

SEDA ERKOÇ

**REPERCUSSIONS OF A MURDER: THE DEATH OF SEHZADE
MUSTAFA ON EARLY MODERN ENGLISH STAGE**

MA Thesis in Medieval Studies

Central European University

Budapest

May 2008

Repercussions of a Murder: the Death of Sehzade Mustafa on Early
Modern English Stage

by
SEDA ERKOÇ
(Turkey)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,
Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the Master of Arts degree in Medieval Studies

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU

Chair, Examination Committee

Thesis Supervisor

Examiner

Examiner

Budapest
May 2008

Repercussions of a Murder: the Death of Sehzade Mustafa on Early
Modern English Stage

by

SEDA ERKOÇ

(Turkey)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,
Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the Master of Arts degree in Medieval Studies

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU

External Examiner

Budapest
May 2008

Repercussions of a Murder: the Death of Sehzade Mustafa on Early
Modern English Stage

by

SEDA ERKOÇ

(Turkey)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,
Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the Master of Arts degree in Medieval Studies

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU

External Supervisor

Budapest
May 2008

I, the undersigned, **Seda ERKOÇ**, candidate for the MA degree in Medieval Studies declare herewith that the present thesis is exclusively my own work, based on my research and only such external information as properly credited in notes and bibliography. I declare that no unidentified and illegitimate use was made of the work of others, and no part of the thesis infringes on any person's or institution's copyright. I also declare that no part of the thesis has been submitted in this form to any other institution of higher education for an academic degree.

Budapest, 26 May 2008

SIGNATURE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	III
INTRODUCTION	1
I. THE IMAGE, THE SOURCES AND THE STORY	7
Ia. The English and the Ottoman Image in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries	7
Ib. Primary Sources	20
Ic. The Death of Sehzade Mustafa in Ottoman Sources	28
II. THE EUROPEAN SOURCES AND THEIR REPRESENTATION OF THE SULEYMAN-MUSTAFA STORY	37
III. SULEYMAN AND MUSTAFA ON THE ENGLISH STAGE	60
CONCLUSION	86
BIBLIOGRAPHY	89

NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION

In referring to Ottoman historical figures, the Romanized version of their names as found in Stanford Shaw's *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey* will be used: Murad, Suleyman, Selim, Hurrem, Mustafa, Bayazid, Rustem, Ahmed.

In referring to the characters in the narrative accounts and plays the names given by the particular writer will be used:

-in Moffan's "*The horrible act and wicked offence...*,"

Mustapha (Mustapha), Soliman (Suleyman), Rustanus (Rustem), Rosa (Hurrem), Acmat (Ahmed).

-in Busbecq's *Turkish Letters*,

Mustapha (Mustafa), Soleiman (Suleyman), Roostem (Rustem), Roxolana (Hurrem).

-in *Solymannidae*,

Mustapha (Mustafa), Suleiman (Suleyman), Roxanes, (Rustem), Rhodes, (Hurrem), Achmat (Ahmed)

-in Greville's *Mustapha*,

Mustapha (Mustafa), Soliman (Suleyman), Rosten (Rustem), Rossa (Hurrem), Achmat (Ahmed).

All the translations from the Turkish sources are mine, and most of the time they are simple paraphrases rather than literal translations.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank Marcell Sebök and György Endre Szönyi for supervising this study. I need to thank to Marianna Birnbaum for her great interest in my work, for her effort to read the very first drafts and for her support, suggestions and encouragement. I am also thankful to Matthew Dimmock who kindly accepted reading my work and sharing his comments with me. Special thanks go to Paul Latimer, from Bilkent University, who deserves my deepest gratitude for he provided me with the help I needed at the hardest times of this study and did his best to encourage and cheer me up when I felt the most desperate.

I need to express my thanks to Özden, without whom it would be impossible to survive in Budapest. I would also like to thank to my “scholarly” family, Luka, Divna, Ünige, Edina, and Goran, for making the last ten months at CEU more bearable. They deserve a big thank you not only for the productive –in every sense of the word- coffee breaks, movie breaks, family lunches, little drink breaks, and gossip circles, but also for kicking at my door to wake me up when I needed. Finally, I would like to thank my family who has always supported me and my decisions with great sacrifices throughout my life. Last but not the least, I need to thank a special person, Harun Yeni, for being on skype whenever I needed him, for making me smile even when it seemed impossible and for providing me with the materials for this thesis. Above all, I need to thank to him, as one day, suddenly, he decided to walk with me. To him, with love, this work is dedicated.

INTRODUCTION

After the economic developments of the sixteenth century, the Mediterranean and the Ottoman world in particular occupied a central place in the consciousness of the English. English people, who met the Mediterranean civilization firstly through commerce, were interested in all aspects of the people living in that far and loose geography. They were particularly eager to learn about the Ottomans, as the Turk was not only an exotic Other or a commerce partner but also a threat coming closer day by day. All over Europe, information not only on the religion, culture, and costumes of the Turk or the Turkish wars with European states was demanded, but the events that were taking place within the borders of the empire were of great importance for the public. An enormous number of publications dealing with the Turk in one way or another were being circulated in Europe. In the sixteenth century alone, more than three thousand publications dealing with the Turk appeared in Europe.¹ According to Matthias A. Shaaber, in England, in the period 1476-1622, more news was printed about the Turks than any other nation after the French and the Dutch.²

In this bulk of first hand information coming through the official reports and records or the personal letters of the diplomats and ambassadors, travel accounts of pilgrims, adventurers and tradesmen and even through the accounts of slaves, the story of the death of Sehzade Mustafa also leaked into Europe. In 1553 Sehzade Mustafa, the eldest son of Suleyman the Magnificent and the expected heir to the throne, was strangled

¹Jonathan Burton, *Traffic and Turning Islam and English Drama 1579-1624* (Cranbury: Rosemont Publishing, 2005), 22.

²As quoted in Süheyla Artemel, “‘The great Turk’s Particular Inclination to Red Herring’: The Popular Image of the Turk during the Renaissance England,” *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 5, No. 2. (1995): 189. (hereafter: “‘The Great Turk’s Particular Inclination to the Red Herring.’”

at the command of his father. This story was recorded by the contemporary chroniclers and the numerous mourning poems dedicated to Mustafa's death on the Ottoman side. After two years, in 1555, Nicolas à Moffan's Latin text, entitled *Soltani Solymanni Turcorum Imperatoris horrendum facinus, scelerato in proprium filium, natu maximum, Soltanum Mustapham, parricidio, anno domini 1553 patratum*, appeared and set off the repercussions of the story in Europe.³ When Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq's well-known letters were published 1581, the story of Mustafa, which had been circulating in Europe in Latin and vernacular for a while, attracted much more attention.⁴

The story of the execution of a son by the fearsome emperor of the Turks appealed to the European audience. After these first publications, this episode of Ottoman history took its place in most of the general histories written by the influential authors of the age, and it was revised, translated and edited many times to be published in various collections on the Turks. Besides, the story also had a flavor that could be dramatized and performed for the public. In the period between the mid-sixteenth and the mid-seventeenth century "the Suleyman-Mustafa story" became one of the most interesting and appealing tales about the Ottomans for both historians and playwrights.⁵ In this period three plays that were plotted around this Suleyman-Mustafa story were written in England.⁶

³Nicolas à Moffan, *Soltani Solymanni Turcorum Imperatoris horrendum facinus, scelerato in proprium filium, natu maximum, Soltanum Mustapham, parricidio, anno domini 1553 patratum* [The Horrible act of Sultan Suleyman Emperor of the Turks and the wicked Murder of his son sultan Mustafa], Paris, 1555.

⁴Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq, *Turkish Letters* (Oxford: Sickle Moon Books, 2001).

⁵Histories: Thomas Newton, *A Notable History of Saracens* (1575); Richard Knolles, *Generall Historie of the Turkes* (1603); William Painter, *The Palace of Pleasure* (1567). French plays: Gabriel Bounin, *La Soltane* (1561); Georges Thilloy, *Solyman II Quatorziesme Empereur des Turcs* (1617); Jean Mairet, *Le Grand et Dernier Solyman ou la Mort de Mustapha* (1639); Charles von Dalibray, *Le Solyman* (1637).

⁶Anonymous Cambridge play *Solymannidae*, Fulke Greville's *The Tragedy of Mustapha* and Roger Boyle's *The Tragedy of Mustapha, the Son of Solyman the Magnificent*. Other than these, a later one, David Mallet's *Mustapha* (1739) can also be mentioned.

Louis Wann's "The Orient in Elizabethan Drama" (1915) can be accepted as the starting point for scholarly activity on the representation of the Eastern Other in early modern English literature.⁷ Wann, with his detailed chart of English plays dealing with the "orient," sets the borders of studies in the field. Samuel Chew's great work *The Crescent and the Rose: Islam and Britain during the Renaissance* (1926), which came a decade later stands as one of the basic reference books for the field.⁸ Although important as a general overview of the English Renaissance literature dealing with Islam, Chew's work is far from a detailed analysis of representations of "the Other" in literature. Rather, what this book focuses on is the extent of the presence of Muslims in English literature, the connections between East and West and Western sources of information about Islam.

After these preliminary works, there comes the second wave which focuses mostly on the nature of the representation rather than the frequency of Islam and the Turk in English literature. Süheyla Artemel, in her doctoral thesis and long after in her article, "'The Great Turk's Particular Inclination to Red Herring': The Popular Images of the Turk during the Renaissance in England" (1995) demonstrates the ambivalence of the attitudes towards the Turk in English drama.⁹ A number of recent works that conclude the inappropriateness of projecting orientalist ideas on the early modern setting, among them Nabil Matar's *Islam and Britain, 1558-1685* (1998) and *Turks Moors and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery* (1999).¹⁰ In his influential works Matar reasserts the fact that considering the Muslim impact on English commerce and society, "it is not surprising

⁷Louis Wann, "The Orient in Elizabethan Drama" *Modern Philology* 12, No. 7 (1915): 423-447.

⁸Samuel Chew, *The Crescent and the Rose: Islam and Britain during the Renaissance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937).

⁹Süheyla Artemel, "The Idea of Turkey in the Elizabethan Period in the early 17th century with Special Reference to Drama," doctoral thesis, (University of Durham, 1966); "'The Great Turk's Particular Inclination to Red Herring,'" 211.

that in their early modern relations with the Muslims, English writers did not express either authority or possessiveness or the security of domination”.¹¹ Brandon Beck’s *From the Rising of the Sun: English Images of the Ottoman Empire* (1987), Jack D’Amico’s *The Moor in English Renaissance Drama* (1991), and Kim Hall’s *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and Gender in Early Modern England* (1995), which deals either specifically with the Ottoman image or the Moor, are among other influential works which focus on the variety of representations of “the Other” on the English stage.¹² All these works, however, as a result of their vast scope in chronology, do not have a chance to deal with individual works or to consider the constructions in each, which ends in a rather loose evaluation of the image of “the Other”. This approach in the end, leads to an over-generalization of the representations in some influential works.

The final wave on the topic came around and after 2000 with the influential articles and monographs of Daniel Vitkus, Jonathan Burton, Matthew Dimmock and Linda McJannet. Daniel Vitkus, one of the most productive scholars in the field, has focused on Anglo-Mediterranean commercial relations and the influence of these relations on the Anglo-Islamic exchange on the stage in his numerous articles. His specific emphasis on conversion to Islam or “turning Turk” became the main focus in his recent publication, *Turning Turk, English Theatre and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630* (2003).¹³ Matthew Dimmock, on the other hand in his *New Turkes,*

¹⁰Nabil Matar, *Islam in Britain, 1556-1685* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); *Turks Moors and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999).

¹¹Matar, *Islam in Britain*, 11.

¹²Brandon Beck, *From the Rising of the Sun: English Images of the Ottoman Empire* (New York: Peter Lang, 1987); Jack D’Amico, *The Moor in English Renaissance Drama*. (Tampa: University of South Florida Press, 1991); Kim Hall, *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and Gender in Early Modern England* (London: Cornell University Press, 1995).

¹³Daniel Vitkus, “Adventuring Heroes in the Mediterranean: Mapping the Boundaries of Anglo-Islamic Exchange on the Early Modern Stage,” *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 37, No. 1 (2007):

Dramatizing Islam and the Ottomans in Early Modern England (2005) analyzed all the aspects of the representations of the Turk in the period of 1529-1601, a period in which “the portrayal of the ‘turke’ on the stage had achieved an articulacy and a variety that would perhaps be repeated, but would not be superseded”.¹⁴ Jonathan Burton and Linda McJannet in their monographs not only affirmed the idea of going beyond the binarism of Said but also shifted the focus to some less known plays from the over-used ones.¹⁵ Still, the majority of the works that are mentioned focus around a small circle of texts, excluding the great majority of those mentioned in Wann’s article. Therefore, it is certain that despite the efforts of recent scholars many texts are waiting to be read with a more critical eye on the representations of “the Other,” without applying the models of post-colonial theory. Besides, most of these studies lack any incorporation of the Eastern sources, both historical and literary, in their analysis. As a result of this lack of Eastern sources in the analyses, the Eastern Other is rather perceived as an object of Western discourse and therefore the picture of “the Other” is left incomplete, as self-representations are not supplied.

The aim of this study is to analyze the reconstructions of an episode of Ottoman history in the English context. Through evaluating two English plays, the anonymous Cambridge play *Solymannidae* and Fulke Greville’s *The Tragedy of Mustapha*, in terms

75-95; “Early Modern Orientalism: Representations of Islam in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Europe,” *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. Michael Frassetto and David Blanks (London: Macmillan, 1999); *Three Turk Plays from Early Modern England: Selimus, A Christian Turned Turk and The Renegado* (New York: Colombia University Press, 2000); “Turning Turk in Othello: The Conversion and Damnation of the Moor,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 48, No. 2 (1997): 145-176; *Turning Turk. English Theatre and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

¹⁴Matthew Dimmock, *New Turkes: Dramatizing Islam and the Ottomans in Early Modern England* (Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2005), 6.

¹⁵Burton, *Traffic and Turning*; Linda McJannet. *The Sultan Speaks. Dialogue in English Plays and Histories about the Ottoman Turks* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

of their relations to their sources and with specific attention to their alterations of the Suleyman-Mustafa story, this thesis tries to reach a better and a deeper reading of the texts than the present literature offers. Although these plays were partially analyzed and commented on in conjunction with the other plays that represent the Turk in one way or another; this study will be unique in its analysis of two English texts, which are the repercussions of a single historical event, in light of, and with a comparison to the Eastern and Western historical constructions of the same story.

This work aims to fill a gap in the literature on these plays through a direct comparison of the plays with their primary sources in terms of the representation of “the Other” and through a comparison of the European sources with Ottoman accounts of the same story to see the uniquely European additions in the process of reconstruction. This analysis of the plays, that is freed from anachronistic projections and misconceptions on the formation of early modern English identity, will be helpful for a better understanding of the representations that one encounters in these plays. This study challenges the over-generalizations on the influence of transforming rhetoric on the Turk in the texts of early modern England, through focusing on relatively less popular works of the age.

I. THE IMAGE, THE SOURCES AND THE STORY

Ia. The English and the Ottoman Image in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries

A precisely historicized depiction of English culture in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries indicates that the binary opposition of colonizer and colonized, so frequently employed by historians of the field to explain the Anglo-Mediterranean relationships of the era, turns out to be meaningless in this particular context. Despite the clear picture of the economic and political position of Europe in the face of the Ottomans in the Early Modern period and the complexity of the dual relationships between the power circles of the era, most of the modern studies on early modern England prefer reading the representations of “the Other” in English texts with the help of a dichotomy between western domination, conquest and colonialism and eastern inferiority, suppression and colonization.¹⁶ However, this highly misleading dichotomy ends in oversimplification of the representations of the eastern other in general and the Ottomans in particular. As Vitkus puts it, “the assumptions of postcolonial theory and criticism simply do not apply to an early modern Mediterranean context...”¹⁷ English representations of the Ottomans and the Islamic world in general were constructed out of a flux of information from all sides as well as direct encounters and it was not based on a simple colonizer/colonized ideology.

¹⁶Stephan Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self Fashioning* (London: University of Chicago Press, 1984), Hall, *Things of Darkness*; D’Amico, *The Moor in English Renaissance Drama*; Emily Bartels, “The Double Vision of the East: Imperialist Self-Construction in Marlowe’s *Tamburlaine*, Part One” *Renaissance Drama* 23 (1992): 3-24. Although these authors refute Said’s *Orientalism*, in their analysis, they accept the existence of a “British Empire” in the Early Modern period.

¹⁷Vitkus, *Turning Turk*, 7.

Under the influence of Said's all-encompassing *Orientalism*, most critical readings of the Early Modern texts accept and assert the assumption that the attitude of early modern Europe towards the Eastern Other remained "static and stereotypical".¹⁸ Actually, the fixed stereotypical depictions of the Eastern other as irrational, despotic, heretical and fanatical belong to eighteenth and nineteenth century representations rather than the Early Modern ones. A general evaluation of the sources that deal with the Eastern Other in one way or another indicates that tracing a continuity and coherence in the Early Modern Western depictions of the East is quite problematic. Rather, what one gets out of this evaluation are discontinuity and the transformation of ideas and identifications. Contrary to Said's argument that "orientalism" existed not through "its openness, its receptivity to the Orient," but through "internal repetitious consistency about its constitutive will-to-power over the orient," Early Modern texts about the Eastern Others present a variety of negative and positive ideas rather than consistent repetition.¹⁹ As Çirakman puts it, Europeans in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries seem to have had quite ambivalent impressions that ranged from sympathy, admiration, amazement and anxiety to fear and hatred".²⁰

Moreover, these ideas were by no means static. As a result of the constantly changing political, military, religious, and economic situation and alliances that were formed in line with these changes, the general characteristic of attitudes towards the Eastern Other became practical ambivalence and ongoing transformation rather than ideological consistency. According to Brummett, alliances were formed "across

¹⁸Anthony Parr, *Three Renaissance Travel Plays* (New York: Manchester University Press, 1995), 11.

¹⁹Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979), 222.

communal lines” and the motivation behind them was “attempts to preserve the traditional balances of power”. She explains that the great competition for commercial control and the desire for profit encouraged “states to alter and accept the alterations of these balances”.²¹ It is impossible to imagine that some stock representations remained unchanged through this shifting period.

Recent analysis of a variety of texts from Early Modern England has shown that the formation of English identity in this period cannot be explained by the overly simplistic categories of “self” and “Other”.²² In great contrast to Said’s attempt to present the East and West as monolithic ideological constructs, there were no such unified ideological structures as the “European” self and the “non-European/Eastern” other in the Early Modern period. “The East” or “the Orient” became a clearly defined geographical and cultural category for the English only after the formation of the British Empire and only after the beginning of Orientalism as a style of thought “based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between the Orient and the Occident”.²³ Until then, and particularly in the Early Modern setting, “the East” did not correspond to a homogeneous cultural/religious/racial “other”.²⁴ The orient might have had a very loose geographical meaning for the English of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries but it certainly did not contain all the attributes that were attached to the word by the scholarly

²⁰Aslı Çirakman, *From the “Terror of the World” to the “Sick Man of Europe” : European Images of Ottoman Empire and Society from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Centuries* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2002), 13.

²¹Palmira Brummett, *Ottoman Seapower and Levantine Diplomacy in the Age of Discovery* (Albany: Sunny Press, 1994), 179.

²²For a discussion of Englishness and the Other in Early Modern period, see Anna Loomba. “‘Delicious Traffick’: Alterity and Exchange on Early Modern Stages,” *Shakespeare Survey. An Annual Survey of Shakespeare Studies and Production*, 52, ed. Stanly Wells (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Vitkus, *Turning Turk*, 1-25; Dimmock, *New Turkes*, 1-20; McJannet, *The Sultan Speaks*, 1-15.

²³Said, *Orientalism*, 2.

²⁴Vitkus, *Turning Turk*, 8.

circles of the late seventeenth century. For the English, no monolithic, standardized “Other” existed in contrast to which they could form Englishness, but rather the Mediterranean Other was one of a patchwork that included a variable set of identity categories like race, religion and language.²⁵ Therefore, it is certain that, firstly, the construction of the notions of Englishness in the Early Modern period cannot be easily explained through a binary opposition of the single self and a sole Other. Secondly, as Matar also states, only in the eighteenth century did the lands of Islam become a material for “Orientalist” constructions. Before that period, it was the Muslim side that had the power of self-representation and the opposing parties had to deal with or reject these representations.²⁶ Despite the emergence of a tolerant state rhetoric that was produced as a result of the economic and social expansion of the Early Modern England there were also voices that refused or protested the connections with Islam and the Muslims.

The reason Said assumed that Orientalism was trans-historical is that he believed that the West had always been in a position of domination vis á vis the East, which was weak and silent.²⁷ Although it is possible to argue for the accuracy of this idea for certain periods, projecting this equation to the Early Modern Anglo-Ottoman relationships is highly problematic. It is quite hard to define England as an imperial power before the end of the seventeenth century as the Tudor period was more of an age of unfulfilled ambitions than an age of success and splendor.²⁸ It is apparent that the English conquest in Ireland was only partially successful and English attempts to colonize the New World

²⁵Ibid., 8-10.

