

6-27-2011

# The Archaeological and Postcolonial Transformation of the Discourse of Orientalism from Renaissance to Restoration Drama

Hussein A Kaream Hussein Alhawamdeh  
*Indiana University of Pennsylvania*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd>

---

## Recommended Citation

Alhawamdeh, Hussein A Kaream Hussein, "The Archaeological and Postcolonial Transformation of the Discourse of Orientalism from Renaissance to Restoration Drama" (2011). *Theses and Dissertations (All)*. 819.  
<https://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd/819>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Knowledge Repository @ IUP. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations (All) by an authorized administrator of Knowledge Repository @ IUP. For more information, please contact [cclouser@iup.edu](mailto:cclouser@iup.edu), [sara.parme@iup.edu](mailto:sara.parme@iup.edu).

THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND POSTCOLONIAL TRANSFORMATION OF THE  
DISCOURSE OF ORIENTALISM FROM RENAISSANCE TO RESTORATION  
DRAMA

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Hussein A Kaream Hussein Alhawamdeh

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

August 2011

© 2011 by Hussein A Kaream Hussein Alhawamdeh

All Rights Reserved

Indiana University of Pennsylvania  
The School of Graduate Studies and Research  
Department of English

We hereby approve the dissertation of

Hussein A Kaream Hussein Alhawamdeh

Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

June 6, 2011

Signature on File  
Ronald G. Shafer, Ph.D.  
Professor of English, Advisor

June 6, 2011

Signature on File  
Lingyan Yang, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor of English

June 6, 2011

Signature on File  
Michael T. Williamson, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor of English

ACCEPTED

Signature on File  
Timothy P. Mack, Ph.D.  
Dean  
The School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: The Archaeological and Postcolonial Transformation of the Discourse of Orientalism from Renaissance to Restoration Drama

Author: Hussein A Kaream Hussein Alhawamdeh

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Ronald G. Shafer

Dissertation Committee Members: Dr. Lingyan Yang

Dr. Michael T. Williamson

This dissertation, based on Foucauldian analysis of discourse, comparatively explores the dramatization of the Turk and Moor on the Renaissance versus Restoration stages and identifies the political, religious, and cultural transformation and modification to the discourse of Orientalism from Renaissance to the Restoration periods. The development, in Restoration drama, of the concept of the “cultural renegade”—or what I call the “Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist,” who is a cross-cultural, revolutionary and political activist, transcending the limitations of place, religion, and nation and interfaces other cultures without losing his/her religion or culture—explains the complex figuration of the Turks and Moors in the western perception. The figure of the “cultural renegade”—Alphonso, Solyman, Ianthe, and Roxolana in William Davenant’s The Siege of Rhodes (Parts 1/2) (1656-1663), Almanzor and Almahide in John Dryden’s The Conquest of Granada (Parts 1/2) (1672), Wildblood and Donna Jacinta in Dryden’s An Evening’s Love (1668), Dorax in Dryden’s Don Sebastian (1689), Towerson and Ysabinda in Dryden’s Amboyna (1673), and Thomazo in Henry Neville Payne’s The Siege of Constantinople (1675)—deconstructs the Renaissance concept of

the religious renegade, who opts for one culture and religion over the other and encourages Islamic/Christian cultural rapprochement.

Moreover, from a Post-Colonial vantage point, this study sheds light on the Restoration period's transformation and modification to the Renaissance discourse of Orientalism in terms of 1) the Restoration deconstruction of the Renaissance perception of the Turk and Moor as a fierce and "greedie lyon," in Knolles's terminology, as represented in Renaissance selected plays—William Shakespeare's Othello (1604), John Mason's The Turke (1607), and Robert Daborne's A Christian Turned Turk (1612)—2) the Restoration denunciation of the Greco-Roman imperial heritage against the East, and 3) the recognition of the notion of the "Trojan Turk," as represented in Dryden's selected plays—All for Love (1678), which adapts Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra (1607); Tyrannick Love (1669); and Troilus and Cressida (1679), which adapts Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida (1602).

This study bridges and corrects the gap left by modern scholarship which either confuses or neglects the dramatic transformation of the discourse of Orientalism between the two periods.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I extend the warmest and sincerest gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Ronald G. Shafer, for his continuous support and vigorous guidance to me throughout the process of writing this doctoral dissertation. Prof. Shafer, in his momentous forty-first year of academic experience, remains an inspiring model of hard-work, professionalism, and scholarly dedication. Also, I wish to thank the committee members, Dr. Lingyan Yang and Dr. Michael T. Williamson, for their earnest cooperation, encouragement, and helpful commentary. No less grateful am I for the English literature staff, especially Dr. Christopher Orchard, whose Renaissance classes were ardently motivating and inspiring. I would like to express special and everlasting thanks to my wife, Isra, and my two little daughters, Niveen and Lamar, who have passionately shared with me all the moments of patience and success. Also, I place on my record endless thanks and indebtedness to my parents, sisters, and brothers for their constant and fervent encouragement.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1
CHAPTER ONE THE WESTERN ANXIETY OF THE ORIENTAL “LION” IN THE WRITINGS OF THE RENAISSANCE .....	62
CHAPTER TWO THE CONCEPT OF THE “CULTURAL RENEGADE” IN RESTORATION DRAMA .....	124
CHAPTER THREE THE GRECO-ROMAN PERCEPTION IN RENAISSANCE AND RESTORATION THOUGHT .....	180
CHAPTER FOUR THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRANSFORMATION OF THE DISCOURSE OF ORIENTALISM IN RESTORATION POLITICS AND CULTURE.....	227
CONCLUSION .....	285
WORKS CITED .....	294

## INTRODUCTION

This study, while comparatively exploring the dramatization of the oriental Turk and Moor on the Renaissance versus Restoration stages, identifies the political, religious, and cultural transformation and modification to the discourse of Orientalism from Renaissance to the Restoration periods. The development, in Restoration drama, of the concept of the “cultural renegade”—or what I call the “Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist,” who is a cross-cultural, revolutionary and political activist, transcending the limitations of place, religion, and nation and interfaces other cultures without losing his/her religion or culture—explains the complex figuration and importance of the oriental Turks and Moors in the western perception and evaluation. The figure of the “cultural renegade”—Alphonso, Solyman, Ianthe, and Roxolana in William Davenant’s The Siege of Rhodes (Parts 1/2) (1656-1663), Almanzor and Almahide in John Dryden’s The Conquest of Granada (Parts 1/2) (1672), Wildblood and Donna Jacinta in Dryden’s An Evening’s Love (1668), Dorax in Dryden’s Don Sebastian (1689), Towerson and Ysabinda in Dryden’s Amboyna (1673), and Thomazo in Henry Neville Payne’s The Siege of Constantinople (1675)—deconstructs the concept of the religious renegade, who defects from the religion and service of his/her nation to foreign paganism and encourages cultural rapprochement.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, this study sheds light on the

---

<sup>1</sup> The term “cultural renegade” was coined by Kenneth Ingram Mayer in his doctoral dissertation, Cultural Renegades in Plutarch’s Lives (1997), to trace the function of the “cultural renegade” figure in Plutarch’s Lives. Even though Plutarch’s “cultural renegade” figures as noted by Mayer have imperial leanings—or what Mayer calls “Hellenizing Mission” (224) of Plutarch’s “cultural renegade,” who is “remade as a missionary of his home culture’s values” (224) to spread “Hellenism” and civilize the uncivilized “barbarians” since “Greeks civilizing others rather than as Greeks succumbing to barbarianism” (221)—Mayer to my surprise calls them “cultural renegades.” However, Mayer’s analysis of Plutarch’s depiction of the “cultural renegade” remains valuable since I argue that the Restoration “cultural renegade” deconstructs not only the Renaissance anxious conceptualization of the renegade but also dismantles the Greco-Roman figuration of the “cultural renegade.” Modern scholarship about the figure of the renegade either focuses on Renaissance conceptualization of the renegade as it is the case with Samuel Chew, Nabil

