gerald MacLean. "ON TURNING TURK, OR TRYING TO: NATIONAL IDENTITY IN ROBERT DABORNE'S A CHRISTIAN TURN'D TURKE", Explorations in Renaissance Culture, 2003 Yayın	<%1
45	MARTA STRAZNICKY. "RECENT STUDIES IN CLOSET DRAMA", English Literary Renaissance, 12/1998 Yayın	<%1
46	alldokument.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
47	conservancy.umn.edu İnternet Kaynağı	<%1

48	Gerald MacLean. "Looking East", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2007 Yayın	<%1
49	ebin.pub İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
50	en.wikipedia.org İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
51	memorients.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
52	Arthur Leon Horniker. "William Harborne and the Beginning of Anglo-Turkish Diplomatic and Commercial Relations", The Journal of Modern History, 1942 Yayın	<%1
53	Mark Hutchings. "Turks, Repertories, and the Early Modern English Stage", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2017 Yayın	<%1
54	Matteo Valleriani. "Chapter 5 Pneumatics, the Thermoscope and the New Atomistic Conception of Heat", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2010 Yayın	<%1
55	doczz.it İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
56	etheses.dur.ac.uk	

İnternet Kaynağı <%1

57	files.libertyfund.org İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
58	igitur-archive.library.uu.nl İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
59	infomotions.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
60	worldcat.org İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
61	www.archive.org İnternet Kaynağı	<%1
62	"Remapping the Mediterranean World in Early Modern English Writings", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2007 Yayın	<%1
63	A. E. H. SWAEN. "ROBERT DABORNE'S PLAYS.", Anglia - Zeitschrift für englische Philologie, 1898 Yayın	<%1
64	open.library.ubc.ca İnternet Kaynağı	<%1

RESUME

Name and Surname: Esranur Topçu

State of Education:

Degree	Field	University	Year
Undergraduate	English Language and Literature	Karadeniz Technical University	2016
Graduate	MA English Culture and Literature	Atılım University	