²⁶Matar, *Islam in Britain*, 12.

²⁷Said, *Orientalism*, 94.

²⁸Vitkus, “Adventuring Heroes in the Mediterranean,” 76-77; Jonathan Burton. “Anglo-Ottoman Relations and the Image of the Turk in *Tamburlaine*,” *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 30 no. 1(2000): 129-131.

turned out to be a failure in the period from the mid-sixteenth to the mid-seventeenth century. The “empire” that James I inherited had great political and economic problems and was far from being a real imperial power. What he inherited was rather monarchies with problems, whose peoples were severely divided.²⁹

The position of the English with regard to the main powers of the age was not one of a colonizer either. In the Early Modern period, the Ottomans were the dominant power in the eastern Mediterranean and much of Eastern Europe. Spanish, Portuguese, English, and Dutch forces were exploring new territories with the aims of conquest and colonization. However, Eastern European territory was being conquered by the Ottomans at the same time. By the seventeenth century, the Ottomans had control of Hungary, the Balkans, Greece, İstanbul, and most of Anatolia, Syria, Mesopotamia, Palestine, Egypt, and the North African coasts from Alexandria to Morocco. Ottoman military success also had important economic implications. As a result of the Ottoman control over the trade routes of the East, European trade depended on Ottoman contact. As Halil İnalcık states, without the trade in Ottoman territories; it is not possible “to comprehend the rise of Western capitalism”.³⁰

In this period, Europe was expanding towards the west but it had a defensive attitude against the Ottomans; and the English were not immune from the fear of Ottoman power. On the contrary, they were as well informed on the Ottoman expansion as continental Europeans. In 1574 Sir Philip Sidney wrote “but there is no reason to fear that the flames will not keep themselves within its frontier, but will seize and devour the

²⁹Bruce Lenman, *England's Colonial Wars, 1550-1688: Conflicts, Empire and National Identity* (New York: Longman, 2001), 142.

³⁰Halil İnalcık, “The Turkish Impact on the Development of Modern Europe,” in *The Ottoman State and Its Place in World History*, ed. Kemal Karpat (Leiden: Brill, 1974), 58.

neighboring states.”³¹ Similarly, Thomas Newton, in his preface to a translation of Curione’s *Saracenicae Historiae*, notes that “they were at the very first very far from our climate and religion, and therefore the less to be feared, but now they are even at our doors and ready to come into our houses.”³² Therefore, it is certain that building some arguments on the assumption that England was an empire in the Early Modern period is misleading. This “backward projection of the later British Empire,” as Burton defines, not only closes the way to a discussion of the fluidity of representations in the period, but also undermines the possibility of multiple representations.³³ Recognizing this situation in the Early Modern period helps to formulate new reading strategies to see the representation of the Eastern other in Early Modern texts.

English interest in the Ottoman Empire and culture began to assume importance only after the middle of the sixteenth century, over a hundred years after the establishment of relationships between the Turks and the rest of Europe. The delay had particular reasons, the most obvious being geographical. John Sanderson’s voyage from England to İstanbul, for instance, took more than five months.³⁴ As the travel was long and full of hardships, the two countries, situated at the edges of Europe, had very little chance to meet without one of the parties making a deliberate effort.

Lack of direct connections did not mean that the English were immune from continental perceptions and ideas about the Turk. From the fifteenth to the eighteenth century the Ottomans were a great threat to Europe, and accounts dealing with them

³¹As quoted in Vitkus, “Early Modern Orientalism,” 211.

³²Ibid., 212.

³³Burton, “Anglo-Ottoman Relations,” 129.

³⁴Orhan Burian, “Interest of the English in Turkey as reflected in English Literature of the Renaissance,” *Oriens* 5, No. 2 (1952): 209. For Sanderson’s account of this voyage see William J. Foster’s edition of his *The Travels of John Sanderson in the Levant 1584-1602*.

express “an anxious interest in Islamic power that is both complicated and over-determined”.³⁵ Although it is possible to mention a variety of ideas coming from the Middle Ages that mixed “popular and learned views, intermingling the realistic with the marvelous and the legendary”³⁶ the dominant voice that survived from those times was one that described the Turks with clichés. Aggression, lust, suspicion, murderous conspiracy, sudden cruelty, and mercilessness characterized the Turk for the European public.³⁷

The European Renaissance view of the East was double-sided as well.³⁸ Not only “different nations in it were looked upon differently,” but also attitudes towards the Turks varied from fear and hatred to admiration for their unity and disciplined army. Ottomans were the fearsome, merciless enemies on the one hand and they symbolized internal unity, discipline, obedience to the ruler, and order on the other. As Anna Loomba states, it is important to notice “how both blacks and Turks can be glamorized as well as hated in contemporary representations and how the two were inter-connected, ... by more recent developments in global culture”.³⁹

Sixteenth century England was never at war with the Ottomans. Rather, the relationship started with intensive diplomatic and trade relations, together with some concerns about a military alliance. Before the 1570s, England was largely dependent and passive in terms of commercial activities. Only after Elizabethan settlement were English merchants able to pursue new connections with the trade routes in both the Atlantic and

³⁵Vitkus, *Three Turk Plays*, 3.

³⁶Jo Ann Hoepfner Moran Cruz, “Popular Attitudes towards Islam in Medieval Europe,” in *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other*, ed. Michael Frassetto and David Blanks (London: Macmillan, 1999), 56.

³⁷Vitkus, *Three Turk Plays*, 2.

³⁸Bartels. “The Double Vision of the East,” 4-5. (Her “British imperialism” assumptions should be ignored, though.)

the Mediterranean. By the late 1570s, a growing conflict with Spain also forced Elizabeth to encourage English merchants to form an alliance with the Ottomans and to found an embassy in İstanbul.⁴⁰

Apart from these commercial connections, the necessary effort for a closer Anglo-Ottoman relationship came from both sides, as a result of some very specific conditions. Elizabeth was excommunicated and thus further alienated from “the common corps of Christendom” in 1570.⁴¹ The Ottomans started an involved and expensive program of reconstructing the fleet that they had lost at Lepanto. In the meantime, they were getting prepared for a hard campaign against Persia in the east. Therefore they both needed allies and supplies from the west.⁴² After the succession of Murad III in 1574, according to Ottoman law all treaties and agreements with other states had to be renewed. The French were asking for the right of consular over most of European shipping to Ottoman lands; the Ottomans were hesitant, however, to grant these privileges as they always chose to play one party against the other in reform conflicts.⁴³ Therefore, instead of supporting “the highly papist” France they deliberately chose to be allies with the English.⁴⁴

These “totally new political circumstances,” as İnalçık puts it, ended in a new set of power balances.⁴⁵ Despite criticizing the French harshly for their alliance with the Ottomans, Elizabeth, under these new circumstances, had to reconsider her situation in

³⁹Loomba, “‘Delicious Traffick’,” 203.

⁴⁰Vitkus, “Adventuring Heroes,” 77.

⁴¹For ideas on the influence of the ideal Christian unity in the early modern period see, Franklin L. Baumer, “England the Turk, and the Common Corps of Christendom,” *The American Historical Review* 50, No. 1, (1944): 26-48.

⁴²Dimmock, *New Turkes*, 85.

⁴³Halil İnalçık, *From Empire to Republic: Essays on Ottoman and Turkish Social History* (İstanbul: Isis Press, 1995), 117.

⁴⁴Burton, “Anglo-Ottoman Relations,” 131; Halil İnalçık, *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 360-5.

⁴⁵İnalçık, *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire*, 365.

this power game. When Ottoman economic interest merged with their strategy of international politics, direct Anglo-Ottoman relations started. The English side took action by sending William Harborne to İstanbul in 1578.⁴⁶ Although they tried, the English could not hide the news of this alliance from other parties in Europe and soon after all the other ambassadors in İstanbul reported the negotiations between the English and the Ottomans to their states.⁴⁷

The French and Venetians were basically disturbed by this Anglo-Ottoman alliance because of commercial competition, but the Austrian and Spanish anxiety was more military. One of the basic items in Anglo-Ottoman trade was bell-metal, an “export which confirmed Elizabeth’s self-styled role as the mighty defender of the Christian faith against all idolatries”.⁴⁸ This kind of export of arms metals to the east by a country who was declared infidel by the pope was scandalous for Christian unity. This situation positioned her, together with the Turk, as an enemy of Christendom. Further alienation of English identity from the imagined Christian unity was inevitable. The idea of a common “corps” of Christendom was pushing England into a corner. There had always been Spanish attacks on Elizabeth for her alliance with the Ottomans, but at the end of the sixteenth century the impact of these attacks became more and more important in both the internal and external responses to Elizabeth’s rule. The Russian monarch, for instance, heard from the papal legate that “her majesty did not only favor the Turk but also aided him against other Christian princes,” to which the reply of England was to reject the accusation.⁴⁹

⁴⁶Burton, “Anglo-Ottoman Relations,” 132.

⁴⁷Ibid., 133.

⁴⁸Dimmock, *New Turkes*, 98.

⁴⁹Vitkus, “Early Modern Orientalism,” 215.

Worse for Elizabeth, however, were internal attacks on her reign. These ongoing accusations and rejections were by no means seen only in the court circles, but also in the public discussions of the age. According to one anonymous work, entitled *A Declaration of the true Causes of the Great Troubles, Presvpposed to be Intended Against the Realme of England*, the realm of England was brought into enmity with the Church of God and with all old allies and friends. “But yf we look what new confederates they haue chosen, in stede of the old,” continues the anonymous author, “we shall see them to be the great Turk... the kings of, all professed enemies of Christ.” *The Declaration of the True Causes* goes on, glorifying noble and famous kings of England who fought in Crusades against the Turk and accuses contemporary rulers of making Catholicism seem far more odious than Islam.⁵⁰ Thus, this implicit connection of England with the Ottomans as two allied powers that were outside the Church of God ended in the commonplace assertion that the English were worse than the Turks and indeed they were “the new Turkes.”⁵¹ On the other hand, an analysis of the correspondence of Murad III and Elizabeth indicates that these two rulers made great efforts to highlight doctrinal identity and diminish the importance of religious difference in their approach to each other.⁵² It is certain that under these circumstances the English needed a more nuanced rhetoric on the Turks, on the “papists,” and on the very essence of Englishness and this nuanced rhetoric ended in a break with the stereotypical representations in some cases.

As a result of these first instances, formal diplomatic relations with the Ottomans were established in 1581, together with a permanent representative of England in İstanbul, handling trading privileges and legal protection for English merchants. Soon the

⁵⁰As quoted in Dimmock, *New Turkes*, 164.

⁵¹Ibid., 166.

Levant Company was founded, which was situated in İzmir, and the first English trading mission arrived in Aleppo in 1583. Many English traders, and on many occasions Elizabeth herself, appealed to the Sultan Murad III or his high officials concerning their problems. Despite James' personal hostility towards Islam, it was not hard for him to realize that he had to follow the same lines as Elizabeth in terms of Ottoman trade for his own financial interests.⁵³

Still, it is certain that James' rhetoric towards the Ottomans and the political situation of his time were quite different from Elizabeth's reign. Although he issued a new charter that guaranteed the prosperity of the Levant Company, in 1605, it is known that he refused to sign letters to the Ottomans, stating that he would never do things that were unfitting to a Christian prince for merchants' sakes.⁵⁴ The peace with Spain and his overemphasized remarks on the unity of Christendom against the infidels indicated a great shift in English policy and with this the image and the rhetoric changed as well.

Burton divides the bulk of sources that informed the English public and authors on the Turk, into three groups: textual-historical, experiential and domestic ones.⁵⁵ According to his artificial classification, the textual sources on late medieval and early Renaissance ideas on historical figures and events that included some sort of connections with the Muslims, with their great ideological baggage, were reprinted in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. More than three thousand texts dealing with the Ottomans were published in Europe in the sixteenth century; most of them were edited or compiled

⁵²For a detailed analysis of the correspondence see Burton, "Anglo-Ottoman Relations," 134-138.

⁵³For James' attitude towards Islam see Vitkus, *Turning Turk*, 31-2.

⁵⁴Dimmock, *New Turkes*, 200.

⁵⁵Burton, *Traffic and Turning*, 22-23.

by authors who did not have any first-hand knowledge about Muslims or Ottomans.⁵⁶ Most of these works were based on centuries-old Muslim-Christian polemics, ideas of crusades, and Mediterranean conflicts. What they reproduced was a mixture of ideas on the Turk that basically repeated clichés.⁵⁷

The “experiential inventory,” on the other hand, emerged based on direct cultural encounters after the increase of English contact with the Turks. Traders, pirates, adventurers, diplomats, and slaves/prisoners shared their ideas through accounts of their experiences. The success stories of the merchants, who made fortunes through friendship and commerce with the Turk, blended with the slave accounts and conversion stories where the same Other was represented with common stereotypes. Considering the strength of prejudices and the difficulty of changing them through knowledge, especially in the public sphere, it is hard to say that these ideas challenged the historical clichés. Therefore, rather than erasing the old ones, what the experiential inventory supplied the public with was a new set of ideas that coexisted with the old ones. Together with the third group, the “domestic inventory,” which Burton explains as “the notions of difference that contributes to an Englishman’s sense of normative selfhood, including concepts of class, gender, nationality, race and sexuality,” the set of ideas that can be used to explain the image of the Eastern Other became more nuanced and complicated.⁵⁸

It is certain that in Early Modern England there was more than one strategy of representing the Ottomans. The representations of the Turks in Early Modern English

⁵⁶Ibid., 22.

⁵⁷For medieval ideas on Muslims see Victor Tolan, *Saracens* (Columbia: Columbia University Press, 2002); Daniel Norman, *Islam and the West, the Making of an Image* (Oxford: One World: 1993); Frassetto Michael and David Blanks, *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (New York, St. Martins press, 1999).

⁵⁸Burton, *Traffic and Turning*, 22.

texts did not only depend on the English/self and the Turk/Other binary. Rather, representation strategies were formulated around the Turk/Muslim/Eastern, the European/Catholic/Western and the English/Protestant triangle, which complicated them. It is hard to decide, however, on the dominance of one of these strategies over the other in a specific period. Although it is possible to argue for a transformation or shift in the discourse related to “the Other” in some specific period, it is hard to specify this argument in terms of time and generalize in terms of genre. First, it is not possible to speak of an English Early Modern peculiarity in terms of nuanced representations of “the Other”. It is certain that the nuanced image of the Turk in English texts emerged as a result of specific historical circumstances. However, there is no point in arguing for this being the case only in England. Throughout the Middle Ages and all around Europe, and especially as a result of Reformation factions, the representations of the Turk had always been varied.⁵⁹ The Middle Ages was not a period of only blind prejudices and static stereotypes on the Eastern Other, thus, the Renaissance or the Early Modern period is not the main period of transformation.

Moreover, it is certain that the transformation of the image of “the Other”, or the emergence of new strategies to represent the Ottomans did not exclude the possibility of the survival of previous clichés. For these reasons, it is important to deal with the texts individually rather than making generalizations about some genre or period. Most of the recent studies that focus on letters, state documents, and political treatises seem to assume that the discourse seen in these texts was repeated by playwrights of the age. Although there may have been some individual cases that would prove this assumption, is it possible to generalize such statements to the point of concluding that as a result of

⁵⁹Çirakman, *From the “Terror of the World” to the “Sick Man of Europe,”* 3.

socio-political changes, the image of the self and “the Other” changed in a few decades? Is it possible to argue that the rhetoric that was created through political treatises or historical accounts of events had a direct influence on the images that were seen in individual fictional productions of the age? Even if it is possible to find out some connections among the sources and the plays, for instance, is it possible to argue for dominance of one set of representations over the others? It seems that the modern scholars who have identified the change based on rhetoric in the official letters and documents have rushed towards enthusiastic conclusions on the representation of “the Other” in general. What they miss in this rush is the works written by the opposing party that reacted against this change of allies and close relations with the Ottomans. The texts that this study deals with indicate that the state alliances based on economic interests were not welcomed by all parties in early modern England. Therefore, strong stereotypical representations were carried on by these texts. Considering these problems indicates the necessity of a focus on individual cases rather than replacing old assumptions with new ones.

Ib. Primary Sources

The primary sources that will be employed for this study are of three sorts. The basic texts that the focus will be on are the English plays; the anonymous Cambridge play *Solymanidae*⁶⁰ and Fulke Greville’s closet drama *The Tragedy of Mustafa*.⁶¹ The second group of sources that will be used is composed of the two earliest European accounts of

⁶⁰*Solymanidae*, a hypertext critical edition by Dana F. Sutton. (The University of California, Irvine.) (accessed February, 2008)

⁶¹Fulke Greville, *The Tragedy of Mustapha*, in Joan Rees, ed. *Selected Writings of Fulke Greville* (London: The Athlone Press, 1973), 65-138. Bolye’s rather later work is not included into the primary sources of this story as it belongs to a completely different political and literary age.

the death of Sehzade Mustafa; Nicolas à Moffan's *Soltani Solymanni Turcarum Imperatoris horrendum facinus, scelerato in proprium filium, natu maximum, Soltanum Mustafam, parricidio, anno domini 1553 patratum* and the relevant parts of Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq's *Turkish Letters*.⁶² Besides, two English variations of Moffan's text, its translation *The Horrible act and wicked offence of Soltan Soliman* by Hugh Goughe, and its adaptation in *The Palace of Pleasure* by William Painter will be employed as the sources that the playwrights might have had referred to.⁶³ Richard Knolles' *Generall Historie of the Turkes* will also be included into this group of historical narratives of the event, as it reproduces a version of the story that was available to the authors of the English plays.⁶⁴ The third group of sources is the Ottoman histories and mourning poems written after the death of Sehzade Mustafa.

It is certain that there is not a direct connection between the first two groups of primary sources and the third one as the transmission line of the story from the Ottoman to the European side is not through direct textual connection. The death of Sehzade Mustafa caused great sorrow in Ottoman society. Mustafa was the eldest son of Suleyman; he was a successful ruler of his province and an expected heir to the throne. After his sudden execution there were many speculations about the plotters of this murder and gossip about many details of the story was circulating. Therefore various details were

⁶²Nicolas à Moffan, *Soltani Solymanni Turcarum*; Busbecq, *Turkish Letters*, 19-23.

⁶³Hugh Goughe, *The Ofspring of the House of Ottomanno, and Officers Pertaining to the greate Turkes Court. Whereunto is added Bartholomeus Georgieuiz Epitome, of the Customes, Rytes, Ceremonies, and Religion of the Turkes: with the Miserable Affliction of those Christians, which liue under their Captiuitie and Bondage. In the Ende also is Adioyned the Maner how Mustafa, Eldest Sonne of Soltan Soliman, Twelfth Emperour of the Turkes, was Murthered by his father, in ... 1553.* (London, 1570); William Painter, *The Palace of Pleasure* <http://www.archive.org/details/palaceofpleasure03painuoft> (accessed December, 2008)

⁶⁴Richard Knolles, *Generall Historie of the Turkes*, <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home>. (accessed December, 2008)

added to the actual event and it was connected to many previous deeds of the major characters of the story.

The story of Sehzade Mustafa was orally transmitted to Moffan by one of his fellow prisoners and Busbecq heard the story in the palace circles.⁶⁵ Therefore both authors when they were writing their accounts long after they heard the story had the freedom to employ their imagination and plotting skills to fill in the possible blanks. A compilation of the story from the Ottoman sources, with all their variations, may supply us with a more or less complete set of stories with the possible gossip and speculations that were in the collective memory. A comparison of this collected version to the one that is narrated by the European authors gives us the possibility to point out the specific alterations of the European authors of the version that they might have heard from the Ottoman side. Here I don't mean a comparison of the "authentic/ accurate" version of the story to the "fictitious" one. Rather I aim a comparison between Ottoman and European versions to see the peculiarities on each side. Therefore, although they will not be included into the close circle of the primary sources that will be analyzed here, the Ottoman sources will be employed to see the European variations and flavor of the story.