Restoration period's transformation and modification to the Renaissance discourse of Orientalism in terms of 1) the Restoration deconstruction of the Renaissance perception of the oriental Turk and Moor as a fierce and "greedie lyon," in Knolles's terminology, as represented in Renaissance selected plays—William Shakespeare's Othello (1604), John Mason's The Turke (1607), and Robert Daborne's A Christian Turned Turk (1612)—2) the Restoration denunciation of the Greco-Roman military and imperial heritage against the East, and 3) the recognition of the notion of the "Trojan Turk," as represented in Dryden's selected plays—All for Love (1678), which adapts William Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra (1607); Tyrannick Love (1669); and Troilus and Cressida (1679), which adapts William Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida (1602).<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, the study explores the influence of John Dryden and Sir William Davenant, who functioned as the "founders of discursivity," in Foucault's terminology, on other Restoration dramatists such as Elkanah Settle, whose plays The Empress of Morocco (1673) and The

---

Matar, and Daniel Vitkus, or confuses between Renaissance and Restoration drama's two different concepts of the renegade as it is the case with Matar, Bridget Orr, Matthew Birchwood.

<sup>2</sup> The notion of the "Trojan Turk," as discussed by Margaret Meserve, in her historical book Empires of Islam in Renaissance Historical Thought (2008), which is whether the Turks were descendants of the Trojans or not, was rejected in Renaissance historiography since it was an "accusation, not an explanation" (26). In this dissertation, I move from Meserve's tracing of the notion of the "Trojan Turk" as represented in Renaissance historical narratives to fictional narratives in Restoration drama, which is not discussed by Meserve, as represented by John Dryden's Troilus and Cressida (1679), which deconstructs the Renaissance rejection of the notion of the "Trojan Turks" and acknowledges the Trojans as part of the East. Similarly, the notion of the "Trojan Turks" has not been tackled by any of the modern scholars like Byron Smith, Nabil Matar, Bridget Orr, Matthew Birchwood, and Anthony G. Barthelemy, who examine the treatment of the oriental Turks and Moors in Restoration drama. Moreover, the notion of Restoration England's identification with the Roman imperial past has been discussed in Bridget Orr's Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714 (2001), in which Orr, however, claims that Restoration England and drama witnessed an "implicit" identification with the Romans as "genetic ancestors of the English" (258) and an "explicit" "English inheritance of the *translatio imperii*" (259) after the Glorious Revolution in 1688. Orr's analysis of Dryden's plays, which counter all "implicit" or "explicit" identification with the Romans, lacks clear discussion of Dryden's role, other than arguing that he was a propagandist to the moral model of empire, in discontinuing the Renaissance discourse of identification with the Romans. Dryden's rejection of the Roman imperial past indicates as I posit in this dissertation that he, as an anti-imperialist to all models of empires whether moral or tyrant, condemns Greco-Roman colonization of the East— as represented by Egypt in All for Love and Tyrannick Love and Troy in Troilus and Cressida—of which the Turks and Moors were part.

Heir of Morocco (1673) imitate the discursive rules of writing about the oriental Turk and Moor, as were defined and established by John Dryden and the politics of Charles II and James II.<sup>3</sup> The purpose of this dissertation is to show how Restoration drama deconstructs three major Renaissance concepts—namely, the religious renegade; identification with the Roman imperial legacy as represented by John Dryden’s All for Love (1678), Tyrannick Love (1669); and the Renaissance anxiety of the notion of the “Trojan Turks” as represented by John Dryden’s Troilus and Cressida (1679).

### Theoretical Approaches

The concept of discourse as developed by Michel Foucault in his theoretical works—namely, “The Order of Discourse,” “What is an Author,” The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language (1972), Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison (1977)—describes the complex mechanism of discourse formation and its

---

<sup>3</sup> Anthony Barthelemy, in his book Black face Maligned Race: The Representation of Blacks in English Drama from Shakespeare to Southerene (1987), argues that Settle’s two plays—The Empress of Morocco and The Heir of Morocco—are the only tolerant plays about the oriental Moors in the Restoration drama: “These plays are quite different from any plays I have discussed thus far; they are the only plays I have found in which there are no white Christians Europeans to serve as exemplars of moral and spiritual perfection” (198). For Barthelemy, Settle’s plays deconstruct the negative and stereotypical depiction of John Dryden’s drama: “Dryden’s Moorish characters either lack grace or are incipient Christians” (198). I argue that Barthelemy’s reading of Settle’s and Dryden’s drama is ahistorical since it ignores and misreads the influence of John Dryden, as a founder of the discourse of the “cultural renegade” on Restoration drama and on Settle’s plays, which continue the revolutionary depiction of Dryden’s and Restoration drama’s phenomenon of the “cultural renegade.” Also, in his book Islam in English Literature (1939) Byron Smith notes that Settle’s plays dramatize courageous and virtuous Muslim characters; however, for Smith, the choice of Muslim characters in Restoration drama is “mainly decorative” (37) to fill in the role of the heroic hero and heroine. Again, Smith’s reading to Restoration drama is reductive since it ignores the cultural and political function of the heroic hero/heroine of bringing East-West cultural rapprochement, as defined by the politics of Charles II and James II and the drama of John Dryden, the founder of the discourse of the “cultural renegade” in Restoration drama. Also, even though Bridget Orr observes that “virtue and honor are by no means absent from Settle’s vision of Morocco,” she argues incorrectly that “they are beleaguered” (Empire 105). Matthew Birchwood, adopting the thesis of “transfiguration” of reading Islam “through the lens of English politics” (Staging 5), focuses his discussion of Settle’s plays on the idea that these plays utilize Islamic scenes to reflect on current political plights such as the “Exclusion Crisis” (159) in Restoration England. In this dissertation, I argue that Settle’s virtuous and heroic dramatization of the Turks and Moors is not a unique case as argued by Barthelemy, nor “decorative” as asserted by Smith, nor “beleaguered” as assumed by Orr, nor only adapted to current English politics “at home” (8) as demonstrated by Birchwood, but as a continuation of the Restoration England’s discourse of “Respect and Friendship,” as mentioned in the Articles of Peace between Restoration England and the Turks and Moor.

relation to the formation of knowledge in societies. According to Foucault, discourse production is always controlled by what he calls “procedures of exclusion” (“Order” 52)—namely, the principles of “prohibition,” “opposition between reason and madness,” and the “opposition between true and false”—which maintain the distribution of authentic and acceptable discursive statements, while at the same time blocking and excluding other anti-discursive statements that go against the discursive rules. Foucault explains the function of the “procedures,” which control discourse formation in societies: “in every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organized and redistributed by a certain number of procedures whose role is to ward off its powers and dangers, to gain mastery over its chance events, to evade its ponderous, formidable materiality” (52). However, discourse, in Foucault’s perspective, is not static; rather, it is subject to transformation, modification, and exclusion since discourse always modifies and transforms its discursive rules and statements at one time or another and from one culture to another. Foucault defines the process, through which discursive rules displace previous and unacceptable rules and statements as the “field of memory”: “statements that are no longer accepted or discussed, and which consequently no longer define either a body of truth or a domain of validity, but in relation to which relations of filiation, genesis, transformation, continuity, and historical discontinuity can be established” (Archaeology 58).

Foucault’s contribution of defining the concept of discourse has been influential to Edward Said’s important book Orientalism (1978). Said refers to this influence in defining Orientalism: “I have found it useful here to employ Michel Foucault’s notion of a discourse, as described by him in The Archaeology of Knowledge and in Discipline and

Punish, to identify Orientalism” (3). Nevertheless, Said’s definition Orientalism, “as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient” (3) does not address the issue of discursive transformation and modification of discursive rules and statements from one time and culture to another. For example, in his article “Orientalism and Its Problems,” Dennis Porter observes that Said’s definition of the discourse of Orientalism differs from Foucault’s analysis of discourse since the former’s is “continuous” and universal: “unlike Foucault, who posits not a continuous discourse over time but epistemological breaks between different periods, Said asserts the unified character of Western discourse on the Orient over some two millennia” (152). Said’s conscious or unconscious deviation from Foucault’s analysis of discourse production clearly asserts that “Orientalism assumed an unchanging Orient” (96) as a “closed system,” which does not accept modification from the Middle Ages to the twentieth century:

A closed system, in which objects are what they are because they are what they are, for once, for all time, for ontological reasons that no empirical material can either dislodge or alter. The European encounter with the Orient, and specifically with Islam, strengthened this system of representing the Orient and . . . turned Islam into the very epitome of an outsider against which the whole of European civilization from the Middle Ages on was founded. (70)

Recent modern scholarship of Islamic perception in early modern drama criticizes the application of Said’s theory of Orientalism and postcolonial theory on early modern drama. Nabil Matar, Daniel Vitkus, and Matthew Birchwood are the most prominent modern scholars, who shed light on the erroneous attempt to apply Said’s theory of

Orientalism on the perception of Islam in early modern drama since it ignores power relations. In his book Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery (1999), Matar points out, “if the orientalism of the late eighteenth century, as Edward Said defines it, is colonialism as a form of discourse, then what the Renaissance English writers produced was merely a discourse—without colonialism” or “paper” (17) colonization rather than reality. In other words, it was the Turkish Empire, which caused a military and cultural threat to Western Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries because as Matar explains in his book Islam in Britain: 1558-1685 (1998) the “lands of Islam were beyond colonization and ‘domination’” (12). In his article “Islam in Interregnum and Restoration England” (1991), Matar argues that the cultural threat of Islam on England and Western Europe lasted till the Restoration period: “the Interregnum and the Restoration periods constitute the last phase in England when Islam challenged, on its own terms, English thought and society” (68). Vitkus like Matar criticizes what he calls in his book Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630 (2003) “postcolonial fallacy” and the inapplicability of Said’s definition of Orientalism on Renaissance drama: “when we seek a theoretical framework to help us analyze the early modern representation of Islamic or Mediterranean alterities, we find that Said’s postcolonial theory, which is based upon the historical experience of Western imperialism and colonization, must be deployed with caution, if at all” (11). For Vitkus, considering England in the Renaissance period as an “empire” is problematic since Renaissance England lived “imperial fantasies” rather than real “empire” as a “conquering, colonizing power” (6). Therefore, Vitkus explains that Renaissance England’s “inferiority complex” of the “multicultural Mediterranean” of Islamic lands

aroused complex and ambivalent attitudes of “fear and desire” (164) since the Renaissance Britons’ sense of “desire” was in their fascination with the power of the Islamic Turks and Moors, while at same time they were afraid and anxious of “conversion to Islam and the practice of piracy [which] were closely associated by the English, who feared and condemned both” (37). Birchwood, following Matar’s and Vitkus’s critiques of postcolonial theory and observations on the complex, ambivalent, anxious Renaissance attitudes of Islam and oriental Turks and Moors, develops in his book Staging Islam in England: Drama and Culture, 1640-1685 (2007) the thesis of “transfiguration,” through which Interregnum and Restoration England resorted to Islam to reflect “through the lens of English politics” (5) upon “religious and political anxieties at home” (8). Building on Vitkus’s thesis of the “fear and desire,” Birchwood claims that Interregnum and Restoration England persists a contradictory and ambivalent attitudes to Islam: “Herein lies the contradiction. By mid-century, the idea of Islam was a volatile mixture of longstanding anxieties centered upon the Ottoman Empire as a spiritual and military threat, combined with esteem for its cultural and imperial achievements” (184).

In this dissertation, I find Foucauldian analysis of discourse in terms of its elasticity and transformability to be an essential critical approach to examine how Restoration England’s discourse of Orientalism transforms, modifies, and excludes the Renaissance discourse, which Matar and Vitkus characterize with anxiety and ambivalence towards the Muslim Turks and Moors. Even though I agree with Matar’s, Vitkus’s, and Birchwood’s critique of Said’s theory of Orientalism, I think their analysis of Restoration drama as a continuation to the Renaissance anxiety, fear, and ambivalence as noted by Matar and Birchwood is problematic since it reminds us of the Saidian generalization of

the western perception of the Orient. Even though Vitkus does not analyze Restoration drama in his works, his thesis of ambivalence—or what he calls “fear and desire,” which is followed by Birchwood—is inept in analyzing Restoration discourse of Orientalism since “ambivalence” as defined by Bill Ashcroft in his book Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts (2000) as a “continual fluctuation between wanting one thing and wanting its opposite” (12), assumes indeterminacy, hesitation, and fear of the Muslim Turk and Moor.

Restoration discourse of Orientalism deconstructs rather than continues the Renaissance discursive statements of anxiety to the Muslim Turk and Moor. Restoration discourse of Orientalism of “Respect and Friendship,” as mentioned in the Articles of Peace with the oriental Turk and Moor, undergoing the process of the “field of memory” in Foucault’s terminology, excludes and displaces the Renaissance fear and antagonism as irrelevant statements and no part of the “body of truth or a domain of validity” in Foucault’s analysis of discourse.<sup>4</sup> The political harmony between the politics of Charles II and James II with the Restoration theater encouraged Restoration dramatists to unequivocally revise and modify the Renaissance discourse of anxiety to the oriental Turks and Moors since the Restoration politics of Charles II and James II no longer allowed hesitation, antagonism, or ambivalence to the oriental Turk and Moor to be as part of the Restoration English society or as part of Restoration England’s “Publick

---

<sup>4</sup> See Articles of Peace Between his Sacred Majesty, Charles II King of Great Brittain, France and Ireland, &c. And the City and Kingdom of Algiers; Concluded by Thomas Allen Esq. Admiral of His Said Majesty of Great Brittain’s Ships in the Mediterranean Seas, &c. London, Printed by Thomas Mabb, Dwelling on St. Paul’s Wharff, 1664 ProQuest, Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 15 Dec. 2010 <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.

faith,” in Charles II’s terminology and “Publick Quiet,” in James II’s description.<sup>5</sup> This dissertation, while examining a comparative study between Renaissance and Restoration drama, avoids reading the two periods in the same chronological and political delineation of the Muslim Oriental Turk and Moor; rather, it adopts the Foucauldian notion of the transformability of discourse.

Also, the notion of the rise of the discourse of “aesthetics” or “autonomy” of literature from “politics” and “history” as defined by Michael McKeon should be applied with caution. In his article, “Politics of Discourses and the Rise of the Aesthetic in Seventeenth-Century England,” McKeon argues that the “rediscovery of Aristotle’s seminal distinctions between ‘poetry’ and ‘history’ and between ‘poetry’ and ‘politics’” contributed to the “autonomy” of the seventeenth century literature from “politics” and “history”: “‘politics’ and ‘history’ are seen gradually to emerge from their subordination to ‘religion.’ The effect of the Poetics, however, is to free ‘poetry’ and its kind of truth from their presumed subsumption under ‘politics’ and ‘history’” (44). McKeon considers John Dryden as one example of the “neo-Aristotelian,” who believed in the “full ‘liberation’ of poetry” from “politics” and “history” (45). Even though I agree with McKeon’s argument that “secularization” participated in part in shifting seventeenth century philosophy from religious interpretation to secular argument, I doubt the