Very little is known about the anonymous Senecan drama *Solymanidae*, which is preserved by British Library ms. 723, ff. 43 – 63 together with the tragedy *Fatum Vortigerni*. According to Donna Sutton, who has prepared the recent critical edition of the text, the play can be seen as a regular English University play and it is almost

⁶⁵Moffan, *Le Meurtre exécration et inhumain, commis par Soltan Solyman, grand Seigneur des Turcs, en la personne de son fils aîné Soltan Mustaphe* (1556), Introduction. This French version of the text also includes an introduction containing information about Moffan's slavery story and his aims in writing this text. This introductory part is incorporated into the text in Painter's version, and excluded in Goughe's translation. (accessed November, 2007).

certainly a Cambridge one.⁶⁶ Bearing the notation of “1581 Martii 5us” on the title page the text reveals its date.⁶⁷ Sutton also notes that this date corresponds to the Shrove Tuesday of that year, which is in itself meaningful as it denotes a popular time for university festivals. According to her, there is little evidence that indicates a specific performance of the play.⁶⁸

The closet drama, written by Fulke Greville was certainly much more influential among the intellectual circles of the age. Composed around 1596, the text was heavily revised by the author after its first appearance in quarto, in 1609. This revised version was also published in Greville’s collected works around 1633.⁶⁹ Fulke Greville (1554-1628), one of the most influential politicians of his age, was from a rich Warwickshire family. He was educated at Shrewsbury and Cambridge and he served the English crown for more than forty years.⁷⁰ He was one of Queen Elizabeth’s favorites, and he worked in various positions for the state during James’s and Charles’s reigns. In religious issues he was a supporter of the puritan party and in politics he preferred monarchy; not because he believed in the divine right of the king, but because he perceived monarchy as the best balance between the governor and the governed.⁷¹ He was a poet and a playwright as well being the author of some influential treatises and a longer prose work, *The Life of Sidney*.⁷²

⁶⁶Sutton, Introduction, <http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/soly/intro.html> (accessed December 2007).

⁶⁷Chew, *The Crescent and the Rose*, 300.

⁶⁸Sutton, Introduction, <http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/soly/intro.html> (accessed December 2007). Interestingly, Linda McJannet assumes that *Solymanidae* is a closet drama, without a clear explanation of this point. Actually, the dating of the play and the stage directions on the manuscript reject this idea. Despite a lack of information on the performance of the play, I, like Sutton, do not think that it was not meant to be performed.

⁶⁹McJannet, *The Sultan Speaks.*, 155.

⁷⁰Ronald A. Rebholz, *The Life of Fulke Greville First Lord Brooke* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 4.

⁷¹Rees, *Selected Writings of Fulke Greville*, 5.

⁷²Rebholz, *The Life of Fulke Greville*, 6.

Greville's *The Tragedy of Mustapha* was composed as a Senecan closet drama. Although this gives us an idea about the "popularity" of the text in its age, Greville's influence as a politician and his proximity to the ruling class makes this play an important one in terms of representations. It is true that he was not writing for a wide audience, or his ideas were not revealed to a wide group, but still, his elaborate discourse on the political behavior and the general condition of human beings transmitted through Suleyman-Mustafa story gives us an insight on the different understandings of Englishness and its comparison with "the Other".

The second group of sources, the historical accounts that the playwrights used as their sources are variations of the two European accounts, Moffan's and Busbecq's *archetypal* texts on the issue. Nicolas à Moffan was a French historian from the second half of the sixteenth century. According to the record in *Nouvelle biographie générale* he was born into a noble family. He studied law but later on quit his education to become a soldier. He joined the armies of Charles V and fought against "the enemies of the Christianity".⁷³ After being "badly injured" he was taken as a prisoner and was sent to İstanbul where he lived for three years. At the end of the three years he was freed as a result of the intervention of Christopher, the duke of Wurttemberg, to whom he later dedicated his work.⁷⁴

⁷³D. Hoefler, *Nouvelle biographie générale: depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à nos jours, avec les renseignements bibliographiques et l'indication des sources à consulter* (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1852-1866) World Bibliography Online, <http://db.saur.de/WBIS/welcome.jsf>

⁷⁴"A Tresillustre prince and seigneur, monseigneur Christofle, Duc de Vuirtemberg and Teclz, Comte de Montbelliard, Nicolas de Moffan, son humble serviteur, Salut." For all quotes from *Solymanndae* <http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/soly/act1eng.html>

During his captivity he heard the story of Mustafa from a certain Turk who was “condemned to perpetual prison” for “reason of debts”.⁷⁵ Through his friendship with this Turkish man he could also get information about the Turkish religion and costumes that are used in ordinary days or in times of war, and he states that he was “happy to hear and remember” these things. He also had the “fantastic opportunity” to learn about the “detestable murder” of Sehzade Mustafa during his captivity. Thus his major work *Soltani Solymani, Turkarum imperatoris, horrendum facinus in proprium filium, natu maximum, Soltanum Mustaphum parricidio a. d. 1553 patratum* was written to retell this story to the French people.⁷⁶

Not only the French but also many other nations were interested in Moffan’s account. It was first published in Latin, in 1555. After being translated into French and German in 1556 a second Latin edition was published in the same year in Paris. Moffan’s text was translated into English four years after its 1555 appearance.⁷⁷ Almost nothing is known about the English translator, Hugh Goughe other than his name and the date of his work. After this translation Moffan’s text was also adopted by William Painter in the second volume of his *The Palace of Pleasure* which was published in 1567. By this adaptation, Moffan’s text became more popular in England. The text was also used as a source by Richard Knolles in his *Generall Historie of the Turkes* which was published in 1603.

⁷⁵“... du soir j'estois enfermé avecq' un certain Turc, qui, à raison de debtes, avoit esté condamné à perpetuelle prison.”

⁷⁶“... au temps de ma captivité, le detestable meurtre commis en la personne du Mustaphe par l'ordonnance de Soltan Soliman grand Seigneur et Empereur des Turcs, et pere d'iceluy, comme ne forlignant point ny degenerant de la tyrannie furieuse et enragee de ses ancestres: non pas toustefois que mon intention feut de le mettre en lumiere, mais à fin qu'en l'escrivant j'eusse moyen d'imprimer plus facilement en ma memoire une histoire digne d'estre racontee devant ceux de nostre pays, à fin qu'ayant recouvert liberté j'en feisse le comte à ceux qui le meritent”

Ogier de Busbecq's *Turkish Letters* was first published approximately twenty-five years after the initial appearance of Moffan's account. Busbecq was born in 1522 as an illegitimate child of George Ghislain II seigneur de Busbecq. He was educated at Louvain and Padua.⁷⁸ In 1552 he entered in the service of emperor Charles V's brother, King Ferdinand I of Austria and in November 1554 he was sent to İstanbul as an ambassador. His four letters, addressed to an unnamed friend, were conscious literary creations written after his return, based on his notes, and most probably they were written around the time of publication, from 1581 to 1588. An edition of the letters was published under his supervision in 1588 and in twenty years the letters had approximately twenty editions in seven languages.⁷⁹

One of the reasons for the popularity of the letters is that they are full of vivid descriptions on every issue related to the Ottoman daily life in the sixteenth century. His lively descriptions of hamams, the harem, Turkish archery and wine and magnificence of the Ottoman army were certainly quite appealing to contemporary readers. Besides, he also had a chance to say a few words on Ottoman power politics while he was narrating the death of Sehzade Mustafa story. When Busbecq arrived at İstanbul Mustafa had been dead for two years. However, most of the characters in the story were still alive and he had a chance to see and communicate them as well as gathering his version of the story from people around him. Busbecq explains his reasons for telling the story of Sehzade Mustafa stating that "it will perhaps, not be out of place at this point to relate why

⁷⁷Clarence Dana Rouillard, *The Turk in French History Thought, and Literature (1520-1660)* (Paris: Ams Press, 1940), 421.

⁷⁸Busbecq, *Turkish Letters*, 5-7.

⁷⁹Zweder Von Martels "Impressions of the Ottoman Empire in the Writings of Augerius Busbequius (1520/1-1591)" *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 5, No. 2. (1995): 210.

Roostem was deposed from his high official position”.⁸⁰ Although this sentence implies that the author narrates the story as a detail that will explain another point, the pages that he devotes to this piece and the colorful, enthusiastic description of the death of Sehzade Mustafa suggests the importance of this piece in the text.

The Ottoman chronicles and mourning poems that will be used to construct an imaginary detailed version of the story are basically materials composed right after the event.⁸¹ The most important ones among the chroniclers’ accounts that will be used here are Ali’s *Künhül Ahbar* and Nişancı Mehmed Paşa’s *Hadisat* as they are contemporary records. Besides, a number of seventeenth century chronicles and histories such as *Hasan Bey-zade Tarihi*, *Sahaif-ül-Ahbar fi Vekayi-ül-a’sar*, *Peçevi Tarihi* and *Solak-zade Tarihi* will be used to see all the versions of the story through the eyes of Ottoman historians that were recording the events shortly after. Although most of the records that come after the two basic contemporary ones repeat the information given by Ali and Nişancı Mehmed, these accounts are quite useful as they supply us with a fuller version of the story with all the speculations and variations on the details. The mourning poems, on the other hand, written by contemporary poets like Yahya Bey, Sami, Funûnî and Rahmî not only reveal different details about the event but also represent the importance of the event on the public.⁸²

⁸⁰Busbecq, *Turkish Letters*, 19.

⁸¹The chronicles that will be referred to are: Mustafa bin Ahmed Ali, *Künhül Ahbar* [The Source of Knowledge]; Nişancı Mehmed Paşa. *Hadisat*. [The Events]; Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede. *Sahaif-ül-Ahbar fi Vekayi-ül-a’sar*. [The pages on the knowledge on the events of years]; Hasan Bey-zade Ahmed Paşa. *Hasan Bey-zade Tarihi*. [History of Hasan Bey-zade]; İbrahim Peçevi. *Peçevi Tarihi* [History of Peçevi]; Solak-zade Mehmed Hemdemi Çelebi. *Solak-zade Tarihi*. [History of Solak-zade] for details about the publications, see the bibliography.

⁸²The mourning poems that will be referred to are: Yahya Bey’s; Samî’s; Funûnî’s; Rahmî’s; Fazlî’s; Nisâyî’s; and Mudamî’s *Mersiyes*. For bibliographical details of the poems see the bibliography.

Ic. The Death of Sehzade Mustafa in Ottoman Sources

Mustafa, the eldest son of Sultan Suleyman, was born in Manisa in 1515 while his father was still a Sehzade. His mother was Mah-i Devran Sultan, a woman of *devşirme*⁸³ origin who had lost power in palace circles after Hurrem gave birth to Suleyman's son.⁸⁴ After the death of Hafisa Sultan, Suleyman's mother, Hurrem strengthened her position in the palace and under her influence, Mustafa was sent to Saruhan as a *sanjak beyi*⁸⁵, and thus he was removed from the circle of power around the palace. Just before Suleyman's 1534 campaign to Persia he was appointed as the official ruler of Manisa.⁸⁶ From there, an important *sanjak*, he was sent to Amasya in 1541, further away from the center, again under the influence of Hurrem, who consolidated her power after İbrahim Paşa (1536) was deposed and executed.⁸⁷ The hostility between Hurrem and Mustafa was obvious.

According to Müneccimbaşı Ahmed, Mustafa is Suleyman's choice as his heir.⁸⁸ However, Hurrem and her daughter by Suleyman, Mihrimah Sultan, who is married to Rustem Paşa, want Bayazid, Suleyman's other son from Hurrem, to be the successor of the father and that is the reason for "the female party" to encourage Rustem to engage in sedition against Mustafa.⁸⁹ Müneccimbaşı Ahmed's narration directly blames Rustem and "the female deceit" for the death of Sehzade, through convincing the father that his life

⁸³*devşirme* (recruit) refers to the levy of Christian children to be trained for posts in the palace. Halil İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire* (London: Phoenix, 1994), 219.

⁸⁴Çağatay Uluçay, "Mustafa," *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, [Encyclopedia of Islam] (İstanbul: MEB Yayınları, 1965), 690.

⁸⁵*Sanjak beyi* is the governor of a *sanjak*, which is a subdivision of a province, İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire*, 224.

⁸⁶Uluçay, "Mustafa," 691.

⁸⁷*Ibid.*, 691.

⁸⁸"Suleyman Han Sultan Mustafa'yı veliaht tayin etmek istiyorlardı." [Sultan Suleyman wanted to appoint Mustapha as his heir.] Müneccimbaşı, *Sahaif-ül-Ahbar*, 565.

⁸⁹"Aslında bu hadise kadınların hilesi sonunda meydana geldi." [Actually this event was a result of the deceit of women.] Müneccimbaşı, *Sahaif-ül-Ahbar*, 565.

and rule is threatened by his son. However, it does not give much information on the actual intrigue or the death of Mustafa.

Ali, on the other hand states that the love and support of the father, mother and the grand *vizier*⁹⁰ are on behalf of Bayazid.⁹¹ Mustafa is rather supported by the army and *ulema*.⁹² In 1552 Suleyman sends Rustem to Anatolia on a campaign against Persia instead of leading the army personally. Upon this, Mustafa's supporters from the army encourage him to take action against Rustem, who apparently does not favor Mustafa:

Some among the soldiers approached Mustafa with vows of loyalty, saying 'your father is old and he doesn't have the power to lead the army anymore. That's why he appointed Rustem as the head of the army for this campaign'. ... Through these words they convinced him of this unrealistic desire.⁹³

According to Ali, the daring idea of killing Rustem while he is on campaign and presenting Mustafa's ascent to the throne as *fait accompli* arose in Mustafa's supporters' minds. Although he suggests that this idea does not come from Mustafa himself, he is convinced somehow in the end. Still, there is no evidence that indicates Mustafa took any direct action himself to carry out this plan. Although there is not enough evidence to

⁹⁰*vizier* (vezir in Turkish) is a minister of the sultan and a member of the imperial council, İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire*, 226.

⁹¹"Peder ve mâderin, hususen Rüstem Paşa gibi Vezîr-i ekberin iltifât ve râğbetleri Sultân Bayezid semtine ve ekser asâkir-i celâlet-rehberin ve ba'zî meşâyih ve ülema-yı hüner-verin sa'y u himmetleri Sultân Mustafa cânibine ve hüddâm-ı havass-ı mihrimân-ı harem-ihtisâs olan ağaların teveccühleri, henüz Saray-ı Âmire'de babasiyle bile sâkin olub sâir şehzâdeler gibi Sancak alâkasiyle paytahttan cüda düşmeyen Sultan Cihangîr cenâbına masrûf olub, Selim şah-î mansûrun nâmi alınmaz, vâris-i tâc u taht olanlar tezekkür kilindikça halkın havratırına bile hutûr etmez idi" [The praises of his father and mother and especially the influential viziers', like Rüstem, was on the side of Bayazid, the love and respect of the soldiers and *ulema* were for Mustafa and the support of palace *ağas* was for Cihangir, who was still with his father in the palace, not yet ruling a province like his brothers. The name of Selim was not remembered when people talk about the heir of Suleyman.] Şerafeddin Turan *Kanuninin Oğlu Şehzade Bayazid Vakası* [The event of Şehzade Bayazid, the son of Kanuni] (Ankara, 1961), 17.

⁹²*ulema* is the general name given to a group of doctors of Muslim canon law, tradition and theology. The *Ulema* as a group was always influential in the palace circles, İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire*, 226.

⁹³"Meyân-ı leşkerden ba'zî ağniyâ, mezbûr şehzâdeye arz-ı sıdk u safâ idüp, Vâlid-i mâcidin kocaldı hareket-i sefere takat götürmekten kaldı; anun çün Rüstem Paşa'yı Serdar idüp Anadolu'ya saldı. Müşârün-ileyh Paşa ise sana bed-hâhtır; bu fırsatta leşkere gelüp başını kesersen husûl-ı merâma kütâhtır deyü izlâl etmişler, tenk dururken bu sevdây-ı batılla direnge çıkarmışlar." As quoted in Turan, *Kanuninin Oğlu*, 27.

claim that Mustafa was planning something against his father, it is certain that he had plans for the period after Suleyman's death. The letter that he sent to Erzurum *beylerbeyi* Ayas Paşa indicates that he thought that it was his right, as the eldest son, to rule after his father, and he believed himself to be superior to other Sehzades.⁹⁴

However, Rustem, who is an experienced vizier, hears about these whispers in the army and he takes action:

Without loosing time, Rustem, the cautious Paşa, wrote whatever he had heard spoken in the army from A to Z on a paper and send it to the palace immediately with Şemsi Paşa and Ali Ağa from *sipahis*.⁹⁵

According to Ali's narration, Suleyman gets very angry when he reads the letter. He refuses to believe in the claims against Mustafa and strictly orders people to stop talking about this issue. In this narration, Suleyman appears to be quite an objective father, who refuses to believe in the arguments against his son, saying "Let it be far from him, to run after something with the desire of power, in my lifetime, and ask for something that he doesn't yet deserve."⁹⁶ Still, according to Peçevi, his decision to dismiss the army and to call Rustem back to İstanbul as soon as possible is the result of the rumors that he reads about himself in the letter, especially about his age.⁹⁷ Ali explains this decision to postpone the campaign by the letters from Persia; Müneccimbaşı Ahmed, on the other hand explains it through a hard winter.⁹⁸

There is another version of the story which includes another type of letter. Hasan Bey-zade takes the basics of his narration from Ali's *Künhül Ahbar*. After finishing the

⁹⁴ For an analysis of the letter see Turan, *Kanuninin Oğlu*, 23.

⁹⁵ "Rüstem Paşa, zaman kaybetmeden, bu kötülüklerin asker içinde şuyûunu, iğneden ipliğe kadar, bir kâğıda yazarak, Şemsi Paşa ve sipahiden Ali Ağa ile alelacele Âsitâne-i saâdete irsâl eyledi." Solak-zade Mehmed, *Solak-zade Tarihi*, 230.

⁹⁶ "Hâşâ ki Mustafa Hân'ım bu ma'kule küstahlığı irtikâb ide ve benim zamân-ı hayatimda sevdây-i mülke pâyini li-hakkından taşra uzata?" as quoted in Turan, *Kanuninin Oğlu*, 29.

⁹⁷ Peçevi, *Peçevi Tarihi*, 301.

story as the way Ali does, however, he explains the intrigue that is planned by Hurrem and Rustem. According to his version, after Hurrem's appeal to Rustem saying that if Mustafa succeeds his father it is sure that he will kill her son thus something should be done about it, Rustem forges some letters in Mustafa's name and seal, and disperses them in the army, keeping some copies for himself to present to Suleyman.⁹⁹ The author explicitly states that Mustafa is innocent in this issue, and he does not have any idea about these letters.¹⁰⁰ Although Hasan Bey-zade does not give much detail about the contents of the letter other than saying that the letters are "full of deceit," in a denunciation letter addressed directly to Suleyman after the death of Sehzade Mustafa, the unknown author states that Rustem secretly corresponded with Persian Shah Tahmasb through making a copy of Mustafa's seal.¹⁰¹ In the mourning poems as well one sees references to "a few fake letters".¹⁰² Thus, it seems apparent that Rustem's campaign against Mustafa included at least some fake documents. It might have been these letters that convinced Suleyman, who had refused all previous accusations about him, of the guilt of the son.

⁹⁸Turan, *Kanuninin Ođlu.*, 29.

⁹⁹"Mehd-i ulyâ-yi saltanat, hâsseki sultan, 'Pâdişâh-ı Süleymân-unvânun Dârü'l-cinân'a intikâli akreb-i ezmanda, vakı' olusa, saltanat u hilâfet, ekber-i Şehzâdegân olup, mâder-i âhardan olan Sultân Mustafa Hân'a intikâl idüp, benüm evlâdum katl ü izâle olinmak lâzım gelür, buna bir tedbir idün' diyü dâmâdı Rüstem Paşa'ya ibrâm eylemeğın, ol mekkâr u hîle-kâr, Sultân Mustafa lisânından ba'z-ı mekâtîb tahrîr itdürüp, asker-i zafer-tes'ir içine bırakdurup, bir kaçını yedine alup, Pâdişâh-ı Süleymân-mekâna gösterüp bir tedbîr eylemek gereksin diyü ibrâm eylemekle..." [*Hasseki* Sultan appeals to her son-in-law Rüstem saying, "if Sultan Suleyman dies in a short time, Mustafa, his son from the previous mother, will be his heir and my son will be executed, find a solution for this". After this that deceitful Rüstem wrote some letters with the name of Mustafa, left some of them among the soldiers and took the others with him. Showing the letters to the Sultan he advised him to take some measures ...], Hasan Bey-zade Ahmed Paşa. *Hasan Bey-zade Tarihi*, 131.

¹⁰⁰"Ma'a-hâzâ, dermend Sultân Mustafa'nun aslâ, ol kâğıdlardan haber ü âğâhı ve bu bâbda, zerre denlü, günâhı yoğ imiş." [Actually troubled Mustafa did not know anything about the papers and he did not have any guilt in this issue], *Hasan Bey-zade Tarihi*, 131.

¹⁰¹Topkapi Arsivi E. 5103. The letter has been published by Şerafeddin Turan. "Rüstem Paşa ve Hakkındaki İthamlar" [Rüstem Paşa and the Accusations against him] *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 11-12 (1955): 11-50.

¹⁰²"Bir iki egri fesâd ehli nitekim şemşir/ Bir iki nâme-i tevzîri kıldı katline tûr," Yahya Bey, "Mersiye"V.