---

<sup>5</sup> See Charles II’s pamphlet By the King, A Proclamation Touching the Articles of Peace with Argiers, Tunis, and Tripoli, London: Printed by John Bill and Christopher Barker, Printers to the Kings most Excellent Majesty, 1662. ProQuest, Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 15 Dec. 2010 <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>. Also, see James II’s treaty of peace renewal Articles of Peace and Commerce between the most Serene and Mighty Prince James II by the Grace of God, King of Great Britain, France and Ireland, Defender of the Christian Faith. And the most Illustrious Lords, the Douletli Basha, Aga and Governours of the Famous City and Kingdom of Algiers in Barbary: Ratified and Confirmed by Sir William Soame Baroner, His Majesties Ambassador to the Grand Signior, on the Fifth of April, Old Style, 1686. Published by His Majesties Command. Printed by Thomas Newcomb in the Savoy, 1687. ProQuest, Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 15 Dec. 2010 <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.

credibility of the notion that Restoration literature was “autonomous” from “politics” since as I argue in this dissertation that the Restoration concept of the “cultural renegade” or what I call the “Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist,” Dryden’s demystification of the Greco-Roman imperial legacy, and Dryden’s celebration of the notion of the “Trojan Turk” were not autonomous from the politics of Charles II nor of James II; rather, they were interacting with the newly emergent discourse of “Respect and Friendship” as noted earlier. Susan J. Owen, a prominent Restoration drama scholar, insists in her article “Restoration Drama and Politics: An Overview” that “politics had a profound effect on both the form and the content of Restoration drama” (126). Also, Birchwood’s thesis of the “transfiguration,” which reads Interregnum and Restoration drama’s utilization of Islam to allegorize the politics of age, is a good example of Restoration politics’ influence on drama. Adopting McKeon’s argument of the “autonomy” of Restoration literature from “politics” does not answer what the political and cultural function of the oriental Turk and Moor protagonist is on Restoration stage. McKeon’s argument reminds us of Byron Smith’s conclusion in his book Islam in English Literature (1939) that the choice of Muslim characters in Restoration drama is “mainly decorative” (37) to fill in the role of the heroic hero and heroine. Therefore, to treat oriental Turkish and Moorish characters as “decoration” or examples of the discourse of the “autonomous” “aesthetics” is problematic and reductive to the politics of Charles II and James II and the complementary and supportive role of Restoration theater to modify the Renaissance discourse of Orientalism.

Whereas I agree with Matar’s, Vitkus’s, and Birchwood’s critique of Postcolonial theory in terms of the impossibility of applying postcolonial terms of “colonized” and

“colonizer” on early modern drama since the Muslim Turks and Moors were not subject to real colonization from West in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, I maintain that Postcolonial Theory, as a broad field of cultural and political studies, is still useful to interpret what Vitkus calls the “imperial fantasies” (Turning 6) in Renaissance in terms of the Renaissance identification with the Roman imperial past, and Restoration drama’s, as represented by John Dryden’s plays, “displacement” in Foucault’s terminology of discourse analysis of the Renaissance discourse of identification with the Romans because Dryden, in his All for Love, Tyrannick Love, and Troilus and Cressida, condemns not only the Roman but also the Greek colonization to the East, which Restoration England looked at as part of the English “Publick faith.” In his book Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction (2001), Robert Young illustrates that the Roman imperial legacy contributed to the formation of the British empire: “The Roman empire gave the British . . . a model through which they could justify their own, and which, . . . afforded a significant precedent for the triumph of civilized races over barbarism and savagery” (33). Young describes the British as “mimic men” since “the English upper classes remained shamelessly in love with the culture of their own conquerors of over a thousand years earlier” (33). Also, in his book Roman Officers and English Gentlemen: The Imperial Origins of Roman Archaeology (2000), Richard Hingley illustrates that just as Britons believed that they benefited from the Roman colonization of Britain, the British Empire considered itself as a heir to the “continuity” of the Romans’ civilizing role: “Through the process of conquest, Rome was felt to have introduced civilization and Christianity to Britain and also to have helped to form the

imperial character of the English. English civilization, religion and imperial spirit are all traced back to the Roman past” (4).

Even though Young’s and Hingley’s discussions mainly focus on the eighteenth through early twentieth centuries British Empire, it is significant to use Postcolonial theoretical approach to examine why Restoration drama, as represented by John Dryden, discontinued the Renaissance identification with the Greco-Roman imperial heritage. Since the notion of Western mystification of the Roman imperial past traced back not only to the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries but also to the Renaissance as has been well-established by modern scholarship, it is important to demonstrate that Dryden exorcizes the heir role of Restoration England of the Roman empire by revising Renaissance plays that deal not only with Roman—as dramatized in All for Love and Tyrannick Love, but also Greek, as it is the case in Troilus and Cressida—colonization of the East as represented by Egypt and Troy.<sup>6</sup> Of course, Dryden’s “displacement,” in Foucault’s terminology, of the discourse of identification with the Greco-Roman past reflects harmony with the anti-imperial Restoration discourse of “Respect and Friendship” with the oriental Turks and Moors. This part of the discussion of Dryden’s exorcism of Renaissance identification with the Roman imperial past and his anti-imperial tendencies to the oriental Turk and Moor differ from modern scholarship, which accuses Dryden of imperial leanings as it is the case with Matar, who in his book Britain and Barbary, 1589-1689 (2005) traces Restoration drama and Dryden’s drama in

---

<sup>6</sup> For more information about the Renaissance assimilation of the Roman imperial legacy, see Charles L. Stinger’s The Renaissance in Rome (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1985). Stinger points out, “the Roman humanists, possessed of superior knowledge of ancient Roman history and determined to revive the splendor of ancient Rome, made more literal the assimilation of the *respublica Christiana* to the Roman Empire” (243). Also, see Andrew C. Fix’s The Renaissance, the Reformation, and the Rise of Nations (Virginia: The Teaching Company, 2005).

particular with the theme of Restoration England's "imperial ambition" to expand its authority over Muslim lands since he argues that "in the second half of the seventeenth century, and as a result of maritime victories . . . Britons developed a sense of imperial glory and destiny" (133); or the case with Bridget Orr, who in her book Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714 (2001) argues that Restoration drama and theater "became an instrument of empire" (27) since England's "imperial power was frequently mediated by a heroic mode" (26). In Orr's reading, Dryden is a propagandist for the moral England's Empire, which was different from Turkish tyrant model of Empire. Orr refers to Restoration England's influence by the Roman imperial past: "the Romans were established as cultural and political (and even to some degree) genetic ancestors of the English" (258) because Restoration England and drama witnessed an "implicit" identification and an "explicit" recognition of the "inheritance of the *translatio imperii*" of the Romans "after 1688" (259). However, Birchwood's opinion for "further" analysis of Dryden's drama, (which he does not tackle in his book) that "there is further scope for the work of other dramatists of the period—perhaps most obviously the now canonical authors Behn and Dryden" (186) in the context of Restoration England's complex and ambivalent perception of Islam remains valuable since this dissertation examines new cultural and political rereadings of Dryden and Restoration drama.

### **The Religious Renegade vs. the "Cultural Renegade"**

Many modern scholars have talked about the western anxiety of the figure of the renegade as represented in early modern drama. In his book The Crescent and the Rose: Islam and England during the Renaissance (1937), Samuel Chew comments on the stereotypical depiction of the figure of the renegade as a "traitor" in Renaissance drama,

as represented in Daborne's A Christian Turned Turk: "The expression 'To Turn Turk' is very common, sometimes in the literal sense of embracing Islam. . . . The title of Daborne's drama A Christian Turned Turk has a double meaning, religious and political, for the protagonist Captain Ward [a renegade] is a traitor to England and embraces Mohammedanism" (144-45). For Chew the Renaissance intolerance not only to the renegade but also to the oriental Turks and Moors owed to the military power of the Turkish Empire and the Moorish land: "Christendom, threatened by the ever-advancing Ottoman power, invested with glory and romance the figure of Timur the Tartar or Tamburlaine who had long since humbled the pride of the Turkish Sultan, Bajazet the First" (469). For example, Chew makes clear that Christopher Marlowe's Tamburlaine, in which the Turkish Sultan Bajazeth is defeated and caged by Tamburlaine, appealed to the Renaissance audience taste when they felt the danger of the Turks. According to Chew, the anxiety of the phenomenon of the renegade and the oriental Turk and Moor lasted till the time of John Dryden in Restoration period since Dryden refers to the "slave-market" of Christian captives in his play Don Sebastian: "Dryden probably had in mind in the opening scene of Don Sebastian. In both these scenes the slaves are made to run through their paces to prove their strength and soundness of limb and wind" (386). Also, Chew alludes to Dryden's continuation of dramatizing the stereotypical legend of the "Dove" or the "pigeon," as represented in his play Don Sebastian.<sup>7</sup> Even though Chew does not analyze a close reading to Dryden's plays as he does with Renaissance plays, he

---

<sup>7</sup> The stereotypical story of the "pigeon," which assumed falsely that Prophet Mohammad deceived his followers of the "pigeon" as the "Holy Ghost": "the story of how he [Prophet Mohammad] 'accustomed and taught a Dove to be fedde, and fetche meate at his eares, the which Dove his moste subtile and craftye maister called the Holy Ghost'" (qtd. in Chew 406). According to Chew, "Vincent of Beauvais seems to have been the first writer to spread it abroad" (406-07).

continuously refers to Dryden's dramatic adoption of many Renaissance misconceptions about Islam and the oriental Turks and Moors.

Recent valuable scholarship by Nabil Matar and Daniel Vitkus sheds light upon the cultural, political, and religious encounter between the Islamic state, represented by the Turkish Empire and the Moorish kingdom, and the Western Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Both Matar and Vitkus present valuable historiography and vigorous analysis of early modern drama, which addresses the notion of the renegade and usher new reading of Orientalism in terms of the cultural and political power relations between the oriental Turks and Moors and western Europe. For Matar, the oriental Turk and Moor in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were not subject to the western domination and colonization, as suggested by Edward Said's analysis of Orientalism; rather, the Turk and Moor exposed a cultural and political power, to which the West was characterized as inferior and unable to meet. In his book Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery (1999), Matar, referring to the Renaissance period as the "age of discovery," illustrates that Britain, which was unable to challenge the cultural and political power or "allure" of the oriental Turks and Moors, defeated the oriental Turk and Moor only on "paper" rather than in reality:

In their discourse about Muslims, Britons produced a representation that did not belong to the actual encounter with the Muslims. Rather, it was a representation of a representation: in order to represent the Muslim as Other, Britons borrowed constructions of alterity and demonization from their encounter with the American Indians. Unable to defeat the Muslims, as they had the American Indians, and unable to situate them in a world view convenient to their colonial and millennial

goals, as they had done with Americans, writers applied constructions of differentiation from the American Indians to the Muslims. This process of superimposition was conscious and deliberate. (15)

Matar explains the materialistic motifs behind the immigration of many British citizens to the oriental land during the Renaissance and Restoration periods to seek job opportunities and residence. In his “Introduction: England and Mediterranean Captivity, 1577-1704,” he points out:

From the Elizabethan period until the end of the seventeenth century, thousands of English, Scottish, Welsh, and Irish men and women interacted directly with the North Africans of the Barbary States as sailors, traders, soldiers, craftsmen, and artisans who either went to North Africa in search of work and opportunity or were seized by privateers and subsequently settled there. (1)

The Moorish land tempted many impoverished Britons to convert to Islam and to enjoy the allegiance to a commanding culture: “Muslim culture was powerful and dangerous, and nowhere else in the world were there more captive Britons than in the Barbary States. . . . Nowhere else in the non-Christian world did Britons face the danger of converting to another religion and emigrating to another society” (38). For Matar, the conversion of many British citizens to Islam was menacing to Britain, which took different procedures to meet the challenge of Islam. In his book Islam in Britain 1558-1683 (1998), Matar refers to the role of British dramatists and theologians in challenging the jeopardy of the phenomenon of the renegade and conversion to Islam:

Aware that the attraction of the Ottoman Empire sometimes proved irresistible to their compatriots, Britons tried to undermine this attraction in three areas of writing

and activity: theological polemic, drama and evangelism. In the area of evangelism, great momentum was generated in England toward the conversion of Muslims to Protestantism; in the dramatic arts, Robert Daborne, Philip Massinger and others wrote to show the horrible punishment that God had in store for the Christian convert to Islam; in apocalyptic commentary, English and Scottish theologians showed that the Saracen who refused to convert to Christianity would be destroyed at the eschaton. (19)

For Matar, the early modern theater in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries attacked the figure of the renegade and misrepresented the image of the powerful Turks and Moors: “In the imaginatively-controlled environments of the theater and the pulpit, Britons converted the unbelievers, punished the renegades, and condemned the Saracens” (20).

Even though Matar refers to Dryden’s tolerant depiction of the renegade in his play Don Sebastian (1689): “The simplistic association of evil with renegade and good with Christian was discontinued by Dryden” (Islam 62), he claims in another recent book—namely, Britain and Barbary 1589-1689 (2005)—that Dryden in his play Don Sebastian (1689) wants to defeat Islam:

Himself [Dryden] defeated, he turned to defeat the Muslim Other, employing the same exaggeration and misrepresentation that his countrymen used against Catholics in their libels and satires. In the play, Dryden presented his audience with an Islamic setting where Moors swore by their ‘Prophet’ and their ‘Law,’ and invoked ‘Alcoran,’ ‘Alchoran’ and ‘Holy Mahomet’—words that constituted about the only knowledge that he showed about Islam in the play. Such emphasis served

to posit Islam as a foil to Christianity. . . . The one topic Dryden could ridicule and attack and on which the British public, both Protestant and Catholic would concur, was Islam. (168-69)

Dryden's plays, in Matar's point of view, depict the weakness of the Islamic state and evoke the "defeat" of Islam in the late seventeenth century as represented in his play The Conquest of Granada, in which "Islam was weak, and the Moors were disunited: after all, it was the dissension between the Abencerrages and the Zegrays, two large Moorish factions, that facilitated the inexorable victory of the Christians" (145). Therefore, Dryden's play celebrates the imperial role of Britain in colonizing the Muslim world and in converting Muslims to Christianity: "As the Spaniards had carried with them into defeated Granada the missionary goal of converting the unbelievers, so were the British hopeful that they would subdue 'the Moors in woods and mountains'" (145).

In Matar's reading of Dryden's plays, Dryden is an imperialist since he employed the theater for the "imperial ambition" of Britain to colonize the "Muslim soil" and "to challenge the Moors": "Dryden portrayed the Moors as evil and depraved, controlled by their lust, ruthless in their pursuit of personal power, and without political or military cohesion. He also changed history and twisted events in his plot to suit his Christian triumphant goal" (146). In this context, Matar's allusion to Dryden's tolerant depiction of the renegade figure in Don Sebastian (1689) was not due to his mission to bring East-West cultural rapprochement, represented by the "cultural renegade" as I posit in my dissertation; rather, because the oriental Muslim turned from a cultural and political rival to Christianity to an easy prey for the British colonization "Dryden and his London audience could think, imagine, invent and describe the Moors any way they wanted. The

Moor was no longer enigmatic, dominant or interesting but was instead a representative of uncivilized and degraded people" (170). I do not agree with Matar that Dryden, as an imperialist, sought "Christian triumphant goal" in his dramatization of the oriental Turks and Moors. Rather, I think that Dryden turned Muslim "cultural renegade"—or what I call "Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist"—as represented in the renegade figure Dorax in Don Sebastian (1689). Also, Dryden's The Conquest of Granada does not depict the weakness of Islam and the imperial role of Britain to colonize the Muslim land; rather, Dryden, as a founder of the discourse of the "cultural renegade" celebrates the "cultural renegades"—Almanzor and Almahide as one example in The Conquest of Granada—who celebrate simultaneously Islamic/Christian identifications and declare victory of both of Islam and Christianity.