The rest of Mustafa's story is approximately the same in all the sources. When the time comes for the Nahcivan campaign, Suleyman together with his youngest son Cihangir leaves Istanbul on 28 August 1553.¹⁰³ On 1 September 1553, Suleyman and his army arrive in Ereğli, where they meet Mustafa, together with his forces. The next morning, all the high officials of the army and the statesmen go to Mustafa's tent to greet him. Mustafa comes to his father's tent with them, again to greet him as it is the custom. There, in his father's tent, he is killed and his dead body is sent to Bursa to be buried next to his elder brother's tomb.¹⁰⁴ According to the poems and almost all chronicles Mustafa is strangled.¹⁰⁵

There are two different points of view about this murder in Ottoman sources. On the one hand, there is the simple, almost codified narration of Nişancı Mehmed, who justifies Suleyman's action:

Sultan Suleyman and all his army, on their way to Persia stopped in Ereğli. There, Sehzade Sultan Mustafa, coming from Amasya encountered his father with a great number of soldiers in great excitement and full of ambition for the throne. However, the sultan, who perceived the evil inside his son, separated his head from his body. The body of Sultan Mustafa who died in this way was sent to Bursa and was buried there.¹⁰⁶

Nişancı Mehmed's narration ends with a couplet which says simply that everyone encounters his own plan in the end. Despite the simplicity of the narration, Nişancı

¹⁰³Peçevi, *Peçevi Tarihi*, 162.

¹⁰⁴Peçevi, *Peçevi Tarihi*, 162.

¹⁰⁵“Yoldı sünbül saçını boynuna geçdükçe resen/ Kara toprağ ile yeksân nic'olur sîm beden,” Samî, “Mersiye” VI; “Bir kemend-i âl ile o şeh şikâr olmuş durur,” Fununi, “Mersiye” III; “Kand-i lebinde gerd-i fenâdan bulup eşer/ İp takdı gerdine boğuldu o dem şeker,” Rahmî, “Mersiye” IV; “Kayd u bend idüp boğasin ol güzel mihmânı,” Nisayi, “Mersiye” IV; “Boynuna dakdun kemendi cânına kıldun ezâ,” Nisayi, “Mersiye” I.

¹⁰⁶Yürüyüş esnasında Karaman ülkeninin Ereğli mevkisine varılıp konaklandığı zaman Sehzade Sultan Mustafa Amasya'dan çok miktarda asker ile gelip babasını heyecanlı bir şekilde, saltanat hırsıyla dolu olarak karşıladı. Lakin Oğlunun içindekileri sezen Padişah başını gövdesinden ayırttı. Böylece Ereğli'de vefat eden Sultan Mustafa Bursa'ya götürülerek orda defnolundu, Nişancı Mehmed Paşa, *Hadisat*, 211.

Mehmed's account stands as a single voice among all the Ottoman sources that this study makes use of. Nişancı Mehmed is the only source, among all the Ottoman accounts, which openly accuses Mustafa and praises Suleyman's action. Mustafa is represented as a greedy rebellious son, and Suleyman as an experienced ruler who "perceives" this, and does not hesitate to take the necessary action. Not giving much detail about the death of Cihangir, younger brother of Mustafa, the author just states that he died in Aleppo shortly after Mustafa's death, on 1 September 1553. He does not refer to any connection between the two deaths.

All the other Ottoman sources either openly blame --directly or indirectly-- Rustem or the stepmother for this death or they assert Mustafa's innocence. While Ali and Peçevi refer indirectly to the intrigue behind this murder and point out Rustem as the main character in this story, they keep their distance from the story with the usage of passive phrases like "it is said," "it is told" or "Rustem was accused ...". Müneccimbaşı on the other hand, through a direct statement, claims that the reason for the death of Sehzade Mustafa was the hostility between him and Rustem.¹⁰⁷ Solak-zade, whose narration is much more dramatic and emotional, gives details about the intrigue and blames Rustem and the step-mother directly. Hasan Bey-zade, who declares Mustafa's innocence frankly, through his narration of the intrigue again identifies Rustem and the stepmother as the plotters of this death. In all these narrations Suleyman is somehow invisible. He is referred to either as a successful ruler and good soldier, who perceives the threat to his rule and solves the problem at once, as in the case of Nişancı Mehmed, or he is depicted as a good father who does not believe in the accusations against his son until

he sees clear evidence, and a good ruler who does not hesitate to kill his son for the good of the state, although he is mistaken on this point. There is not even a reference to his mistaken decision, or his being deceived by the intrigue of his wife and the vizier. What the authors do, even when they tell of the intrigue, is to diminish the role of Suleyman's belief in this intrigue and in killing his son. He is not a weak, guilty character, but a strong ruler.

The mourning poems, on the other hand, supply more detail on the actual intrigue and the general public opinion after the event. According to Yahya Bey, the basic cause for this murder was "a few clever treacherous men" and "a few fake letters". Similarly, Samî explains the reason for this murder as "a collaboration of the enemies" and he emphasizes that Mustafa is totally innocent. He also states that Mustafa goes into his father's tent without weapons, to support his argument of innocence.¹⁰⁸ Fununî, who addresses fate in his poem, states that Mustafa is the real enemy of the Persian shah. This emphasis is probably made to falsify the claims that Mustafa appeals to Persia for help against his father.¹⁰⁹ Probably, the letters that are said to have been written by Rustem with the seal of Mustafa were on this issue. After this statement of enmity against the Persian Shah, Fununi tells how "loyally" Mustafa went to his father's tent and how he was strangled inside. Mudamî also emphasizes this point of loyalty in his poem, which strengthens the claim that Mustafa somehow heard of his father's decision beforehand or at least he was aware of the danger.

¹⁰⁷Sultan Mustafa'nın katline sebep Rüstem Paşa ile arasında olan düşmanlıktır, [The reason for the execution of Sultan Mustafa was the enmity between him and Rüstem Paşa], Münecçimbaşı, *Sahaif-ül-Ahbar*, 565.

¹⁰⁸"Sana ol toğrı idi egri nigâhi yoğ idi/ Hak ana şâhid idi gayri güvahu yoğ idi// Ceng ider geldi disen iki sipâhi yoğ idi// Yoğ idi cürmi bu Sâmi dir İlâhî yoğ idi," Sami "Merisyey," VII.

¹⁰⁹"Havfi ile surh-ser geh mest ü geh hayrân iken/ Şâh Tahmâsa kara tağlar gibi düşmân iken," Fununi "Mersiyey," II.

Two poems written by a female poet, Nisayî, who was probably from Mustafa's mother's entourage, are the most direct and bitter. Not only does she blame Suleyman directly for killing his son "without pity," "martyring him in haste and anger" as he is filled with envy and ambition; but also identifies the plotters of this intrigue in harsh words. According to her, Suleyman was persuaded to this action by the "Russian witch," Hurrem.¹¹⁰ Similarly, Fununi calls fate "the witch," which can also be interpreted as a reference to the step-mother.¹¹¹ All the poems assert the fact that Mustafa is strangled in his father's tent and they simultaneously stress his innocence, while criticizing his father's attitude as he naively believes in the treason and does not give Mustafa a chance to defend himself. Other than the method of execution and the name of the executioner, Zâl Mahmud¹¹², the poems do not reveal any more details about the death scene.

The representation of Suleyman is quite different in the poems. Most of the time his injustice is criticized, and his action is explained as a deterioration of the Ottoman practice, as being just was one of the most important qualities of the Ottoman Sultan, in the eyes of his people. In complete contrast to the European sources, which connect this action to absolute arbitrary rule of the sultan, apparently the subjects of the Ottoman sultan believed in his justice and they protested when they saw the opposite. While Yahya Bey states that this is an event that is "unexplainable" to people, which was not seen before, Samî conveys his worries saying "are we in the times when fathers kill sons?". Therefore, in the poems the execution of Mustafa is not connected to the practice of fratricide at all and it is perceived as a single extraordinary event that was a result of

¹¹⁰"Bir Urus cādûsınun sözün kulağuna koyup/ Mekr ü âle aldanuban ol 'acûzeyeye uyup," Nisayi, "Mersiye," II.

¹¹¹"Yüri ey cādû-yı dehr âl âsikâr olmus durur," Fununi, "Mersiye," III.

intrigue. Besides, again connected to the idea of the just ruler, Suleyman is criticized for taking action quickly and killing his son before letting him defend himself. To strengthen their point, Mustapha's innocence is emphasized in all these poems. All these points indicate that what the Ottomans sources reflect is a criticism of the ruler who behaves against tradition and unjustly kills his innocent son.

¹¹²It is said that this title "Zâl" (the brave one) was given to the executioner by the Suleyman himself. see Turan, *Kanuninin Ođlu*, 33.

II. THE EUROPEAN SOURCES AND THEIR REPRESENTATION OF THE SULEYMAN-MUSTAFA STORY

According to Hayden White's classification, there are three main approaches to history writing, the historian's, the chronicler's, and the annalist's. Among these, White explains, the historian's approach bears great similarities to the narrator's approach. The historian is to "narrativize" the events, to display them with the coherence, integrity and a proper closure, which can only be imagined.¹¹³ Therefore it is certain that history should also be analyzed for its narrative strategies, as well as its factual content. This chapter accordingly aims at seeing the ethos and rhetoric of two continental narrators through their "narrativization" of the Suleyman-Mustafa story, with specific attention to their alterations and diversions from the main factual line. As the authors heard the story through their Ottoman connections, the full "factual" version of the story constructed from the Ottoman sources will be the point of comparison to see the main alterations. The English translation of Goughe, and Painter and Knolles' adaptation of the story follow Moffan's account very closely, and in some cases word by word. Therefore, other than the differences that will be indicated, the English historical narratives which were available to the playwrights merely repeated the story as it was told by Moffan. To complete the version of the story and images that were available to the English playwrights, however, the specific alterations of the English authors will be indicated where necessary.

¹¹³Hayden White, "The Value of Narrativity in Representation of Reality" in *On Narrative*, ed. W. T. Mitchell (Chicago: Chicago University press, 1981), 12-23.

The first account of the Suleyman-Mustafa story that circulated in Europe, written by Moffan is a highly sensationalized version with a strong moral lesson at the end, which reproduces certain stereotypical representations of the Ottomans. In Moffan's construction not only are many details of the story arranged to highlight the general stereotypical depiction of the Turk but also the main line of narration is broken many times, either with dialogues or with long speeches, to fill the narration with certain ideas and ideologies that the author wants to convey. Despite the dominance of negative ideas about the Turk, it is not possible to reduce this text to a simple, single-dimensional narration. As in the case of many slave accounts, the text reveals the author's conflicting ideas, arising from the results of personal experience and the dominance of prejudices about Ottoman society and the Turk in general. As Matar puts it, captive accounts are not necessarily objective, "since they were often encumbered with anti-Islamic prejudice," but in the end, "[the authors] had experienced the world they described" therefore they knew many details that their audience would not have a chance to learn otherwise.¹¹⁴ Thus, when read carefully, it is possible to track some implicit positive ideas about the Turk and to see some variations in the depiction, despite the prejudiced attitude that dominates the work.

Moffan's narration of the story starts with a dedication and an epistle to the reader, where the author explains his source for the story and his aim in narrating it to the French people. Moffan dedicates the text to "Monsignor Christopher, Duke of Wurttemberg," explaining that he was freed from slavery through the intervention of one

¹¹⁴See Nabil Matar, "Introduction: England and Mediterranean Captivity, 1577-1704," in *Piracy, Slavery, and Redemption: Barbary Captivity narratives from early modern England*, ed. Daniel Vitkus (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 1-52.

of his ambassadors.¹¹⁵ Right after that, he gives a short account of his three years with the Turks, although he believes that it is impossible to explain all the “miseries, troubles, calamities, hunger, cold, poverty and torments” that he experienced.¹¹⁶ Two years after his capture, when his owner lost hope of getting a ransom for him, Moffan was sent to the castle of Strigon, where he worked like an “ordinary slave”. In this castle, at nights he was imprisoned with a Turk, with whom he became “friends” as “commonly happens in such places”. From him, Moffan learned a number of things about the Turkish religion and costumes they used ordinarily and in times of peace and war, which he was “very happy to hear and remember”.¹¹⁷ Although Moffan’s narration of his own slavery starts with a strong negative tone, which is quite normal considering his experience, by the end of the narration he sympathizes with a fellow prisoner, calls him his “friend” and openly states that he was happy to learn about Turkish religion and customs.

Besides, through his address to the reader it is possible to see the depth of his knowledge of the Ottoman social and military structure, as in these parts he explains “some names and offices” of the Ottomans which “cannot be familiar to the people ignorant of Turkish language”.¹¹⁸ For the structure of the offices he states that one can get an office only through the consent of the sultan, and as they are appointed by him, they do not have anything of their own. He goes on telling that every three years the officers are deposed and they can no longer be governors of the same region, except in the case of

¹¹⁵Hoefler, *Nouvelle biographie générale*; Painter, 397.

¹¹⁶“Durant lequel temps je ne me peux persuader qu’il soit possible de croire, ny mesmes de raconter en combien de miseres, angusties, calamitez, faim, froid, pauvreté, et tormens j’ay vescu ou plus tost languissant alongé ma vie miserable.”

¹¹⁷“... je me suis rendu fort familier de ce Turc, de sorte qu’il me racontoit plusieurs choses de leurs religion et meurs, et de quelles coustumes ils usent ordinairement en temps de paix et de guerre, lesquelles j’estois fort joyeux d’entendre et retenir.”

¹¹⁸“Or comme ainsi soit, qu’en ce traicté se trouveront plusieurs noms propres d’offices et dignitez, qui ne peuvent estre entendus par gens ignorans le langage Turc, j’ay pensé faire chose utile, de les expliquer,... .”

the sultan's specific decree and permission. Moffan also explains the reason for this structure, stating that "lest through their long abode in the Provinces assigned to them, in some incident, they might enter familiarity with the Christians and in time be converted."¹¹⁹

Probably as a result of his legal education, Moffan shows a great interest in the Ottoman social structure. Despite the lack of any explicit positive statement, it is visible that he admires the social structure in which the offices are held not by wealth or nobility, but by talent and success. Later on, when he explains recent corruption in the system, stating that "in the past time best offices were given to the best captains and soldiers, but in these days, they are sold for money or given for favor," he actually, very much like an insider, establishes the original superiority of the system, while criticizing the present situation.¹²⁰ Busbecq, as well, in his letters, makes a more explicit evaluation of the social structure of the Ottoman Empire and criticizes the situation in Europe through comparing it to the Ottoman case.¹²¹

After this introductory information, Moffan's text follows a basic story line, with some additions and alterations. Mustapha, Soliman's eldest son by a *devsirme* woman is popular among people from his childhood onwards. He is accepted as the only hope of the country that is sent "by some heavenly providence".¹²² After some time, Soliman falls in love with other slave woman, Rosa, by whom he has three sons and a daughter. The daughter is married to a "paschan" Rustanus, who is using his office "with the averice in

¹¹⁹"Car ils sont en crainte, que, faisans plus longue demeure en un lieu et province, ils ne trouvent occasion d'entrer en familiarité and alliance avec les nostres, au moyen dequoy par succession de temps se pourroyent tourner de nostre party."

¹²⁰"pour le jourd'huy est si bien corrompu et amorty par argent et faveur, qu'ils exposent tout en vente au plus offrant"

¹²¹Martels, "Impressions of the Ottoman Empire," 215.

him,” not only to increase his wealth through stealing from the poor, but also to gain sultan’s favor, to guarantee his position in the state.

After this introduction of the characters of the story, Moffan passes to Soliman’s marriage to Rosa, like a flashback. Rosa, with whom Soliman is in love, “under a colour of religion” goes to Muchti, telling him that she is “stirred of a godly desire and affection” to make donations. To that end, she asks Muchti whether a temple and a hospital founded by her would be accepted by God. After getting Muchti’s reply that even if God accepts them they will be accepted for Soliman’s soul, not hers, as she is a slave having nothing of her own, she is greatly saddened. Seeing his beloved so sad and miserable, Soliman frees her with a “great quantitie of treasure”. After a while, while Rosa is busy with her donations; Soliman, who is in “an unbrideled desyre and lust of Rosa,” commands her to be taken to his bedchamber. To that request, she replies saying that “shee acknowleged her selfe no lenger to be a bonde, but a fre woman” and therefore any kind of relationship between them would be “a grevous sinne and offence”. After Muchti’s confirmation of this answer, as it is impossible to stop the “king’s affection” who was “blinded beyounde all measure with sensuall appetite,” Soliman has to marry her although “it was contrary to the usage and custom of the house of Ottomanno”.

This story of the marriage is repeated with few variations in all the accounts after Moffan. This first diversion from the Suleyman-Mustafa story introduces the power relation between Soliman and Rosa. Rosa, the witty, determined slave woman, gains her first victory over weak and lustful Soliman who ignores even the customs of his ancestors

¹²²I refer to Goughe’s reliable translation as the basis for Moffan’s text. For all quotes from Goughe’s translation see <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home>. (accessed: December 2007)

for the sake of carnal desires. The Ottoman custom of marriage is explained in Moffan's text:

For, to avoyde [inequalitie] in the Empire, they never marye anye honest and lawful wives, but in their places to satisfye their pleasures, and libidinous lusts, (whereunto in moste vile and filthy manner, they are subiecte as have all other nations) they have ravished virgines frome all partes of the worlde, ...

Although Moffan criticizes the idea of not getting married to one honest and lawful wife severely, still Soliman, who altered this tradition by getting married, is accused of acting in contrast to tradition because of carnal desires.

Knolles states that Roxolana, who was “by condition a captive, but so graced with beauty and courtly behavior, that in short time she became mistress of his thoughts, and commandress of him that all commanded.”¹²³ Here again, this strong emphasis on Solyman's being blinded by carnal love not only polishes the “lustful Turk” stereotype, but also indicates that Suleyman was weak and gullible as he did not follow his ancestors' traditions. The two most frequent *topoi* about the Ottomans, “the cruel Turk” and “the effeminate Turk” are employed in both texts. “Effeminacy” in early modern culture had a twofold meaning, signifying a displacement of masculine authority to biologically and socially “inferior” women, which was against the God-created order of beings, and an “indication within one conceptual frame the deployments of both gendered discourses”.¹²⁴ Solyman, as the weak ruler, lets the “commandress” of his thoughts rule him. Although it sounds contradictory; it should be stated that the juxtaposition of the figures of the “cruel Turk” and the “effeminate Turk” emerges in many writings of the Early Modern period.

¹²³Knolles, *Generall Historie*, 757.

Knolles' version also includes Muphti into this intrigue of marriage:

Solyman ravished with her love and well the more for her denial, sent for the Mufti, requiring his judgment in the matter; who before instructed in all points, agreed with that Roxolana had said, aggravating the heinousness of the fact, is he should proceed to enforce her as his slave, whom being now free, he might not without great offence touch unmarried.¹²⁵

Knolles, through including the religious figure in the intrigue of Roxolana, not only makes him a part of the power circle but also indicates the hypocrisy of Muslims, which is another strong stereotypical image.¹²⁶

After getting what she wants, being the “chefest of the women of Asia,” still Rosa's the “ambitious endeavours and desires” are not fulfilled. This time she wants his son to inherit the throne, and the only obstacle to her desires is Mustapha. She first consults on this matter with Rustanus, who “by the instinct of reason,” “would rather desire his kinseman, and brother of his wife” to be the sultan after Soliman. Together, they try to raise Soliman's suspicion about Mustapha's loyalty to him, constantly reminding him of the case of Selim.¹²⁷ But as “these arguments of suspicion, at the first sight, seemed not in every behalf so probable unto the king” Rosa has to try some other ways:

She directed her malicious thoughtes unto other disceites, sekyng opportunitye by all mannes possible to distroye the younge manne wyth poison. ... Wherefore he first touched not the venimed robes, sent unto him, by this woman, under the name of hys father, ... by whiche provident wisdome, he prevented the undeserved mischefes of his unnaturall stepmother.

¹²⁴Gary Spear, “Shakespeare's ‘Manly’ Parts: Masculinity and Effeminacy in *Troilus and Cressida*” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 44, No. 4 (1993): 410.

¹²⁵Knolles, *Generall Historie*, 758.

¹²⁶Cruz, “Popular Attitudes towards Islam,” 56.

¹²⁷Suleyman's father, Selim I, who ruled from 1512 to 1520, had his father, Bayazid II, deposed and murdered, and put his brothers to death upon his accession.

Being unsuccessful in this attempt, Rosa also tries to “allure the king’s mind” with the help of a “bewtifull woman, a Jewish enchauntresse”. This detailed narration of the various methods that Rosa tries to fulfill her desire, is the second main diversion from the factual story. In this part, Moffan uses other stereotypical descriptions --of the Turk as superstitious and the Jew as the witch. Through depiction of these he also indicates that these family struggles lasted for a long time. This passage also strengthens his point about Mustapha’s good will and virtue. He is through “provident wisdom” saved from death. This providential protection granted to Mustapha is repeated in the text by means of the narration of Mustapha’s dream, where he speaks to Machomet, the prophet.