Again, Matar like Chew studies the Restoration period as a continuation of the Renaissance representation of the oriental Turks and Moors. For example, in his historical article "Islam in Interregnum and Restoration England" (1991), Matar analyzes the Restoration period from power relations' point of view since Restoration England's interest in Islam was not to accept it as part of the British society; rather, it was to challenge the powerful Islamic culture:

For Englishmen, safe in their insularity, the Ottomans did not pose any direct danger; but upon seeing the cultural and imperial thrust of Islam, writers could not avoid responding to the religion and history of the Muslims. Islam was too powerful militarily to ignore, and too autonomous culturally to be subdued by perceptions and reformulations. In this respect, the Interregnum and the Restoration periods provide the last decades in England in which Islam was treated as a civilization of

power. . . . (58)

Even though Matar in his historical article does not analyze the role of Restoration drama in the controversial debate about the perception of Islam, he refers to the new sense of toleration represented by “calls for the salvation of the Turks” (60) as represented in many nonfictional narratives. However, for Matar, Islam was still to be “rejected” from the Christian debate with other religions like Judaism: “The model of the *responsa* that was frequent between Christians and Jews and which invariably ended with the conversion of the latter, is conspicuously absent from the Christian-Islamic confrontation. Islam was to be rejected, but not controverted” (65).

I think Matar’s focus on the discussion of Renaissance drama makes his reading to the Restoration drama and John Dryden in particular deficient since Restoration drama should not be read as a continuation of the cultural and political rivalry between Islam and Christianity; rather, it should be examined as deconstructive to many Renaissance misconceptions and supportive of the cultural and political acceptance of Islam and the Oriental Turks and Moors in Restoration England. For example, Matar’s argument about the Restoration drama: “Where a hundred years earlier, Peele and other Elizabethan playwrights had emphasized the Negroid features of the Moors, and contrasted them with their own English/European whiteness, Dryden, along with the other Restoration playwrights, used the religion of the Moors rather than their race to alterize them into dangerous Others” (Britain 169) is incorrect since Dryden and other Restoration dramatists deconstruct the Renaissance discourse of alterization of Muslim heroes/heroines and celebrate both Christian and Islamic cultures.

Daniel Vitkus, like Matar, reflects on the western anxiety of the phenomenon of the renegade in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Vitkus emphasizes that the stereotypical depiction of the renegade in Renaissance drama did not assume the western Christian superiority over other religions like Islam nor provoked the colonization of the Turkish and Moorish lands; rather, on the contrary, it reflected what he calls in his article, “Early Modern Orientalism: Representations of Islam in Sixteenth-and-Seventeenth-Century Europe,” “West’s inferiority complex” (210) of the power of Islam and the Islamic state, represented by the Turkish Empire and the Kingdom of Morocco:

Many of the images of Islam that were produced by European culture in the early modern period are imaginary resolutions of real anxieties about Islamic wealth and might. The Christian West’s inferiority complex, which originated in the trauma of the early Caliphate’s conquests, was renewed and reinforced by the emergence of a new Islamic power, the Ottoman Turks. (210)

Vitkus, like Matar, rejects the notion that England was an Empire to expand and colonize the powerful Turkish and Moorish lands. In his book Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630 (2003), Vitkus believes that modern application of Post-colonial Theory in terms of the British colonizer and Turkish and Moorish colonized is a “postcolonial fallacy” since “calling England an ‘empire’ does not mean that England was in fact a conquering, colonizing power” (6). On the contrary, England looked at the Turkish model of empire as a successful example of imperial expansion, which England was not ready yet to establish: “In their relations with cultural contestants like France, Spain, Portugal, Venice, and Turkey, the English were, in many ways, a society of mimic men who were learning (or hoping) to imitate alien models of

power, wealth, and luxury" (9). To Vitkus, the English attitude in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries to the Turkish Empire was mixed by fear and admiration: "the Ottoman empire was an institution to be feared and appeased" (30) since the Turkish Empire or the "multicultural Mediterranean," which was an attractive destination of commercial relations and business for the Levant and many English merchants and maintained multicultural interaction and ethnicities of Muslims, Christians, and Jews, remained a source of anxiety and fear of the loss of the English identity by converting to Islam or "Turning Turk":

The heterogeneity and instability of identity that characterize the Mediterranean region made the English presence there a source of anxiety and contradiction: on the one hand, the English felt their difference as Protestant outsiders acutely, almost as alienation; on the other hand, they felt drawn into exchanges and relations that threatened to 'convert' them to a foreign condition or, at least, contaminate them. (43)

The phenomenon of the renegade and conversion to Islam was widespread in sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries: "It was much more common for Christians to turn Turk, and by the early seventeenth century, many English subjects had become renegades in North Africa and the Middle East" (109). Vitkus, like Matar, refers to the economic motif as one factor behind the conversion of many English citizens to Islam since "in England the period under study, 1570-1630, was one marked by repeated episodes of famine, plague, and economic depression" (110).<sup>8</sup> However, many English Protestant converts admired the Islamic culture:

---

<sup>8</sup> Matar also refers to the economic motif behind the conversion of many English subjects to Islam in early modern England: "Islam projected an allure that promised a common Briton social and political power, and

English Protestants were also attracted to Islam because of the openness and freedom that Islamic culture allowed to its converts and adherents. If we consider [how] . . . a typical seaman from London or the West Country lived, and then we contrast those circumstances with the conditions of an English ‘Turk’ living in North Africa or under Ottoman sovereignty, it is possible to understand the appeal of Islam as an alternative way of life. (110)

Conversion to Islam in sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries was not always enforced on Christian European subjects. As Vitkus notes “Adult conversion to Islam was only rarely coerced or forced . . . and yet many hundreds, perhaps thousands, of English subjects willingly converted to Islam and took their places within the hetero-ethnic religious communities of the Muslim Mediterranean” (111). Therefore, the Turkish Empire and the “multicultural Mediterranean” caused not only military but also cultural threat to the English fabric of society as represented by the phenomenon of conversion to Islam, which was an act to be renounced by the English church and state: “Conversion to Islam (or to Roman Catholicism) was considered a kind of sexual transgression or spiritual whoredom, and Protestantism proclaimed the same judgment—eternal damnation—for all those who were seduced by either the pope or the Prophet” (78). In his “Introduction: Three Turk Plays from Early Modern England” (2000), Vitkus refers to the function of church sermons in condemning the act of conversion to Islam: “in London, sermons were being preached to congregations that included large numbers of English mariners, warning these worshippers against conversion and threatening eternal damnation for those who turned Turk” (5-6). In early modern narratives, the act of

---

turned a poor European soldier into a well-paid *rais* (corsair captain: it was the allure of an empire that changed an Englishman’s hat into a turban—with all the symbolism of strength associated with the Islamic headdress” (Islam 15).

conversion to Islam was more fatal than piracy: “English sailors who turned Turk were condemned for their crimes against Christianity, but piracy itself was not necessarily considered an evil pursuit” (29).

Vitkus analyzes the English anxiety of the renegade with reference to the ambivalent and complex attitude of England in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries to the Ottoman Empire and the Mediterranean, where English subjects interacted with multicultural and multiethnic Mediterranean subjects, including Muslims, Christians, and Jews. For an Englishman, the Mediterranean was a place of commercial success but at the same time a source of temptation of conversion to Islam: "Very Often, it was the Mediterranean that functioned as the imaginary site where these changes in identity were acted out in a play of fear and desire" (Turning 163-64). There was a "fear" of losing identity and religious identification and a "desire" to imitate the imperial success of the “multicultural Mediterranean.”