After years of hard work trying to raise the father’s anger against his son, finally, “fortune at length minding to faver those cursed intentes of the woman,” brings some “suspicious” letters from the Paschan, Mustapha’s personal tutor and advisor. These letters, which explain the possibility of an arranged marriage between Mustapha and the daughter of the Persian shah, basically to free Mustapha from suspicion, are used by Rustanus and his step-mother for Mustapha’s destruction. The plotters lay this evidence in front of Soliman as a proof of Mustapha’s disloyalty and his plans to ruin his father through an alliance with the Persians, “most auncient and deadly enemies to the of springe of Ottomanno”. Finally convinced by this evidence, Soliman decides to kill his son.

Until that point, Soliman is almost invisible in the account of the murder, other than in some clichéd remarks about him like “the unnatural father” or the “impious tyrant”. After the preliminary notes on his licentious character and weakness, he is not mentioned as a bad character at all until his decision to kill his son. On the contrary, as in

the Ottoman sources, he is depicted as a father who trusts his son and who does not react to the provocations of Rosa and Rustanus for a long time. Although he consents to marry Rosa out of weakness and lust, as a ruler he is depicted at least as rational to some extent, as he does not take action against his son before seeing clear evidence. Only after seeing the letters and hearing the story of Mustapha's probable alliance with the Persians is "the troubled minde of the olde manne" brought "to suche passe that he fullye purposed to provide for safegarde of his owne estate, by death of his sonne ...". It is certain at the point of taking the decision to kill his son that Soliman is depicted as an old, confused man who wants to save his estate rather than a cruel determined tyrant. But after the point of making the decision to kill his son, Solyman turns out to be a real cruel, cold hearted tyrant.¹²⁸ He immediately sends Rustanus to Siria (Syria) with a big army,

[to] laye handes on Mustapha, and bringe him bounde unto Constantinople, but if he could not commodiouslye bringe it to passe, that then by one meanes or other, he shoulde cause him to be murdered.

Mustapha encounters Rustanus with "seven thousand of the most valiant and the best appointed soldiers through out all Turkeye" and Rustanus after seeing that he cannot win over Mustapha, decides to go back to Constantinople. Here Moffan makes another shift in the story through which he shows Mustapha's chivalric courage and Rustanus' and Soliman's weakness and hypocrisy. In contrast to the Ottoman sources, in Moffan's version, the decision to kill Mustapha is taken long before Rustanus' being sent to Syria. And he is not sent for a campaign in the east, but as an open challenge to Mustapha. There, after seeing Mustapha's power, Rustanus flees from him, "with such spede, that he dared not to see the duste, rayseed in the aire by the horsemene of Mustapha, much lesse to abyde hys commynge." Back in Constantinople he informs the Sultan that "he thought

¹²⁸McJannet, *The Sultan Speaks*, 147.

it not good, in so dangerous a business to attempt the matter by open war”. Through this little diversion, Moffan makes it clear that the “wicked Sultan” and his “deceitful vizier” do not have the courage to challenge Mustapha, the knightly prince, directly. Therefore they use trickery to destroy him. The trickery Turk that “runs from the battlefield” or even when he is fighting, fighting for the wrong causes are frequently repeated stereotypical depictions.¹²⁹ At this point Soliman, as he is also in the intrigue together with the others, is depicted as “the uncurteouse and bloudshedyng father, and in no pointe degenerating from the engrafted crueltye of his auncestours”. Here the wickedness of Soliman is explained as an ancestral quality in contrast to the Ottoman sources.

After this, the pace of narration slows down and just before passing on to Mustapha’s death, the author not only includes some detailed narrations which strengthens his point of Mustapha’s innocence and innate goodness, but also introduces other positively depicted Turks, Acmat Pascha and the Doctor, Mustapha’s advisor. Soliman, pretending a campaign against Persia, leaves İstanbul with an enormous force and asks Mustapha to join him with his army at Alepes (Aleppo). Following Rustanus’ advice, Soliman decides to hide his anger towards his son, but, being “not so able to conceale by outwarde aparance,” he makes it evident to some of the paschas. One of those, Acmat, tries to warn Mustapha against his father. Despite this warning and “althoughe with no small peril of his lyfe” Mustapha decides to obey his father “for he thought it to be more honest and laudable, by obeyinge his father to incurre death,” then “to fall into crime of disobedience.” Here again the heroic qualities of Mustapha are presented.

¹²⁹Cruz, “Popular Attitudes towards Islam,” 57.

Later on, Moffan continues his narration with an imagined dialogue between Mustapha and his advisor. Mustapha, “in this so great sorrowe and heavines, many cogitations in his minde,” asks his advisor, “whether an empire of the worlde, or a blisshed lyfe, were rather to be wished for by a man?” To this, the Doctor “frely aunswered”:

... the Empire of this worlde, unto a man thoroughlye considerynge it, doth bring no felicitye, but under a vaine and colored apearance of the trewe goodnes, ... [It brings] with it selfe, mere sorowe, perplexitye of minde, tribulation, suspicions, manslaughter, feare, ungodlines, ruin, captivitye, spoilinge, with divers other kindes of mischefe, ... by the whyche doutles the happye lyfe should be loste and not won, ...

Here, the Doctor’s answer supplies a kind of explanation, if not a justification, for all the evil things happening in the narration. As the Doctor refers to the “trouble of mind,” “suspicion” and “fear” that ruling an empire may cause, he actually offers a general idea on the rulers rather than specific irregularity or wickedness in the Ottoman case. He sees all the wickedness, ungodliness, ruin and spoiling as a part of the nature of the office. Therefore, his evaluation of the general conditions of the minds of rulers and their ways indicates a universality which in the end causes recognition, if not an affirmation. It is obvious that by putting these words into the mouth of the Doctor, a rather less developed character in the narration, Moffan philosophizes on the nature of kingship and he does not attach these evil deeds to the Ottoman identity, but to the general human condition.

The Doctor’s answer goes on:

but unto whom be geven, depelye to weye and consider the unstabilitye and shortnes of this our fragile estate, whyche strive againste the vanities of this worlde, and embrace honestye, that no doubtte for them, ther was a place assygned and prepared in heaven by the highe God, wher they shoulde geve the fruition of perpetuall ioye, and a blessed lyfe.

Having stated the perils of kingship for a soul, the Doctor suggests a pleasure in heaven, which is preserved for those who can “strive against the vanities of this world”. Later on,

his wisdom is proved by his accurate interpretation of Mustapha's dream, and Mustapha is implicitly criticized for not following his words.

Another interruption of the basic line of the story comes right after this, where Moffan tells of Mustapha's dream in which he dreamt a "thirde daye before he shoulde make ready hym selfe for the iourneye" that he will take to meet his father. "Sleepyng about the twye light of the daye," Mustapha dreamt of Machomet, "appareled with glisteringe robes". Machomet takes Mustapha by the hand and brings him to a place "moste delectable, garnished with exquisite and gorgeous palaices, and environed with a most pleasant garden". There, Muhammad, pointing to everything that they see, speaks to him:

Here perpetually do rest as many as in the world, have leaden a godlye and upryght lyfe, with suche as have bene maintainers of the lawes and rightuousnes, and equitie and reprovers of synne and vices.

After that Muhammad turns his face to the other side and showing the river which is "more blacke than any pitche," in which many have been drowned, appearing on the surface of the water "cryng for mercye with a most horrible voice," and says:

... and in this place are tormented such as maliciously have wrought iniquitie, remaininge under the waveringenes of hys fickle life. And the greatest parte of them [are] Emperours, kynges, princes, and other suche great potentates of the worlde.

Here again, as in the answer of the Doctor, is a general criticism of the "great potentates" of the world, rather than the Ottoman Empire. The prophet not only indicates to Mustapha his death and the perpetual beauties waiting for him, but he also warns him against the dangers of trying to be one of the great powers of the world.

This passage is important from two perspectives. Firstly, it supplies the text with a representation of the Muslim prophet, about whom an enormous number of clichés were

circulating in Europe.¹³⁰ It is impossible to miss this rather neutral, if not positive, representation of him in Moffan's account. Moffan, although he had a great chance to draw a negative image of the Muslim religion, chooses to forgo this opportunity. Secondly, the passage is a repetition of the arguments of the Doctor on power and sovereignty in this world. It is apparent that through replicating the same theme through a religious figure, Moffan strengthens this point with his support. Therefore, Mustapha is warned first in a direct way by a secular man, and second in an implicit manner by a religious authority to stay away from the struggle for the throne. In this way, as in the case of the danger of being poisoned, Mustapha is depicted as being under divine protection.

Moffan goes on to tell that, right after his dream, Mustapha tells everything to the Doctor and asks for an interpretation. According to the Doctor, this vision "was to be feared, as one which foreshowed unto hym great peril of hys life". Mustapha, "havyng no respecte to hys aunswere" answers back that he will not stop because of childish fears when there is no reason to be suspicious of his father's intention. He then states his aim of ruling "without all slaughter, bludshedding and crueltye" after the death of his father and rushes to obey his father's command.

After this point, the story speeds up again; Mustapha goes to father's camp, enters into the tent with great respect, leaving his weapons outside. There he is strangled by seven "dumb" men (mutes) in the presence of his father. After that, the Doctor, Mustapha's advisor, is also killed, again in "kynges presence". Soon, Giangir, who could not stand the sorrow of loosing his brother, also commits suicide.

¹³⁰ For a summary of these clichés see Chew, *The Crescent and the Rose*, 387-451.

Moffan's last diversion from the basic line of the factual narration is the part where he tells at length the struggle between the two parties of the army, supporters of Mustapha and Soliman's soldiers. As soon as the rumors concerning the death of Mustapha starts to circulate in the army, "a bloddye cumbate was fought on bothe sydes, in so muche that in short space wer slain above two thousande men, and manye other wounded". The only one who took action against this problem is Acmat Pascha, who is depicted as "a manne moste grave, and for his vertuous exploits, of no small reputation among the solders". Acmat Pascha after ordering the janissaries to stop, also gives a speech to the soldiers of Mustapha, mitigating "with gentill wordes and exhortations their stirred mindes". Addressing the soldiers, he says:

What will you nowe deare brethren ..., degenerating from that wisdom throughe the whiche in so many ages you have been praised and highely commended, go against and withstande the commaundementes of the great Soltan our emperour? I can not ... marvell enoughe, what hath so inflamed your harts, ..., as in this civill conflicte, to stretche fourth these wepons againste your own fellowes, which with suche prosperous successe, and good fortune, you have used upon enemies of the house of Ottomanna and to represent such a spectacle unto your adversaries, that they, ... should now reioyce for their mutual destruction and slaughter.

From the mouth of Acmat Pascha, one hears comments upon the harms of fighting with fellows. He states that such an attitude not only diminishes their power, but also makes "the enemies of the house of Ottomanno rejoice". Making his point clear, the pascha concludes,

Therefore my sonnes for your magnanimitie sake, ... reserve these wepons which to much you have exercised agaynst your own selves, for your enemies, when a better occasion, and more praise worthy shall be ministered.

When considered together with the previous two diversions from the story — the Mustapha-Doctor conversation and Mustapha's dream — and especially when connected

to the moral ending where the author completes the story suggesting that the reader “take diligent care for our souls that we may abstain from civil wars,” this addition becomes much more meaningful. It is possible to argue that in all these parts, Moffan addresses Christian princes, with the aim of reminding them to be united against the enemy. He not only expresses his ideas on the unworthiness of worldly authority, the desire for power in this world, but also, through the episode of conflict in the army, finds a chance to speak of the importance of being united against “the Other”. These diversions from the story are not accidental, but deliberate additions of the author to convey his ideas.

In terms of the depiction of “the Other” in the text, it is certain that Moffan’s narration is by no means fully stereotypical. Together with the devilish Turks like Rustanus and Rosa, there are also some characters that are presented ambiguously, according to minute changes in the narration. Soliman, the Grand Turk, is a weak and lustful man at the beginning where the stereotypes are emphasized, a caring and rational father when it is necessary to use him to highlight the wickedness of Rosa and Rustanus, and a blood-thirsty, cruel father in the end.

The depiction of Mustapha also changes through the narration. The Christ-like, obedient, courageous, and witty Mustapha is criticized for not paying attention to the Doctor’s interpretation of his vision. At the very end, where the direct moral lesson to the Christian audience is stated, he becomes an anti-hero whose death should be celebrated. Two characters are depicted positively throughout the text: Acmat and the Doctor. Not only their statesmanship and experience on the state and military issues are praised, but both of them are represented as fully respected, educated, and pious men. The Prophet Machomad is also depicted in a rather positive manner, as a means of divine protection

for Mustapha. This case in Moffan's text indicates that this European account of the story, presented a variety of images of the Turk and their representations were not always stereotypical, despite the dominant tone of the prejudices.

The second account of the Suleyman-Mustafa story comes from Busbecq's *Turkish Letters*, which was published long after his return from Istanbul. Busbecq's narration, compared to Moffan's, is much more serious and less sensational in tone. Although the letters were published for common readers rather than diplomatic circles, the narration of the experienced scholar is quite calm and down to earth. Here it should be emphasized that unlike Moffan's single piece that is dedicated to the narration of this story, in Busbecq's case, the Suleyman-Mustafa story is just a short piece in the four lengthy letters. Therefore one does not see the same care and consideration for the construction of the piece as is seen in Moffan's case. Either because of Busbecq's rather calm tone or as a result of his short account of the story, this account was not directly employed by the English playwrights. Still, his account will not only complete additional details about the story which the English authors might have had read, but it will also be useful to see the full range of variations in the images of the Turks that were circulating in Europe with the Suleyman-Mustafa story, as Busbecq's presentation is rather complicated, but more positive one.

Busbecq, tells the story of Mustapha as an explanation for the deposition of Roostem, whom he knew personally from the palace. Very much like Moffan, Busbecq starts his narration with the introduction of the main character, Mustapha. Mustapha in Busbecq's account is stripped of all the perfection and unnaturally bright qualities that were attached to him in Moffan's account. Here, he is not the perfect hero but only a

“man in his prime of life,” who enjoys a great reputation “among the soldiers”.¹³¹ After this brief introduction of Mustapha, Busbecq passes on to Roxolana, to whom Solyman gives “the position of the legal wife” as he is “so much attached to her”. Busbecq, despite quite a different attitude towards it, also mentions the “marriage” between Roxolana and Solyman, explaining the situation as follows:

In doing so [marrying Roxolana] he violated the custom of the Sultan’s who had preceded him, none of whom had contracted a marriage since the time of Beyazid I.

After making this statement, Busbecq explains the reason for not marrying one legal wife. According to his account, after the defeat of Beyazid by Tamerlane, and his capture along with his wife, the Ottoman sultans did not choose one wife for themselves as they did not want to experience the humiliating position of Beyazid after the “insults and affronts to which his wife was subjected before his very eyes”. Busbecq’s explanation of the reason for not getting married is distinctively different from that of Moffan’s. He neither represents the Turk as a lustful creature whose appetite never ends nor indicates any kind of power relation between Roxolana and Soleiman other than saying that he was attached to her. His narration stands as a challenge to the lustful Turk stereotype.

After that diversion, he goes on with Mustapha, telling that as a result of his “remarkable natural gifts and suitability of his age” he is seen as the successor to the empire. Then he explains Roxolana’s and Roostem’s mutual interest in changing this expected order. According to Busbecq, Roxolana’s and Roostem’s “fortunes were closely linked,” as a result of his marriage to Roxolana’s daughter. Here the character of Roostem is introduced, actually for whose sake all this story is being told. He is depicted

¹³¹Busbecq, *Turkish Letters*, 19-23. For all quotes from Busbecq’s text, see the same publication and the indicated pages.

as a “keen and far-seeing mind” whose only handicap was “his avarice”. But according to Busbecq he turned this into an advantage, as he employed his vice in his master’s interest. “He amassed large sums of money and filled Soleiman’s treasury.”

After this point comes the second diversion from the line of narration, where Busbecq explains “the most unhappy” situation of the sons of Turkish sultans:

The Turks tolerate no rival to the throne; indeed, the attitude of the soldiers of the bodyguard makes it impossible for them to do so. For is a brother of the reigning monarch chances to remain alive they never stop demanding largesse; and if their requests are refused, cries of ‘long live the brother’, ‘god save the brother’ are heard whereby they make it pretty clear that they intend to put him on the throne. Sultans of the Turkey are thus compelled to stain their hands with their brothers’ blood...

Here, Busbecq’s explanation of the tradition of fratricide is rather neutral, especially when one considers the way in which this specific case of the Ottomans was used by European authors. As in the case of the marriage part, here again it is possible to see that Busbecq observed Turkish traditions with a neutral attitude and does not explain them through the cruelty or lust of the Turks but rather with specific references to the peculiarities of “the Other”. This representation of the Turk is apparently a diversion from the Western stereotype of the Turks as irrational, fanatical killers.¹³² This does not mean that Busbecq approved of all these specifically Turkish customs; what he does is rather representing them without passing explicit judgments or prejudices.

After this point, Busbecq quickly passes the intrigue part of the story saying “whether Mustapha was afraid of this fate [of being killed by one of the brothers] or Roxolana wished to save her own child sacrificing him,” and states that as a result of the action of either Mustapha or Roxolana it is suggested that Soleiman kill his son. Here the ambiguous attitude of Busbecq is clear towards the reasons for the decision of Suleiman.

He does not point out one side as the guilty one and describe all these events as being a result of common power dynamics in the palaces. He does not demonize Roxolana and does not present Mustapha as an angel. More importantly, he does not explain the events through the characters' evilness or innocence, but through human nature and the contemporary situation.

After that point the pace of Busbecq's narration also slows down and he makes some quite interesting remarks. After it is suggested that Suleiman kill Mustapha, Suleiman sends Roostem on a Persian campaign, which at first sight seems to be unconnected with the Suleyman-Mustafa story. When Roostem approaches the Persian frontier, he

suddenly halted and sent a dispatch to Suleiman saying that he was in a critical position, that treachery was rife, the soldiers had been bribed and were zealous for no one except Mustapha.

At this point though, Busbecq's narration does not explicitly accuse Roostem of lying just to provoke the father. Right after this point, as another diversion from the story, Busbecq tells that Mustapha was summoned to father's presence, "to clear himself of the crimes which he was suspected and now openly accused of," although later he states that Suleiman has already decided to kill his son before he leaves Istanbul. Apparently, according to Busbecq, this was not a real attempt to defend himself, but just a trick to catch Mustapha. Confronted with such a difficult choice, Mustapha chooses "the braver and more dangerous course". Although this statement implicitly indicates Busbecq's support for Mustapha, right after saying this, he adds that, "either [Mustapha] relied on his innocence, or else he was confident that no harm could come to him in the presence of the army," again giving an ambiguous tone to his narration.

¹³²Vitkus, "Early Modern Orientalism," 221.

After this, another diversion follows where Busbecq tells how Soleiman got permission from the Mufti, before his departure from İstanbul, to kill his son. Here, the Mufti, whose position is explained as “the chief religious authority among the Turks, as the Pope of Rome among us,” is depicted quite neutrally, without any comments on his decision or advice on the issue. When Busbecq comes to the end of the story, his narration becomes more and more vivid and exciting. Mustapha comes to the father’s tent and sees everything in peace. But when he enters into the inner tent, “several mutes” attack him, with the aim of throwing a noose around him. Mustapha fights with them, “not only for his life but also for the throne,” with the hope of throwing “himself among the Janissaries,” who would “not only protect him but also proclaim him as the sultan”. With this little remark through the narration of the death scene, Bucbecq creates an ambiguous tone on Mustapha’s innocence or guilt.

He is skeptical about the other party as well. Soleiman, fearing that Mustapha can save himself and “being only separated by the linen tent hangings from the scene” directs “fierce and threatening glances upon the mutes and by menacing gestures” rebukes their hesitation. After that, Mustapha is quickly strangled. Busbecq’s account ends with a narration of the situation in the army, which first protested the death of Mustapha’s, but later, after Roostem’s deposition, “with the usual credulity of the vulgar” they believed that “Suleiman had discovered the crimes of Roostem” and were relieved.

It is clear that Busbecq’s narration of the story is realistic, plausible and down to earth. The story is narrated as a regular conflict in imperial politics and all throughout his narration he stays away from ethnic generalizations. Especially in the character of Soleiman, the stereotypical representation of the Turk is ignored. He is calm, stern, and

reasonable all the time. He has full control over the events and he even saves his own reputation among the soldiers after the murder, simply by deposing Roostem, whom everyone thought to be the plotter. Mustapha on the other hand is not an angel-like figure although he is praised for his talents and courage. Busbecq's tone is not accusing towards anyone; he does not blame a specific character as he sees this event as an outcome of the situation rather than a result of the personal vices. Even when he later speaks of common ideas among people about the murder story, he just states that Soliman's action of "putting his son to death" is thought to be "imputed to [Roxolana's] employment of love-potions and incantations," keeping himself out of these common opinions.