In this dissertation, the concept of the renegade in the Renaissance context and as discussed by Chew, Matar, and Vitkus can be characterized under the category of the “religious renegade,” who prefers one religion and culture to another as discussed by Chew and Matar or undergoes a moment of hesitation, "ambivalence," "play of fear and desire" in deserting his/her Christian/ Islamic religious, cultural, and political identification as analyzed by Vitkus. The purpose of this concept is to show how Restoration drama deconstructs the Renaissance conceptualization of the religious renegade by introducing the “cultural renegade” or what I call the “Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist,” who does not undergo any hesitation, anxiety, temptation, or ambivalence in shifting Islamic/Christian identification; rather, he/she

confidently celebrates both Islam and Christianity and remains simultaneously Muslim/Christian. Moreover, in this dissertation, I examine Restoration drama not as a continuation of the religious and cultural rivalry and anxiety between Islam and Christianity as it was the case in Renaissance and was analyzed by Chew, Matar, and Vitkus; rather, it looks at Restoration drama as deconstructive, disruptive, and modifiable to the Renaissance discourse of anxiety and fear of the Ottoman Turk and Moor and the renegade. Chew, Matar, and Vitkus focus their discussion on Renaissance drama and historiography, whereas Chew and Matar show confusion between the role of Restoration drama and theater and the Renaissance dramatization of the oriental Turk and Moor and the renegade, Vitkus does not analyze Restoration drama at all in his major works. This study draws a line of demarcation between Renaissance and Restoration contexts that I can put in a Shakespearean style of questioning: in Renaissance, the phenomenon of “Turning Turk” will be “To turn Turk or not to turn, this is the question,” which indicates the state of anxiety, fear, hesitation, while in Restoration questioning “To turn Turk or remain Christian is no difference since I am both,” which show confidence, cultural revolutionary motif, and an indifference at the same time to the value of religious bias since the newly emergent discourse of the Restoration “cultural renegade” does not undergo religious conversion in the literal since; rather, he/she maintains his/her Christian/Islamic religious affiliation and celebrates simultaneously both Islamic and Christian cultures. Of course, Dryden and Sir William Davenant are the “founders of discursivity,” in Foucauldian terminology, of the discourse of the “cultural renegade” or what I call the “Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist.”

## The “Cultural Renegade” vs. the “Gone Native” Protagonist

As noted earlier, the term “cultural renegade” was coined by Kenneth Ingram Mayer in his doctoral dissertation, Cultural Renegades in Plutarch’s Lives (1997) to trace the function of the “cultural renegades” in Plutarch’s Lives: “I have given them the descriptive label of ‘cultural renegades’” (2). Mayer refers to the association between the term “cultural renegade” and the modern postcolonial concept in the nineteenth century of the “gone native”: “*topos* of a protagonist who rejects his own customs and turns instead to those of another, often less industrialized society” (1). For example, Mayer associates the notion of the “gone native”—as represented in Rudyard Kipling’s Kim (1901), in which “Kim, while dressed as an Indian and a master of Indian ways, ultimately uses this knowledge to advance the British empire” (246) and as dramatized in Burroughs’s Tarzan of the Apes (1912), in which Tarzan’s communication with animals ends with the “advancement of his own people and civilization” (246)—with Plutarch’s “cultural renegades.” For example, the “Cultural renegade” “Alexander” (247), whose cross-cultural identifications are performed for political ends or a “means to an end” (246)—namely, to spread the Hellenistic culture and civilization, or what Mayer calls “Hellenistic mission,” to other parts of the uncivilized world: “In these narratives, ‘Going Native’ is represented as a means to an end” (246). Therefore, my application of the term “cultural renegade,” as an antithesis to the notion of the “gone native,” is different from Mayer’s since I do not trace the imperial and cultural superiority of one culture over the other. In Mayer’s focus of study, it is the Greek cultural superiority over the Roman and barbarian cultures as depicted in Plutarch’s Lives. For example, Mayer explains how Plutarch’s “cultural renegades” refuse to quit their own Greek cultures because it is a

“betrayal”: “The Lives of these six men, the cultural renegades, treat abandoning one’s culture as something far worse than mere political betrayal” (5). Contrasted with the Restoration “cultural renegade,” Plutarch’s “cultural renegades,” who are “presented as not rejecting their homeland, its costume, or its language,” are “remade into a missionary of his [their] home culture’s values” (224). The “cultural renegade” in Plutarch’s Lives is “portrayed as disseminating his own culture abroad” (224).

Plutarch’s “cultural renegades” are imperial renegades rather than true “cultural renegades.” Since Plutarch’s “cultural renegades” adopt foreign languages and clothes only to serve their “civilizing mission” of spreading Hellenism to other cultures: “Heroes like Themistocles and Alexander have become cultural missionaries, who will not rest until the peoples of the world see the inherent superiority of Hellenic culture and begin learning Greek” (222-23), in my point of view, I do not think Plutarch’s heroes or “cultural renegades,” as they are labeled by Mayer, deserve the value of the label of “cultural renegades,” since Plutarch’s “cultural renegades” are imperialists and cultural chauvinists in disguise. However, Mayer’s discussion of Plutarch’s “cultural renegades” remains valuable to the core of this dissertation since I argue that the Restoration dramatization and conceptualization of the phenomenon of the Restoration “cultural renegade” deconstructs not only the Renaissance religious renegade, but also the Greco-Roman imperial conceptualization of the “cultural renegade” as represented in Plutarch’s Lives and discussed by Mayer. In this context, Plutarch’s renegades are more similar to the concept of the religious renegade than the “cultural renegade” since they show reluctance and rejection to the spontaneously and simultaneously combining of two cultures. Whereas the Restoration “cultural renegades”—a period which is not discussed

by Mayer—seek cross cultural interfacing with other cultures to establish liberal and cultural reconciliation and harmony between Islam and Christianity, Plutarch’s “cultural renegades” aspire to civilize the uncivilized barbarians as seen in Mayer’s discussion of Plutarch’s Lives.

Moreover, the Restoration “cultural renegade” or what I call the “Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist” is different from the concept of the “gone native” in Postcolonial literature. In his book Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts (2000), Bill Ashcroft defines the concept of the “gone native”: “The term indicates the colonizers’ fear of contamination by absorption into native life and customs. The construction of native cultures as either primitive or degenerate in a binary discourse of colonizer/colonized led . . . to a widespread fear of ‘gone native’ amongst the colonizers” (115). Since the relationship between the oriental Turk and Moor and the Restoration England was not a relationship of domination or colonization; rather, it was based on commercial and military alliance, the notion of the “colonized” and “colonizers” is not applicable in the formation and defining the Restoration “cultural renegade,” who does not “fear of contamination by absorption into native life and customs,” as Ashcroft pertains to the “gone native” protagonist, nor feels cultural superiority over other foreign cultures since the Restoration “cultural renegade” does not suffer from hegemonic or colonial threat; rather, his/her perception to the Islamic culture is based on cultural equality.<sup>9</sup> Ashcroft also explains how the “gone native” protagonist fears the “threat” of

---

<sup>9</sup> The Turkish Empire in the late seventeenth century was perceived by Western Europe as part of the European continent, see Daniel Goffman’s historical book The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe (2002). Goffman observes that “the Europe of Louis XIV and Charles II, however, considered the Ottomans—as friend or foe—along with the other states of Europe in their diplomatic, commercial, and military policies. This was an Ottoman Europe almost as much as it was a Venetian or Habsburg one” (225).

“association with other races and even the mere climate of colonies in hot areas can lead to moral and even physical degeneracy” (115). On the contrary, the Restoration “cultural renegades” find moral and cultural esteem over the oriental land. For example, In Dryden’s The Conquest of Granada, Almanzor, a “cultural renegade,” who, as a Christian hero, is brought up as a Muslim amongst the Moors, acquires heroism and respect from all Moors. Even though he learns of his Christian origin, he does not show repentance for his past years as a Muslim nor fear “contamination” with intermixing foreign cultures—namely, Islamic culture. Therefore, he remains simultaneously both Muslim/Christian in the play. Also, in Dryden’s Don Sebastian, Dorax, as a Portuguese “cultural renegade,” finds moral solicitation over the Moorish land. Dorax, who I think represents the Catholic Dryden the writer and renegade living in Protestant England, is not religiously biased to any of Islam or Christianity. Even when he reconciles with his Christian King, Don Sebastian, and Christianity, he never regrets his past conversion to Islam; rather, he celebrates both cultures. Dorax, reuniting with his Christian King and culture over the Moorish land, anticipates an optimistic future of East-West reconciliation and peace since the new Moorish Emperor, Muley-Zeydan, offers friendship with the West: “I trusted *Muley-Zeydan*, as a friend” (V.i.648).