Busbecq's general description of the Turk is not free from stereotypes, though. Although he shows Soleiman as a strong reasonable man, Busbecq explains that "even in his earlier years, he did not indulge in wine or in those unnatural vices to which the Turks are often addicted". According to Busbecq Suleiman was a rare example of soberness and virtue among the Turks. Moreover, although he does not elaborate his point in the narration of the Suleyman-Mustafa story, he later on mentions Suleyman's undue submission to his wife. Therefore it is certain that his narration is also nuanced and his digressions from the main story line are used to explain the situations in which the events took place rather than in portraying ethnic generalizations.

Other than this story, Busbecq's overall remarks about the Ottoman world are not stereotypical either. Most of the time, except some minor points about the superstitious nature of the people and their ignorance of the value of antiquities, Busbecq's general comments on the Ottoman rulers and their capacities are quite positive. He does not only compare the Ottoman Empire to Christendom, concluding that the latter, being divided,

irresolute, and debauched, would not be incapable of withstanding the disciplined might of the Turks¹³³ but also “recommends the virtues of the Ottoman aristocracy to his own ruler”.¹³⁴ A criticism of the Christian world’s being divided and weak and admiration of the highly unified and disciplined army of the Turks were commonplaces of the European writings of the era.¹³⁵

Both English versions of the story –Knolles and Painter’s- further strengthen the stereotypical representations rather than shattering them. William Painter, who basically translated Moffan’s text, states in his prefatory remarks that he is telling this story as:

[to have] it continue in man’s remembrance thereby to renew the auncient detestation, which we have, and our Progenitors had against that horrible Termagant, and Persecutor of Christyans, I have insinuated the same amongst the rest of these Novels.¹³⁶

After setting his narration in the context of the long history of the “detestation of the Turk” he elaborates his point on the cruelty and wickedness of the Turk.¹³⁷ He states that it is impossible to find a more “notorious or horryble Tragedy” than that “unnaturall murder done” by the enemy of Christianity, in the writings of the ancient poets and writers. Suleyman from the very beginning onwards is depicted as “the Hellysh Champyon” who has a “devilish fury” that exceeds that of a beast or as “the libidonous” lusful infidel.¹³⁸ In Painter’s and Knolles’s accounts not only are ethnic stereotypical representations, but the religious identities are represented especailly, together with more

¹³³Busbecq, *Turkish Letters*, 77.

¹³⁴Suraiya Faroqhi, *Approaching Ottoman History: An Introduction to Sources* (Cambridge University Press, 1999), 132. For a detailed analysis of Busbecq’s account’s representations of the Turk, see Martels, “Impressions of the Ottoman Empire”.

¹³⁵Nancy Bisaha, “‘New Barbarian’ or Worthy Adversary? Humanist Constructions of the Ottoman Turks in Fifteen-Century Italy,” *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe. Perception of Other*, ed. Michael Frassetto and David Blanks (London: Macmillan, 1999), 185-187.

¹³⁶Painter, *Palace of Pleasure*, 395.

¹³⁷McJannet, *The Sultan Speaks*, 150.

¹³⁸Painter, 396.

nuanced versions. It is certain that these representations, rather than the rhetoric created by state circles influenced the representation of the Turks in the plays that will be analysed in the next chapter.

These two texts reveal the variety of representations of the Turk in the European repercussions of the Solyman-Mustapha story. Moffan's rather less studied work *Soltani Solymanni*, despite its one-dimensional appearance, reveals rather complicated figures who are sometimes condemned for their lustful and deceitful natures, and at other times praised for their experience, intelligence and pious nature. Through his construction, Moffan deliberately diverges from the original story or breaks the story line either for the purpose of portraying the goodness or evil nature of the characters or to fill out the text with some moral lessons. Busbecq on the other hand through his reliable and less sensational narration explains the causes of the events through the specific situation and customs of the Ottoman state. These accounts, especially Busbecq's, stand as a strong challenge to the stereotypical representations of the Turk in Europe. Besides, when compared to the repercussion of the Suleyman-Mustafa story in England, these European accounts which are the sources of the English plays, indicate that the socio-economic conditions of the sixteenth century did not always end in a milder representation of the Turk on the English stage.

III. SULEYMAN AND MUSTAFA ON THE ENGLISH STAGE

Aristotle, in his *Poetics*, states that literature is more universal than history. But this chapter will deal with the peculiarities of the Early Modern English history plays rather than the universality. Actually, as Hattaway suggests, they are better called “political plays” as they are “not mere chronicles,” but “dramatic essays” on the institution of kingship and on the origins, nature and the transfer of power.¹³⁹ As in the case of the historical accounts, what these dramatic texts do is to offer a record of the periods when they were composed, on perceptions of “the Other” or Others. Moreover, these texts, through their correspondence between theological and moral ideas and political and social realities present an image of the self as well.

The representations of Turks in the plays that will be analyzed here are not a blend of stereotypes and more nuanced figures. It is certain that as a result of the complex of ideas on the Ottomans and Ottoman-based policies of the English throne, the Ottomans are represented from different angles and with quite a variety of features in many of the plays written in sixteenth-century England. This does not mean, however, that some general ethnic and religious prejudices about the Turks that were circulating either through translations of European literature or revived by the parties against pro-Ottoman policies did not operate on the English stage. Most of the time the stereotypical representations go hand in hand with much nuanced, and sometimes even positive, depictions, even in the same character. In *Solymanidae* and Fulke Greville’s *Mustapha* what one sees is a rather strict traditional anti-Turkish discourse that is blended with a hidden criticism of the socio-economic developments of the age.

Solymannidae, an anonymous Cambridge play which applies Senecan methods to an Eastern topic, was written in 1581, and probably was never performed. The dramatic construction follows the sources closely, with some alterations and an additional sub-plot which is again an execution story from the Ottoman court. As a Senecan tragedy, the play has a chorus, and basically the chorus distinguishes itself from the characters in terms of time and space through commenting on past, present, and future events.¹⁴⁰ The violence is not staged, and is reported by another character who does not, like the chorus, only tell of events, but also comments on the actions.¹⁴¹ Probably for the sake of keeping the unities, some changes were made in the story through the introduction of messengers and ambassadors coming into the palace rather than the characters leaving for campaigns and meetings. Therefore, the setting is Suleiman's palace in Istanbul: Mustapha is summoned to the palace and executed there.

Solymannidae opens with a ghost reporting both the past and the future events. Selim I's (1512-1520), Suleiman's father's ghost is seen on the stage and he tells the audience about the previous cruelties seen as a result of the Ottoman custom of fratricide.

I am the unhappy ghost of Selim ... I see that the gods, avengers of a father, will not allow a crime to go long unpunished. Victorious, I destroyed my father Bayazid and my two brothers so I alone might possess the throne and abolish all the laws, as if they were hanging over my head. Blood atones for blood, unjust murder demands the crime be requited by fresh killing.¹⁴²

¹³⁹Michael Hattway, "Drama and Society" *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama*, ed. A. R. Brounmuller and Michael. Hattaway (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 94.

¹⁴⁰Chew, *The Crescent and the Rose*, 437.

¹⁴¹Sutton, Introduction, <http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/soly/act1eng.html> (accessed February, 2008).

¹⁴²*Infelix umbra Selimi, qui quondam potens/ ... / Patris ultores video deos/ Impune nullum facinus diutius pati./ Ego Paizetem victor oppressi patrem/ Geminosque fratres, ut regios solus thronos/ Tenerem et omnes, ut supra caput, leges/ Tollere liceret. Sanguinem sanguis luit,/ Iniusta caedes poscit ut caedes nova/ Scelus rependat.* A hypertext critical edition by Dana F. Sutton. (The University of California, Irvine.) For all quotes from *Solymannidae* see <http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/soly/act1eng.html> (accessed February, 2008).

The ghost of Selim is the first character on the stage. Although he is a part of the Senecan style, the way he expresses the practice of fratricide is meaningful. Selim tells that he killed his father and brother, so that he “alone” might possess the throne and “abolish all the laws”. At a very early stage of the play, with a reference to Selim and his cruelties, the author emphasizes the repetitious conflicts within the Ottoman dynastic family. The practice of fratricide, which is completely omitted from the Ottoman accounts and barely emphasized in the European sources of the Suleyman-Mustafa story, is used as the opening point in *Solymannidae*. Later, with references to another Mustapha, a vizier of Bayazid who had alienated Suleiman’s father Selim against his grandfather Bayazid, the writer emphasizes this idea. Besides, Selim’s explanation that he has murdered his father and brothers to rule alone and to “abolish all the laws” unites cruelty with a desire for absolute power, which were two main ideas circulating in Europe about Ottoman dynastic politics.¹⁴³

In the first act the ambassador of “Tartary” comes to Suleiman to inform him that they “have discovered nobody who is equal of Mustapha” to marry the daughter of “the mighty master of Tartary”.¹⁴⁴ This marriage issue is mentioned in Moffan, the main source of *Solymannidae*. In the play, however, there is a change in the way Suleiman is informed of the marriage. Suleiman is not informed of this arrangement through the parties that are against Mustapha, in a deliberately provocative way, but he is directly informed by the ambassador, who asks: “if such an offer is to [his] liking”.¹⁴⁵ By removing the basis for Suleiman’s suspicions of his son, but still indicating that he is

¹⁴³Vitkus, “Early Modern Orientalism,” 213.

¹⁴⁴... *Ut regis prolem stirpem cum regis thoro/ Aequali sortiet, haud quemquam similem tuo/ Invenit Mustaphae.* ...

¹⁴⁵*Conditio si talis placet.*

quite suspicious through his long conversation with the Turk that accompanies the ambassador, inquiring about Mustapha's reaction to this situation and right after that asking his son to be summoned, "to see the virtue of his family," Suleiman himself is depicted as the first source of suspicion, rather than others.¹⁴⁶ His utterance that Mustapha "possesses a province full of warlike men" and "on all sides he has blood-thirsty flocks of men" not only reminds the reader of the fearsome, terrible army of the Turk but also indicates that Suleiman is afraid of his son, whom he has not seen for four years.¹⁴⁷ His next sentence, "perhaps under his generalship I am destined to conquer the Christians and subdue them to my yoke" points out the target of the fearsome army, the Christians.¹⁴⁸

Right after this comes the first chorus:

Whatever ruler does not love his family, but dreads deceit and fears the treachery of his lords, he fretfully doubts the constant loyalty of his sons, and scarcely trusts himself. ... fearing every sound of the winds, so he invents sources of dread. Mighty Suleiman himself, who scorns the German and the Persian, is scared, pointlessly fearing Mustapha's cruel arms.¹⁴⁹

The chorus depicts Suleiman as a ruler who does not like his family, who "fretfully doubts" their loyalty. He is likened to a "runaway soldier" who "invents sources of dread". In contrast to the sources he used, the anonymous author accuses Suleiman of "pointless" doubts. Here, although the argument starts like a general one about all dynasties, with the strong emphasis on the deeds of "mighty Suleiman" and "the cruel arms of Mustapha," in the end it points to Ottoman identity. The chorus goes on:

¹⁴⁶*Volo videre stirpis virtutem meae/ Et ingens Ottomanni faelicis genus.*

¹⁴⁷*Provinciam bellicis tenet plenam viris./ Habet cruentos undique populorum greges.*

¹⁴⁸*Forsan Christigenas illo domiturus duce/ Iugo captivis opprimam victor meo.*

¹⁴⁹*Quicumque regnat non suum diligit genus./ Horrescit fraudes et procerum timet dolos./ Trepidus natorum de firma dubitat fide./ Sibi vix credit. .../ Sonitus ventorum, sic sibi fingit metus/ Omnia sic omnes*

Mustapha, who in his pride hopes for a wedding that will be deadly for this realm, is preparing his own downfall. Taken in by his father's deceit, he will succumb.¹⁵⁰

Again in great contrast to the sources, the anonymous author depicts Mustapha, at the end of the very first act, as a man of pride, who wants to accept offer that which will be deadly for his realm. He is not a strong knightly figure, but a young man full of pride who is surrounded "with blood-thirsty flocks of men".

The second act introduces other characters: Rhodes, Roxanes, and Selim, son of Suleiman. The reader is informed about the plans of Rhodes after the hearing about the conflict between Suleiman and Mustapha. Nothing much is changed in the depiction of Rhodes and Roxanes. Roxanes is again a woman of high ambition, who believes that "one must gain power by doing right and wrong".¹⁵¹ She is determined and fearless. She gets angry with Rhodes, her fellow conspirator, when he states that he finds it "bold and savage to throw kingdoms and royal fortunes into confusion," and accuses him of being coward.¹⁵² The superiority of Mustapha over Selim, and thus the impossibility of an open victory over him, is told, and other means of getting him out of the way, such as assassination, poisoning and incantation are discussed one by one. Then Roxanes explains to Rhodes the intrigue of provoking the father against the son as a way to "seek empire in such a way that [she] can live better if [Selim] gets it".¹⁵³ As a deviation from the source, Selim, the nominee for the throne after Mustapha, is included in the play, depicted as a passive son under the direct authority of the mother.

solliciti reges pavent/ Solymannus ipse, Germani ac Persae potens/ Trepidat contemptor, arma Mustaphae fera/ Incassum metuens./ ...

¹⁵⁰*Qui nuptias regno graves/ Superbus optat, exitum sibi parat,/ Mustapha paterno captus occumbet dolo.*

¹⁵¹*Regna per fas et nefas/ Paranda.*

¹⁵²*Movere regna et principum summas opes/ Et trahere gentes servitutis ad nova/ Iniquae iura, legis antiquae ratos*

¹⁵³*Sic regnum pete/ Ut parto <eo> melius vivas regno tibi.*

The next deviation from the source is the introduction of Hybrachimus, İbrahim Paşa (1493-1536), a previous vizier of Suleyman. İbrahim, a pasha of *devşirme* origin, was one of the best advisors and viziers of Suleyman whom he had known since his childhood. Later on, in 1536 he was suddenly executed at the command of Suleyman, without a clear accusation.¹⁵⁴ In the play, the story of İbrahim, who was executed seventeen years before Mustafa, and whose story is mentioned in Moffan's introduction to his text with little emphasis, is combined with the Suleyman-Mustafa story. In the play, he is the second victim of Suleiman's rage and suspicion and Rhodes and Roxanes' intrigue. He is depicted as an experienced statesman and quite a virtuous, loyal and educated advisor. He is the one who suggests that Suleiman decide calmly, after hearing his son's defense. He also explains to him that Mustapha's marriage to the princess of Tartary is a good chance for the Ottomans to strengthen their army and to have a good ally. After his persuasive speech Suleiman decides that "it is not pleasure to accuse [his] son's noble faith out of doubtful care".¹⁵⁵ The chorus also praises Hybrachimus for "his customary loyalty"; with that, Hybrachimus helps Suleiman to see the real causes behind everything. But through his "honest piety" that overcomes the "credulous fears" of his friend, he becomes the target for Rhodes' and Roxanes' intrigue. Roxanes gives Rhodes a "little notebook" where he has written down everything "ever since powerful Hybrachimus began to lord it in the palace to the detriment of our prince's wealth and the condition of his empire" and asks her to give it to Suleiman.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵⁴M. Tayyib Gökbilgin, "İbrahim Paşa," *İslam Ansilopedisi* [Encyclopedia of Islam] (İstanbul: MEB Yayınları, 1965), 915.

¹⁵⁵*Haud gratum est inclytam nati fidem/ Taxare ancipiti cura.*

¹⁵⁶*Hic est libellus. Hunc mecum tacitus tuli,/ Ex quo Hybrachimus nimium caepit potens/ Dominare in aula adversus principis opes/ Statumque imperii.*

In the next act, in great contrast to the previous one where he summons Hybrachimus to take counsel from him, Suleiman is quite skeptical about Hybrachimus's own deeds. After their discussion on the deeds of Hybrachimus, at the very end it is revealed that Suleiman has seen the "little notebook" that Roxanes kept and that is the reason of his anger. The discussion between Suleiman and Hybrachimus gives a detailed account of Ottoman conquests in Europe and Asia, reminding the reader of the chronic Ottoman danger. Hybrachimus defends himself against every accusation that Suleiman makes. In between this question-answer-type dialogue, Hybrachimus refers to the plotters, indicating his wit and keenness in evaluating the events around him, and reflecting a great contrast to Suleiman, who "gullibly" believes in everything he hears:

HYB. Mustapha is the great glory of your family. One must always show favor to royal sons. He who favors the king's son gives the king his due.
 SOL. But he's preparing the ruin of my empire and myself.
 HYB. I hope that whoever seeks the golden pinnacle of power by means of crime, great felony and murder will fail in his hope and suffer a wretched and deadly downfall. This is the favor I show to crime.¹⁵⁷

Towards the end of their dialogue, right before Suleiman commands the execution of Hybrachimus, he reminds him of one event, his failure in taking the "negligible citadel," *Quintium*.¹⁵⁸ Then Hybrachimus explains the reason for this failure:

HYB. Thrice we inflicted a great slaughter, ... Thrice our fierce soldiers, burning with great wrath, invaded their tumble-down defenses with their confident steps, when a sudden loud noise brought them back from the all-but-captured city.
 SOL. Will a victor be taken captive and depart, driven from his place?
 HYB. There was a terrible horseman, surrounded by gleaming fire, of superhuman size. ... In his hand he held a fearful sword, its point

¹⁵⁷HYB: *Stirpis Mustapha tuae/ Decus praecelsum est. Regios partus libet/ Fovere semper. Qui nato principis fovet,/ Iustum vectigal in nato solvit patri./* SOL: *At ille exitium et mihi et regno parat./* HYB. *Imperii quisquis aureum culmen petit/ Per facinus et grande nefas et caedem patris,/ Opto successu careat, per clades ruat/ Miser cruentas. Hic meus scelere favor.*

¹⁵⁸Sutton states that she cannot determine what place is Latinized as *Quintium*, and so does not know what military setback is being described.

gleaming like sunlight. ... This celestial wrath turned us commanders away from the ridge of *Quintum* and put an end to our fighting.¹⁵⁹

Considering the general theme of the play, it is possible to read this fantastic description of the fight between the Ottoman soldiers and the “terrible horseman,” of “superhuman size” with the “celestial wrath” as an allusion to Suleiman’s anger, destroying his own empire with his own “celestial wrath”. This passage, on the other hand, coming after so many accurate factual details about the Ottoman conquests in Europe, with its fantastic description of a fight in an unknown “negligible” citadel, not only conveys the cruelty of the Ottoman army, referring to their tortures in time of war, but it may also foreshadow a desired Christian “celestial” wrath that would one day win over these “fierce soldiers” of the Ottomans. At the end of this dialogue, Suleiman displays the notebook given to him, and ends the dispute, calling him “the author of treachery”.¹⁶⁰

Suleiman is in another conflict now and another issue is attached to the Suleiman–Hybrachimus story. Suleiman, who wants to execute Hybrachimus, remembers the oath he took when he was young, saying “I swear by the gods that Hybrachimus’ life will be safe as long as I live”.¹⁶¹ At this point Roxanes, through reference to previous deeds of the Ottoman emperors, the ways they killed their brothers and fathers for absolute power over their realm, tries to persuade Suleiman to kill him, as he thinks that “in a kingdom, whatever is greater than royal power drags everything to its ruin”.¹⁶² But still, Suleiman is

¹⁵⁹ HYB: *Ter ingens strages facta/ ... ter miles ferox/ Immani ardescens ira per moles gradu/ Lapsas firmato invasit, cum subito fragor/ Ab urbe turmas paene iam capta trahit./ SOL: An victor pulso captus abscedet loco?/ HYB: Erat micante flamma terribilis eques,/ Humana maior forma. .../ Horrendus alta gladius in manu fuit,/ Et in mucrone fulgens, ut Phaebi iubar./ .../ Haec nos caelestis ira de Quintia rupe/ Ductores flexit et pugnae finem dedit*

¹⁶⁰ *perfidiae caput*

¹⁶¹ *Obstat consilio sacra/ Conceptum voce votum quo testes deos/ Olim iuravi Hybrachimo vitam fore/ Me vivo incolumem.*

¹⁶² *Quicquid in regno magis/ Valet quam regnum cuncta in exitium trahit.*

indecisive and upon the advice of another pasha, Ajax, that he “can preserve the empire and his faith at the same time,” wants to see the “venerable Mufti”.¹⁶³

This final part related to the Suleiman-Hybrachimus story is again a diversion from the main storyline, the death of Mustapha. Suleiman, trying to find a way out, asks the Mufti if it is “permissible” to break an oath. The first answer to this is a direct no, as “the rulers of high heaven demand sure faithfulness regarding an oath”.¹⁶⁴ After a little inquiry of the mufti, who asks who took the oath, when it was taken, and the exact words of it, comes his suggestion:

SOL. Calling the great gods to witness, I swore to Hybrachimus, “You shall be happy as long as I live, nor shall I allow you to die.”
MUF. Good. Having taken that oath, you are only able to kill Hybrachimus in the middle of the night, when Diana steers her wandering car and occupies the height of Olympus. When all things are still as they are overcome by sleep and slumber possesses you as you lie abed, you may allow Hybrachimus to be dispatched to Orcus. But don’t command this. Point out the steel with which you want his throat to be cut, and leave the rest to your trusty slaves.¹⁶⁵

Here, it is apparent that the answer of Mufti is quite tricky. This trickiness of the answer is also emphasized by Suleiman’s first asking “Is not sleep a reflection of my life?” but after the Mufti’s reply, he accepted the suggestion. The “cunning” answer of the religious man is also criticized by the coming chorus with these words, “Cunning men always conceal the deceits of kings and the base strivings of their crimes”.¹⁶⁶ At first sight, this episode resembles Knolles’ inclusion of a religious figure in the intrigue story as a man under the control of Rhodes. Here again is a tricky Mufti who willingly uses

¹⁶³ *Servare regnum servata fide potes, ...*

¹⁶⁴ *Summi rectores poli/ In iuramento solidatam exposcunt fidem.*

¹⁶⁵ SOL: *Hybrachimo iuro, magnosque attestor deos./ ‘Me vivo, vives faelix, nec patiar mori.’/ MOF: Bene est. Iuratus illo Hibrachimum modo/ Potes necare, nocte cum media vagos/ Diana flectit currus et summo tenet/ Gradu fastigium Olimpi. Cum omnia silent/ Humentem pressa somno, teque intima quies/ Tenet iacentem lecto, Hybrachimum sine/ In Orcum mitti. Nec tamen fieri iube./ Demonstra ferrum, quo velis iugulum peti./ Caetera relinque servis quos fidos habes.*

word play to open the way to the emperor's wicked desire. This is certainly a repetition of the long lasting stereotype of the devious and oath-breaking Turk.¹⁶⁷

In the last act the author turns back to the Suleiman-Mustafa story, and introduces Mustapha. The messenger that comes from the "seraglio" tells Mustapha about the execution of Hybrachimus, which concludes the Suleiman-Hybrachimus story:

Fearful Suleiman himself, not daring to harm his pasha's sacred body, gave a sword and ordered it be plunged in his throat, for the man's red blood to be let. ... First he [the executer] pulled away the pillow set under Hybrachimus' head, and suddenly used the sword to strike his exposed neck. The wound began to gape and the hot blood poured forth. ... Then his languid head lolled, his limbs contracted, his arms tossed about, until, befouled by his own blood, ...¹⁶⁸

After that, upon Mustapha's question about the burial place of Hybrachimus, the messenger replies:

Your irate father denied him burial. He bade the body be stripped bare and in its foul condition be dragged to the great seashore, for a great stone to be tied to his tender feet, and for him to be thrown in the ocean.¹⁶⁹

With this finale to the Solyman-Hybrachimus story, the point of making this diversion from the main Suleyman-Mustafa story becomes clearer. Through this story, the most frequent *topos* on the Turk is accentuated and Suleyman's cruelty is emphasized, even torturing the dead body of an ex-friend.

Turning back to the Mustapha story, the small shift in the characters should be noted. Achmat, whom has appeared as a virtuous pasha, is now the advisor of Mustapha, and the Doctor is left out. Other than this change, the play basically repeats the details in

¹⁶⁶ *Principum fraudes, scelerumque turpes/ Homines conatus semper versuti tegunt.*

¹⁶⁷ Vitkus, "Early Modern Orientalism," 209.

¹⁶⁸ *Solymannus ipse trepidans, vix ausus sacrum/ Violare corpus bassae, mucronem dedit,/ Iussitque iugulo infigi et sanguinem viri/ Purpureum fundi.../ Primum pulvinar capiti suppositum trahit,/ Et ense iugulum nudum subito ferit.../ Tunc volvi corpus languidum, membra trahi,/ Brachia iactari, donec faedatus suo/ Sanguine quiescit.*

Moffan's account. Achmat warns Mustapha to be careful and suggests him to flee, but Mustapha rejects this, saying

So must I hide myself in furtive flight?" Am I, who recently bore arms and dauntlessly overmastered the greatest captains, to live as a wretch hunting for bolt-holes? ... Whoever strives after virtue's abiding glory manufactures no vain fears for himself.¹⁷⁰

Here again, Mustapha is depicted as a young, impatient, and proud character, who does not listen to the more experienced advisor. Achmat answers this by reminding him that "sweet love is all-convincing" and that Hyman conveys great power.¹⁷¹ Suleiman's being under the control of his wife is implied, but not with a strong emphasis on lust as seen in Moffan and Knolles. Moreover, Mustapha's decision to see his father is not due to obedience, but because of his interpretation of his dream:

After my first deep slumber had passed and a lighter sleep came over my limbs, with his venerable appearance our Prophet stood there... He drew near, touched my bed, and called me by name, saying 'Mustafa, before the third day has passed for you, you will stand on happy feet with me in a better place, greater than mortal men.' This consoles me. Mohamed's excellent place is my father's empire, and his days signify years.¹⁷²

In the anonymous author's version, Mustapha's dream is constructed in a totally different tone. It does not convey any ideas about the dangers of fighting for power in this world and it is free from the moral tone attached to it in Moffan's account. Here it is just used to remind the reader of the greedy, proud nature of Mustapha, who in a rush

¹⁶⁹*Iratus ei sepulchrum denegat pater./ Nudari corpus iussit et sordidum trahi/ Ad pelagi vastum littus, ad molles pedes/ Ingens ligari saxum, et immergi salo.*

¹⁷⁰*Egone corpus abdita tegam fuga?/ Qui nuper arma sustinui et summos duces/ Invictus domui, nunc quaeram latebras miser?/ .../ Quicumque constans virtutis decus petit,/ Haud ullos vanus affingit sibi metus.*

¹⁷¹*... blandus omnia persuadet amor,/ .../ Adhuc ignoras, Hymeni quantus favor/ Et quanta improbitas insit?"*

¹⁷²*Postquam stupore pulso lenior venit/ In membra somnus, veneranda noster stetit/ .../ Accessit, lectum tetigit et nomen sonans/ 'Mustapha,' ait, 'ultra cum tertium Phaebus diem/ Tibi tradat, mortalibus maior locos/ Mecum beatos fausto pulsabis pede./ Hoc me solatur. Summus Mahometis locus/ Imperium est patris, annos significant dies.*

interprets the dream as an indication of his success. Achmat, the wise advisor, comments on this “foolish hope” and reminds him that “whoever dwells in Mohamed’s blessed place is stone dead”; but Mustapha does not react to these comments.¹⁷³ Suleiman’s words before ordering his son’s execution; “You two pashas, give Mustapha a lofty seat in the camp. A throne stands, bright with gold and picked out with glittering gems. Let this be my son’s place, let him rest on that seat,” also indicates an irony between Mustapha’s “foolish hope” and the reality.¹⁷⁴

One last item added to the story is a Suleiman-Achmat dialogue, when Suleiman’s son is being killed inside, through which Suleiman learns about the innocence of his son and confesses his “gullible” nature, saying: “Why did I gullibly listen to those accusations?”¹⁷⁵ Finally a messenger comes and informs the regretful Suleiman that his son is dead. Before he dies Mustapha, showing bravery, tells the mutes and pashas that he is innocent. The anonymous author takes Suleiman out of the death scene and instead of him he puts there Roxanes there, at whose “fierce” nod Mustapha was killed. This little shift is of no importance as probably it is because of the author’s sensitivity concerning offstage violence, and also his decision to end the play with the main character.

Later, while the regretful Suleiman is mourning for his son, the messenger also informs him of the suicide of Ganger, out of sorrow; the other son whom Suleiman had “always cherished at [his] bosom and loved as [his] darling”.¹⁷⁶ Ganger is the only character, at the very end of the play, who praises Mustapha, other than the pashas, and he openly points out the guilty ones together with the “gullible” Suleiman:

¹⁷³*Quicumque dulces habitat Mahomatis locos,/ Exanimus moritur.*

¹⁷⁴*Vos gemini bassae, celsum vos Mustaphae date/ In castris solium. Stat fulgidus auro thronus/ Gemma distinctus nitida. sit filii locus, Illa quiescat sede.*

¹⁷⁵*Cur credulus dedi/ Criminibus aures?*

Noble Mustapha, once you were the equal of our ancient heroes and the great pillar of our noble family, but you have abandoned the fostering sunlight.¹⁷⁷

Apparently, together with Ganger's bitter words about his father and the plotters, this angelic description of Mustapha is just meant to highlight the cruelty of the plotters. Right after these words of Ganger, the chorus turns back to the original depiction of Mustapha stating:

But he who established the sum of all things in heaven and governs the indomitable and unalterable laws of Fate, turns human ills to good ends. ... [Mustapha] was blood-thirsty, rough, cruel, threatening, savage in war, and fierce in sharp battle. He could work harm, as by his savage vow he promised he would. But the ruler of the world preserves us by His help. He arms this father against his sons, hastening the enemies of virtue to their proper punishments.¹⁷⁸

This passage not only reasserts the general stereotypical depictions of the Turks, but it also repeats the moral lesson that Moffan set out in his work. The death of the blood-thirsty, rough, cruel, threatening, savage Mustapha is seen as assistance from the "ruler of the world". Here again, through the dichotomy of "us" and "the enemy," the position of "the Other" is presented. Finally, Ganger's suicide, as an unexpected result of the plot, not only adds much to this cruel act, but also stands as a deserved punishment for the father.

When compared to Moffan's much more nuanced characters and much more even distribution of the good and the evil, *Solymanidae* presents a more negative idea of the Turk as an ethnic type. The dominant themes: rage, absolute power over life and death,

¹⁷⁶Ganger, quem molli semper fovisti sinu/ Et ut delitias adamasti semper tuas, ...

¹⁷⁷ 'Tu, Mustapha magnanime, priscis <olim eras>/ Heroibus par <atque> Ottomanni decus./ Generisque <grande> columnen inclytum nostri,/ Solares vitae luces almae deseris.

¹⁷⁸At ille, summa cuncta qui statuit polo/ Legesque fati invictas immobiles regit, / Bonos humana transfert ad fines mala./ .../ Se vovit hostem populo perpetuo fore./ Erat cruentus, asper, immitis, minax./ In Marte saevus, in praelio ferox gravi./ Poterat nocere, sese nociturum fero/ Admonuit voto. Nos orbis rector sacro/ Auxilio servat. Armat in natos patrem/ Virtutis hostes poenas in proprias ciens.

and violence, not only towards the enemy, but within the family unit, are expressed as essential parts of the characters' ethnicity. From the beginning onwards, despite the quite strange setting, the readers are reminded of the ethnic identity of the characters, through references to historical facts about the Ottomans and though their contrast to the Christians. The guilt is evenly distributed among the plotters and Suleiman, but this time it is duplicated with the Hybrachimus story as well. Here again, the emphasis is on the arbitrary cruelty that the Ottoman Sultan exemplifies. He is the "gullible," weak ruler who is decisive but who very easily changes his decisions. What he indicates throughout the play, right from the very opening sentences of the ghost, is the cruelty of the Ottomans in particular and the danger of absolute power in general.

The only good characters are the pashas, and they are, as in Moffan's account, generally praised for their merits in statesmanship and their wit. There is very little reference to religion, other than reminding the reader of the infidelity of the Turk and chorus's comments on his cunning. The most striking change is in Mustapha's character. In both of the accounts, despite Busbecq's skepticism, he is depicted as a positive character, a brave, obedient, successful ruler and a good soldier. In Moffan, he has some divine protection over him, and he is only described as a bloodthirsty Turk at the very end of the play, where the moral lesson is stated. In *Solymannidae*, from the very beginning onwards his weak points are presented. He is accused of the most severe deficiency in ancient heroes and good Christians, pride and over-self-confidence. He is only openly praised by his brother, who commits suicide after his death.

Mustapha's deficiency does not diminish Suleiman's wickedness though. As the title of the play suggests, this is a piece about Suleiman, depicting him and his actions in

two different plots. His weak, “gullible” character is emphasized all throughout the play. His rage and wrath are told through his murder of his old friend and good counselor. The wars he lead and the slaughters he inflicted are listed. His plans for the future, to “conquer the Christians and subdue them to [his] yoke” are stated at the very beginning of the play and repeated at the very end, although his regret in the final scene arouses some pity towards him. It is apparent that the diversions from the main line of the Suleyman-Mustafa story in *Solymanidae* serve to establish and strengthen the stereotypes. Together with the moral lesson at the very end, this depiction of the Ottoman threat and the relief that comes after the death of Mustapha is not only a repetition of the basic idea of the source, but it is also very appropriate to the contemporary intellectual English audience’s expectations.

This play, despite constant references to Ottoman society and despite its quite stereotypical representations, makes some statements about contemporary English society as well. The absolute rule, state-power and religion themes are employed in the main story through some alterations in the main story. Especially in the scene when Suleiman is in conflict about his decision on Hybrachimus’ fate, the anonymous author comments on state-religion affairs through Ajax’s comments and suggestions. The good and loyal counselor to Suleiman openly states the possibility of “the empire and the good faith” at the same time. It is certain that this sentence coming from a Muslim meant a great deal to a contemporary English audience, who were the subjects of an excommunicated queen, especially when these words were coupled with the rest of Ajax’s comments: “all men who want to adapt new laws should not cleave to that which can be touched or seen. Let them seek higher things. Often poison lurks hidden with gold, evil exists under an

appearance of good.”¹⁷⁹ It is true that in documents and political pamphlets of the Early Modern England the representation of the Turk was evolving into a more nuanced, complex rhetoric as a result of the economic and political developments. However, this does not nullify the possibility of criticisms concerning these developments and strongly stereotyped representations and repetitions of the Ottoman danger.

Fulke Greville’s *Mustapha* has much more nuanced depictions, although he relies on Moffan’s account and Busbecq’s letters for the Suleyman-Mustafa story. Greville was a member of the group that was formed around the Countess of Pembroke, Sir Philip Sidney’s sister, and he was an admirer of Seneca, as were the other members of this group such as William Alexander and Sidney himself. Greville’s *Mustapha* is a closet drama, in the Senecan tragedy style.¹⁸⁰ It is filled with long interventions of either one character or the chorus for the discussion of political views, the explanation of personal conflicts and comments on religion. In *Mustapha*, Greville’s representation of the story is much more philosophical than either of his sources and the previous play, which was written approximately fifteen years before *Mustapha*. As Bullough argues, Greville’s treatment of the story takes it much further than a personal or dynastic struggle in the Ottoman court and sets it like a moral, political and religious conflict through which issues like statecraft, the absolute rule of a tyrant and obedience to him, and the weaknesses of individuals are dealt with.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁹*Omnes qui cupiunt nova/ Suscipere iura, non id quod manibus premi/ Ante oculos cerni possit, debent sequi./ Altiora quaerant. Saepe caelatum iacet/ In auro virus, sub specie boni malum,/ Utrinque pestis. Hinc salus, illinc fides.”*

¹⁸⁰U. M. Ellis-Fermor, *The Jacobean Drama: An Interpretation* (London: Methuen, 1936), 191.

¹⁸¹*Ibid.*, 193; Peter Ure, “Fulke Greville’s Dramatic Characters,” *The Review of English Studies* 1, No. 4, (1950), 310.

Mustapha starts with a long discussion of love, fatherly care and ruling power.

Soliman, at the very beginning of the play sets out his main conflict, with a question:

Soliman: So ill a judge is love of things beloved
But is contempt the fruit of parent's care?
Doth kindness lessen kings' authority?
...
This frailty in myself I conquer I must¹⁸²

The most striking difference of Greville's play from *Solymannidae* is certainly the depiction of Soliman. From the very beginning until the end, Soliman is depicted as a three-dimensional human being rather than a tyrant or a weak ruler. He knows his weaknesses and moreover, he is not a "gullible," ignorant man; but he understands the hidden agendas of the people around him. He openly calls Rosten a "crafty slave" and accuses him of being the one who is trying to get betwixt him and his son.

Soliman: The hollow depts. Of Rosten's mystery,
Long had he waved betwixt my son and me
...
Now in my son through active powers he find,
...
He grounds his work on jealousy of kings,¹⁸³

Still, the most dominant side of the Soliman character is his indecisiveness. In contrast to *Solymannidae's* Suleiman, who easily changes his mind at the suggestions of others, here, he is depicted as a completely indecisive man:

Soliman: Turns fear to hope, and hope again to doubt
If thus it work in man, much more in thrones¹⁸⁴

He listens to his wife's suggestions, he weighs his own feelings and he questions his counselors on the recent situation of Mustapha among the soldiers and as a ruler. In the end, all he can say to his wife is just a rejection of her persuasion, "You move me, yet I

¹⁸²Rees, 67.

¹⁸³Ibid., 71.

remove not!” The important point about the Soliman character here is that, very much like in Busbecq’s account, his actions are not simply explained through his own merits and characteristic weaknesses, but with reference to the general condition of human beings. Certainly Greville’s play is much more involved in great common human conflicts than in the peculiar condition of the Turkish ruler. This more realistic, less stereotypical representation of the ruler helps Greville to make his theme clear.

Greville’s divergences from his source in terms of both the construction of the story and the representation of the characters come at the correct places to insert lengthy discussions of political ideas. The basic themes of the play, that all earthly power seeks absolutism, and that law and religion generally mitigate this, are not only the topics of the choruses but also of the soliloquies of almost all the characters. Such a discussion is first introduced by the chorus of “Bashas and Cadis”:

Chorus: We silly Bashas help power to confound,
 With our own strength exhausting our own ground
 An art of tyranny; which works with men
 To make them beasts and high-raised thrones their den
 Where they that mischief others, may retire
 Safe with their prey and lifting tyrant higher.¹⁸⁵

The chorus goes on with comparisons with the “Christian courts of chancery” where, although the offices are distributed by titles and land, people are afraid of disobedience, as they can always be imprisoned for that. Then we hear a bitter self criticism of the Bashas and Cadis saying:

Chorus: ...
 For as we see, when sickness deeply roots,
 Meat, drink, and drugs alike do little boot;
 Because all what should either nurse or cure
 As mastered by diseases, grow impure:

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., 70.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 79.

So when excess (the malady of might)
Hath (dropsy-like) drowned all the styles of right,
Then doth obedience (else the food of power)
Help on that dropsy canker to devour.¹⁸⁶

To discuss the same topic from the mouth of an officer and, closer, from a family member, Greville added the scenes of the discussion between Soliman and Achmat and between Soliman and Camena. These two characters with their quite similar soliloquies not only discuss the same issue of obedience to a tyrant, but they also fulfill a more practical role with their speeches aimed at persuading Soliman of Mustapha's innocence. Achmat, as in the historical accounts and the previous play, is the good, experienced, witty statesman who understands the unseen parts of visible events. Achmat's dilemma is clear: should he "for [his] prince's sake, destroy succession / or suffer ruin to preserve succession"?¹⁸⁷ In the end, as expected from him, he decides that although he is "sworn to [his] king and his honor," he is "First nature's subject then [his] princes".¹⁸⁸

In his dialogue with Soliman, Achmat supports Mustapha and praises him. Besides, again in a divergence from the historical account, he offers Soliman a solution against the "rage" and "ambition" of the stepmother. He tells Soliman to "establish Rossa's children" as heirs, and "let Mustapha's hopes fall, translate his right," and when the stepmother's "proud ambitions glutted be" the envy will also die and there will be no accusations against Mustapha. To this, Soliman's answer; "Traitor! Must I doubt all to credit thee?" does not only exemplifies the danger of reminding the king that he can also be deceived, but also shows how Soliman is puzzled as a result of the things that he hears

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 81.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 84.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 85.

from all sides.¹⁸⁹ Again here, despite his rapid anger, Soliman is not an unnatural cruel tyrant, but a suffering man.

Very much like Achmat, Camena voices the same conflict; she is a character that does not appear either in the historical accounts or in *Solymanidae*. Camena, the daughter of Soliman and Rossa is the pious, good character who is basically introduced to the play for three reasons: firstly, through her one hears a repetition of the conflicting ideas on obedience to absolute rule and family members, with a more religious stance this time; secondly, she voices another witness to Mustapha's innocence and goodness, and a repetition of the intrigue:

Camena: My mother and my husband have conspired
 For brother's good, the ruin of my brother'
 ...
 I that to help by nature am required
 While I do help must needs still hurt a brother
 While I see who conspire I am conspired
 Against a husband father and a mother¹⁹⁰

In a recent analysis of Greville's play, Burton has emphasized the saint-like representation of Camena. According to him, the variation that Camena introduces to what Achmat has already said is to set this discussion into a Christian background.¹⁹¹ She mentions the plot of the intrigue, directly pointing out the plotters and tries to persuade her father to be "merciful," reminding the reader of the characteristics of an ideal Christian prince. Besides, her constant reference to virtue and her belief that pain "must be the guide" to virtue completes her saintly representation. She completes the argument that starts with Soliman himself, and goes on with the chorus and Achmat, showing the

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., 88.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 90.

¹⁹¹ Burton, *Traffic and Turning*, 187.

right way both for the ruler and the conflicted self. Thirdly, she, as the victim of the completely black character, Rossa, highlights the evil in the latter.

Rossa is the only unchanging character in all the constructions. She is the determined, strong, bold, ambitious stepmother who does everything to bring about the death of Mustapha and the succession of her own son. What changes her character in Greville's play is the lack of a direct reference to the practice of fratricide. Although it is mentioned through the explanations of Achmat and the chorus that Rossa is in an intrigue against Mustapha, the reason for this intrigue is not explained through a mother's fear for the life of her son, but through her own ambitious desire to rule. Accordingly, Selim, her other son, is excluded from the text. Her motivation is much more related to herself rather than to her son,

Rossa: ... My chiefest end
Is, first, to fix this world on my succession;
Next so to alter, plant, remove, create¹⁹²

This emphasis on personal ambition and removing the issue of fratricide somewhat from the general construction makes it easier for Greville to discuss political power and the theme of absolutism in a context less strange to the English audience. But this divergence, at the same time, underlines Rossa's cruelty for the sake of power. Finally when she kills her daughter after hearing Camena's dialogue with Soliman, she reaches the ultimate cruelty that one can inflict for the sake of power, a behavior which will be replayed by Soliman. In the case of Soliman, however, as he is the tragic character of the play rather than the tyrant, this acceptance of tyranny happens only after Camena's death, in the crises where he makes the wrong decision after being indecisive for such a long time.

Soliman's speech to his men is an important divergence from the main storyline as well. After talking to basically everyone around him and after getting their advice, Soliman, completely puzzled and indecisive, goes to ask for divine council. While he is declaring his decision to be a tyrant, for the sake for the empire, he says that he has consulted God, who alone is above him. And despite God's words that "vengeance is his" Soliman is just about to decide to kill his son. He says:

Soliman: If God work thus, kings must look upwards still,
 And from these powers they know not choose a will
 Or else believe themselves their strength, occasion,
 Make wisdom conscious and the world theirs sky.
 So have all tyrants done, so must I.¹⁹³

As this passage clearly states, Soliman's tyranny is not coming from his birth, but appears as a result of certain circumstances that surround him. When speaking about God and religion, his rather Christian tone is remarkable. At this point, his ethnicity and his religious identity are deliberately undermined for the sake of turning his conflicts into instances more familiar to the English audience. Another character, Camena, when she speaks to her father about his decision, clearly sets the model of a Christian king before him:

Camena: Besides the Gods whom kings should imitate
 Have placed you high to rule, not overthrow
 For us, not for your selves, is your estate;
 Mercy must hand in hand with power go.¹⁹⁴

According to Burton, such advice to an Ottoman ruler is quite out of context as "mercy" was generally not an adjective reserved for Ottoman rulers in European literature.

¹⁹² Rees, 105.

¹⁹³ Ibid., 113.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., 94.

Therefore Burton concludes, there should be some other explanation for Camena's advice, which is, a mere projection of English concerns on to the Ottoman setting.¹⁹⁵

Another Christianized character of the play is Mustapha himself. Mustapha is the good, successful, and innocent victim of the cruelty that is inflicted on him. The only divergence from the story, for his part, is his counselor. In contrast to his representations in all other accounts, this time he is not warned of the danger to his life by a good "doctor" or a secular advisor, but by a religious figure. Instead of his wise, pious advisor who advises him to stay away from the political struggles of this world, now he is told to rebel against his father by a "tempter" priest who previously names himself "the evil's friend, hell's mediator". As in all other accounts, Mustapha rejects the option of fleeing from his father.¹⁹⁶ Through his dialogue with the priest, his righteousness and virtues are highlighted in contrast to the wickedness of the religious man. As in the case of Camena, the religious tone of his speech is clear. From the very beginning of his dialogue, he criticizes *Heli*, the priest with a strange name that reminds one of hell, for his "rage," and reminds him of the "wicked colors of desire" and the importance of "obedience" against confusion. The way he accepts death is told by Achmat as "in haste to be an angel," and his final words before he dies echoes Christ:

Mustapha: O Father! Now forgive me.
 Forgive them too, that wrought my overthrow
 Let my grave never minister offences
 Since my father coveted my death
 Behold, with Joy I offer him my breath.¹⁹⁷

¹⁹⁵Burton, *Traffic and Turning*, 109.

¹⁹⁶Although Burton indicates a difference here, from Moffan's account, Mustapha rejects to fleeing from his father with the same reasons in Moffan's account.

¹⁹⁷Rees, 130.

With these final words Mustapha dies, or rather, is canonized. Greville's strangest divergence from his sources is his introduction of this final challenge to Mustapha. Instead of getting "divine help" for his innocence he is openly tempted. But still, in full obedience, he goes and dies at the command of his father.

It is apparent that all the issues that Greville forced into the Suleyman-Mustafa story reflect basic concerns of his age. From his two dramas, it is certain that he was not troubled to make his plays theatrical or even dramatic, and the long analyses of statecraft, the debates on religion, fate, war, learning, and the variety of human knowledge "extend themselves freely through speeches and inter-act choruses as they never could with Chapman, Tourneur, Webster or Shakespeare".¹⁹⁸ The Suleyman-Mustafa story is a good choice for speculating on the struggle to overthrow a tyrant, accompanying reflections on monarchy, the relations of the monarch and the individual, on loyalty, honor, religion and, the relations of the governing power and the state religion, as well as the part played by state religion in the control and even the oppression of the people. All these topics, together with a desire for order, unity and a more or less certain future were basic concerns of the English people, which were on the edge of Catholic world, divided within themselves, confused by great changes in the country and with the lacking of an appropriate heir to the throne, which was apparently the only strong pillar on which they could rely. Greville, in his play, through constructing a less-Muslim, less-Ottoman atmosphere, helps his readers to connect the discussions to the English context.

Still, the plot turns around the Ottoman court, in a Muslim state. Therefore some comments on Ottoman ways are indispensable. Not surprisingly, when Greville through the choruses, is talking directly about the Muslims and the Turk, he is quite critical. The

second chorus of “Mahomedan priests” comments how Muslims destroy the antiquities with their swords, how they destroy all the temples to found theirs, how the seraglio is filled with pleasures and how they spread their empire with their vices.¹⁹⁹ It is certain that Greville not only makes use of long-lasting stereotypes like the cruel and lustful Turk, but he also applies the Renaissance ideas of the Turk as the “new barbarian” to his representation.²⁰⁰

The chorus of “Mahomedan priests,” through a comparison of Christian and Muslim societies and states, gives a detailed list of the peculiarities of these two cultures. The puppet-prophet stereotype and the prejudices about the lustful, beastly Turk are all represented through the speeches of the five choruses: “the chorus of Bashas and Cadis,” “the chorus of Mahomedan priests,” “the chorus of Tartarorum” and “the chorus of converts to Mahomedanism”; which are the choruses of “the Others” that reflect their self-criticism.²⁰¹ A constantly debated topic of the age, that the Christians tended to convert to Islam more than Muslims did to Christianity, is also stated. Moreover, a criticism of the relations with Muslims is also conveyed, in reverse, from the mouth of the Muslim priests after they set out the differences between two cultures:

Yet by our traffic with this dreaming nation,
 Their conquered vice hath stained our conquering state,
 And brought thin cobwebs into reputation,
 Of tender subtlety; whose step mother Fate,
 So inlays courage with ill-shadowing fear,
 As makes it much more hard to than bear.²⁰²

¹⁹⁸Ellis-Fermor, 195.

¹⁹⁹Rees, 96.

²⁰⁰For a detailed analysis of the “new barbarian” idea in the Renaissance texts, see Nancy Bisaha. *Creating East and West. Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2004), 43-94.

²⁰¹For stereotypical representations of the prophet in the medieval and Early Modern texts, see Tolan, *Saracens*, and Chew, *The Crescent and the Rose*.

²⁰²Rees, 98.

It is clear that a harsh criticism of the relations with the Muslim state is implied at this point. This means that some English perceived the confrontation with Mediterranean plurality, tolerance, and multicultural identities and the reality of the attraction of this new influence as a problem for their own identity. Not only trafficking with the Turk, but also the adoption of Turkish manners of dressing, hair style and even beards were recorded and attacked by contemporary authors.²⁰³

Therefore, it is clear, at least in the anonymous author's work and in Greville's, that there was nothing on the stage that was genuinely Turkish/Muslim and positive. The prejudice-based, stereotypical figures were deliberately highlighted by the anonymous author, to reinforce his concern on the point that "the greatest things are in collapse". In Greville's case, the representations were certainly much more nuanced, but still they were not there as real Others but as mere tools for the author to make his point, probably with the hope of getting through strict censorship. When it came to representing his points on "the Other", Greville could not go beyond depicting the stereotypes. Some other cases might help to prove mistaken "notions of an English culture unwilling to accept positive representations of non-Christian peoples," but apparently *Mustapha* is the wrong choice for this.²⁰⁴

²⁰³ Artemel, 193.

²⁰⁴ Burton, *Traffic and Turning*, 194.

CONCLUSION

This study analyzes the constructions of an episode of Ottoman history in an English context. From a thorough analysis of the two English plays, the anonymous Cambridge play *Solymannidae* and Fulke Greville's *The Tragedy of Mustapha*, with specific attention to their sources, this study concludes that the representation of the Ottomans on the sixteenth century English stage was not always influenced by the transforming rhetoric on the Turk that emerged as a result of Anglo-Ottoman proximity. An analysis of these two different constructions of the Suleyman-Mustafa story on the English stage, in connection with the Eastern and Western sources, challenges the over-generalizations on the influence of the transforming sixteenth-century rhetoric on the Turk in the literary productions of the age.

A general evaluation of the European sources that deal with the Eastern Other indicates that it is not possible to talk about a continuity and coherence in the Early Modern Western depictions of the East. As a result of the continually changing political, military, religious and economic circumstances and alliances that were formed in line with these alterations, the general characteristic of the European texts' attitudes towards the eastern other became a practical ambivalence and ongoing transformation rather than an ideological consistency. From the analysis of this study it is apparent that the two European and the two English versions of the Suleyman-Mustafa story employ quite different discourses and in contrast to the general assumption, in this case, the European historical narratives represent a milder attitude towards "the Other". After the analysis of the construction of the Suleyman-Mustafa story in the European accounts this study

rejects the idea that the nuanced rhetoric on the representations of the Turk was a sixteenth century English peculiarity. It also concludes that in the construction of the Suleyman-Mustafa story the European representations were more flexible and multi-dimensional vis á vis the English ones.

It is certain that in early modern England there was more than one strategy to represent the Ottomans. The representations of the Turks in early modern English texts did not only depend on the English/self and the Turk/other binary. Rather, as a result of the English alienation from the Catholic circle in Europe and Anglo-Ottoman relations the representation strategies were formulated around the Turk/Muslim, the European/Catholic and the English/Protestant triangle, which complicated them. However, this rhetoric that was basically employed by the state documents and letters was not always replicated by the literary productions of the age.

An analysis of Nicolas à Moffan's and Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq's narratives of the Suleyman-Mustafa story indicates the variety of sixteenth century representations of the Turk in the European context. Through a comparison of the representations in the European accounts to the English ones, this study not only challenges the assumption of an English peculiarity in terms of a nuanced representation of the Turk, but it also brings forth the idea that welcoming the newly emerging rhetoric on "the Other" was not the only response of the English playwrights to the sixteenth-century Anglo-Ottoman relations. Accepting the importance and validity of the completely new strategies of representing "the Other" that appeared as a result of the alliances with the Turk, this analysis shows that there was at least one more result of the Anglo-Ottoman relations; a stricter and clear-cut rhetoric on the differences between the Turk and the English, which

was blended with the long-lasting stereotypical images, emerged in this period as result of the same social conditions, and these representations offered strong criticism of the influence of Mediterranean ways on English society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- de Busbecq, Ogier Ghiselin. *Turkish Letters*. Oxford: Sickle Moon Books, 2001.
- Greville, Fulke. *The Tragedy of Mustapha*. In *Selected Writings of Fulke Greville*. Ed. Joan Rees, 65-138. London: The Athlone Press, 1973.
- Anonymous. *Solymannidae*. (a hypertext critical edition by Dana F. Sutton. The University of California, Irvine) <http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/soly/act1eng.html> (accessed February, 2008).
- Goughe, Hugh. *The ofspring of the house of Ottomanno, and Officers Pertaining to the Greate Turkes Court. Whereunto is added Bartholomeus Georgieuz Epitome, of the Customes, Rytes, Ceremonies, and Religion of the Turkes: with the Miserable Affliction of those Christians, which liue under their Captiuitie and Bondage. In the ende also is adioyned the maner how Mustafa, Eldest Sonne of Soltan Soliman, Twelfth Emperour of the Turkes, was Murthered by his Father, in ... 1553*. (London: 1570) <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home> (accessed December, 2008).
- à Moffan, Nicolas. *Le Meurtre exécration et inhumain, commis par Soltan Solyman, grand Seigneur des Turcs, en la personne de son fils aisé Soltan Mustaphe*. [The Horrible act of Sultan Solyman Emperor of the Turks and the wicked Murder of his son sultan Mustapha] (1556). <http://www.sjsu.edu/faculty/danielle.trudeau/Constant/> (accessed November, 2007)
- Painter, William. *The Palace of Pleasure*. <http://www.archive.org/details/palaceofpleasure03painuoft> (accessed December, 2008).
- Richard Knolles. *Generall Historie of the Turkes*. <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home>. (accessed December, 2008).
- Ali, Mustafa bin Ahmed. *Künhül Ahbar* [The Source of Knowledge] as quoted in Şerafeddin Turan. *Kanuninin Oğlu Sehzade Bayazid Vakası*. Ankara, 1961.
- Nişancı Mehmed Paşa, *Hadisat* [The Events]. Ed. Enver Yaşarbaş. İstanbul: Kit-san Matbaacılık, 1983.
- Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede. *Sahaif-ül-Ahbar fi Vekayi-ül-a'sar* [The pages of the knowledge on the events of years]. Tr. İsmail Erünsal. İstanbul: Tercuman, --.

Hasan Bey-zade Ahmed Paşa. *Hasan Bey-zade Tarihi* [History of Hasan Bey-zade] Ed. Şevki Nezihi Aykut. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basım Evi, 2004.

İbrahim Peçevi. *Peçevi Tarihi* [History of Peçevi] Ed. Murat Uraz. İstanbul: Neşriyat Yurdu, 1968.

Solak-zade Mehmed Hemdemi Çelebi. *Solak-zade Tarihi* [History of Solak-zade] Ed. Vahid Çabuk. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1989.

Yahya Bey, Samî, Funûnî, Rahmî's, Fazlî, Nisayî, Mudamî "Mersiye" [Mourning Poem] as quoted in Mehmed Çavuşoğlu "Sehzade Mustafa Mersiyeleri" [Mersiye's on Sehzade Mustafa]. *Istanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi* 12 (1982): 641-686.

Secondary Sources

Artemel, Suheyla. "The great Turk's Particular Inclination to Red Herring': The Popular Image of the Turk during the Renaissance England," *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 5 No. 2. (1995): 189-208.

Bartels, Emily. "The Double Vision of the East: Imperialist Self-Construction in Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*, Part One." *Renaissance Drama* 23 (1992): 3-24.

Baumer, Franklin L. "England the Turk, and the Common Corps of Christendom" *The American Historical Review* 50, No. 1. (1944): 26-48.

Beck, Brandon. *From the Rising of the Sun: English Images of the Ottoman Empire*. New York: Peter Lang, 1987.

Bisaha, Nancy. "'New Barbarian' or Worthy Adversary? Humanist Constructions of the Ottoman Turks in Fifteen-Century Italy." In *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe. Perception of Other*, Ed. Michael Frassetto and David Blanks, 185-207. London: Macmillan, 1999.

_____. *Creating East and West. Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004, 43-94.

Brummett, Palmira. *Ottoman Seapower and Levantine Diplomacy in the Age of Discovery*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994.

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

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

_____. "Anglo-Ottoman Relations and the Image of the Turk in *Tamburlaine*." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 30, No. 1(2000): 129-131.

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

Çirakman, Aslı. *From the "Terror of the World" to the "Sick Man of Europe": European Images of Ottoman Empire and Society from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Centuries*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2002.

Cruz, Jo Ann Hoepfner Moran. "Popular Attitudes towards Islam in Medieval Europe." In *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other*, ed. Michael Frassetto and David Blanks, 55-83. London: Macmillan, 1999.

D'Amico, Jack. *The Moor in English Renaissance Drama*. Tampa: University of South Florida Press, 1991.

Vitkus, Daniel. "Adventuring Heroes in the Mediterranean: Mapping the Boundaries of Anglo-Islamic Exchange on the Early Modern Stage." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 37, No. 1 (2007): 75-95.

_____. *Turning Turk. English Theatre and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

_____. *Three Turk Plays from Early Modern England: Selimus, A Christian Turned Turk and The Renegado*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.

_____. "Early Modern Orientalism: Representations of Islam in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Europe." *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. Michael Frassetto and David Blanks, 207-230. London: Macmillan, 1999.

_____. "Turning Turk in Othello: The Conversion and Damnation of the Moor." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 48, No. 2 (1997): 145-176.

Dimmock, Matthew. *New Turkes: Dramatizing Islam and the Ottomans in Early Modern England*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2005.

Ellis-Fermor, U. M. *The Jacobean Drama: An Interpretation*. London: Methuen, 1936.

Faroqhi, Suraiya. *Approaching Ottoman History: An Introduction to the Sources*. Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Frassetto, Michael, and David Blanks. *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. New York, St. Martin's press, 1999.

Gökbilgin, M. Tayyib. "İbrahim Paşa" *İslam Ansilopedisi* [Encyclopedia of Islam] İstanbul: MEB Yayınları, 1965.

Greenblatt, Stephan. *Renaissance Self Fashioning*. London: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Hall, Kim. *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and Gender in Early Modern England* London: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Hattway, Michael. "Drama and Society." In *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama* Ed. A. R. Brounmuller and Michael. Hattaway, 94-126. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Hoefler, D *Nouvelle biographie générale: depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à nos jours, avec les renseignements bibliographiques et l'indication des sources à consulter*. Paris: Firmin Didot, 1852-1866.

İnalçık, Halil. *From Empire to Republic: Essays on Ottoman and Turkish Social History*. İstanbul: Isis Press, 1995.

_____. *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

_____. *The Ottoman Empire*. London: Phoenix, 1994.

_____. "The Turkish Impact on the Development of Modern Europe." In *The Ottoman State and Its Place in World History* Ed. Kemal Karpat, 51-58. Leiden: Brill, 1974.

Lenman, Bruce. *England's Colonial Wars, 1550-1688: Conflicts, Empire and National Identity*. New York: Longman, 2001.

Loomba, Anna. "'Delicious Traffick': Alterity and Exchange on Early Modern Stages." *Shakespeare Survey. An Annual Survey of Shakespeare Studies and Production*, 52 Ed. Stanly Wells, 201-214. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Martels, Zweder Von. "Impressions of the Ottoman Empire in the Writings of Augerius Busbequius (1520/1-1591)." *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 5, No. 2. (1995): 209-221.

Matar, Nabil. "Introduction: England and Mediterranean Captivity, 1577-1704." In *Piracy, Slavery, and Redemption: Barbary Captivity narratives from Early Modern England*, Ed. Daniel Vitkus, 1-52. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.

_____. *Turks Moors and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999).

_____. *Islam in Britain, 1556-1685*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

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

Norman, Daniel. *Islam and the West, the Making of an Image*. Oxford: One Word: 1993.

Parr, Anthony. *Three Renaissance Travel Plays*. New York: Manchester University Press, 1995.

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

Rees, Joan. *Selected Writings of Fulke Greville*. London: The Athlone Press, 1973.

Rouillard, Clarence Dana. *The Turk in French History Thought, and Literature (1520-1660)*. Paris: Ams Press, 1940.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.

Spear, Gary. "Shakespeare's 'Manly' Parts: Masculinity and Effeminacy in Troilus and Cressida." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 44, No. 4 (1993): 409-422.

Tolan, Victor. *Saracens*, Colombia: Columbia University Press, 2002.

Turan, Şerafeddin. *Kanuninin Oğlu Sehzade Bayazid Vakası* [The Event of Sehzade Bayazid, the Son of Suleyman the Magnificent]. Ankara: -- , 1961.

_____. "Rustem Paşa ve Hakkındaki İthamlar" [Rustem Paşa and Accusations against Him] *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 11-12 (1955): 11-50.

Uluçay, Çağatay. "Mustafa" *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, [Encyclopedia of Islam] İstanbul: MEB Yayınları, 1965.

Ure, Peter. "Fulke Greville's Dramatic Characters." *The Review of English Studies* 1, No. 4 (1950), 308-323.

Wann, Louis. "The Orient in Elizabethan Drama." *Modern Philology* 12, No. 7 (1915): 423-447.

White, Hayden. "The Value of Narrativity in Representation of Reality" *On Narrative*. Ed. W. T. Mitchell, 12-23. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1981.