Ashcroft explains that the “gone native” protagonist fears intermarriage or “inter-racial sex”: “The threat is particularly associated with the temptation posed by inter-racial sex, where sexual liaisons with ‘native’ peoples were supposed to result in a contamination of the colonizers’ pure stock and thus their degeneracy and demise as a vigorous and civilized (as opposed to savage or degenerate) race” (115). The Restoration “cultural renegades” celebrate intermarriage of Christian and Muslim partners, who prefer

love over religious prejudice and allegorize political and cultural marriage between Restoration England and the Turkish and Moorish states. For example, in Dryden's The Conquest of Granada, Almanzor after being informed of his Christian origin is worried that Almahide, his Muslim beloved, abstains from his love and marriage: "Will you [Almahide] not think I [Almanzor] merit some reward, / When I my love above my life regard? (2 COG IV.iii.177-78). Even though Almahide converts to Christianity at the end of the play, Almanzor's worries are not addressed to the issue whether Almahide is a Christian or Muslim; rather, it is whether his conversion to Christianity is beneficial to the continuation of their love or not. Also, Dryden's An Evening's Love (1668) exalts intermarriage between the English Wildblood and the Moorish Jacinta (Fatyma), who as "cultural renegades," commemorate cultural communication between Islam and Christianity and call for the acceptance of the other. Jacinta recognizes that their love will end religious animosity between Islam and Christianity: "No, the love you made was certainly a design of charitie / you had to reconcile the two Religions" (III.i.588-89). Even though Wildblood does not convert to Islam, he praises both religions and acts simultaneously as both Muslim/Christian. For example, Bellamy, a friend of Wildblood, describes the dramatic transformation in the personality of his friend: "in that case my friend is a *Turk* to me" (IV.i.424). Bellamy's notice of Wildblood's cross cultural transformation does not allude to his friend's "contamination," as the "gone native" protagonist fears, from the oriental Moorish culture; rather, he rejoices the cross cultural transformation of Wildblood, who is a "*Turk*" and a Christian.

Therefore, I do not agree with modern scholars' problematic conclusions that Restoration drama and Dryden's drama emphasize the theme of conversion of Muslim

women to Christianity by Christian heroes. For example, Matar comments on this theme: “On the Restoration stage, therefore, any Moorish woman marrying a Christian was made to renounce her Islam” (Britain 170). Similarly, in his book Black Face Maligned Race: The Representation of Blacks in English Drama from Shakespeare to Southerne (1987), Anthony G. Barthelemy argues that “interracial marriage” in Dryden’s plays is preconditioned by the conversion of Muslim women to Christianity to be accepted as a virtuous marriage. For example, Barthelemy notes that in Dryden’s The Conquest of Granada, the conversion of Almahide, a Muslim woman, to Christianity is “but the first step in her regeneration into a suitable wife for the newly recovered Christian prince” (197). I think that both Matar and Barthelemy, ignoring the cross cultural fluctuation in Dryden’s plays, misread Restoration drama as a continuation of the Renaissance anxiety of the figure of the renegade.

Unlike Plutarch’s “cultural renegades,” the Restoration “cultural renegade” does not assume cultural superiority over other cultures nor propagates the “disseminat[ion] [of] his own culture abroad” to civilize the uncivilized. Also, unlike the Renaissance religious renegade, the Restoration “cultural renegade” does not fear inter-racial communication nor hesitates to convert to foreign cultures. Also, unlike the “gone native” protagonist, who fears “contamination” by “absorption into” foreign cultures and customs, the Restoration “cultural renegade”—what I call the “Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist”—is an antithesis to the “gone native” figure.

### **Modern Scholarship on the Figure of Renegade in Restoration Drama**

Recent scholarly reevaluation by critics like Byron Smith, Bridget Orr, and Matthew Birchwood on the perception of Islam in Restoration England and drama

indicates that the relationship between oriental Turk and Moors and Restoration England was complex and ambivalent. These scholars argue that the dramatization of Islam in Restoration drama reflected current religious and political issues in England, which found in Islam a rich material for instructing the English politics. However, their discussion of the Restoration dramatization of the figure of the renegade shows either a confusion with the Renaissance anxiety of the religious renegade as in the case with Orr and Birchwood, or lack of discussion as in the case with Smith. For example, in his book Islam in English Literature (1939), Byron Smith notes that the literature of the Restoration period alleviates the tone of abhorrence of the oriental Turks, Moors, and Indians: “the English literature of the Restoration period is free from that note of anxiety over Turkish aggressions which marked the literature of the Renaissance period before the naval victory of Lepanto (1571)” (20). However, the dramatization of Muslim characters, in Smith’s point of view, is either “decorative” (37) to suit “the scene of heroic action and romantic love” or critical to the current English political and religious issues, which often could not be discussed openly and directly: “The choice of Muslim characters and settings for the heroic plays is part of the tendency to seek remote times and climes as the scene of heroic action and romantic love. Whether located in ancient Troy or . . . India, or Turkey, the far away and long ago was chosen in preference to the here and now” (44). From my point of view, Smith’s reading of Restoration drama is reductive not only because he does not extend his discussion beyond the “decorative” function of Muslim characters, with which I do not agree, but also because he argues that the Restoration drama does not correct stereotypical accusations against Islam and Muslim characters:

The use of Islamic characters and settings in the drama was not accompanied by

representations of Muslim manners, and the figure of Muhammad was still shrouded in the mists of legends. The one element that was common to all types of literature was the ancient belief that Muhammad was an imposter who by craft and cunning won men to his pernicious faith. (57)

Unlike Smith's argument, I posit that the choice of Muslim characters in Restoration drama is conscious and predetermined in order to demolish previous misconceptions about Islam and Muslims characters, who were part of the English "Public faith," in Charles II's terminology, and "Publick Quiet," in James II's description, as noted earlier.

Whereas Smith argues that the function of the oriental Muslim heroes and heroines in Restoration drama was "decorative," Bridget Orr, in her book Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714 (2001), claims that the oriental Turkish model of empire of "despotism" helped the Restoration England to identify themselves against the tyrant model of the Turkish Empire: "The heroic plays deploy an emergent Orientalist discourse of despotism, irreligion and sexual license, against which England could be defined as civil politically, religiously and sexually" (10). For Orr, the Restoration drama's staging of the oriental Turkish Empire indicates Restoration England's "debates" (3) and "ambivalence" over the concept of "universal monarchy" (5), which was followed by the Turkish and Spanish Empires, and which contradicted the "English notion of genteel manners" (11):

The late seventeenth dramas which used the Turkish empire as a setting generally served . . . to remind English audiences of the unique advantages of their own free, law-abiding, Protestant polity even if occasionally, as in The Siege of Constantinople (1675), they hymned the virtues of arbitrary government. The

representation of the problems of Ottoman expansion, preservation and absolutism, however, also provided a template of Oriental despotism which served as a negative exemplar not simply of statehood, but of empire. (66)

Even though Orr situates major Restoration dramatists like Sir William Davenant and John Dryden in the notion of “ambivalence” to Restoration England’s pursuit of empire, she makes many incorrect analytic accusations of their drama—namely, Davenant’s The Siege of Rhodes, Dryden’s The Conquest of Granada, and Don Sebastian. For example, she asserts that Davenant’s The Siege of Rhodes emphasizes the cultural “difference” between oriental and Christian cultures as represented by the dichotomy between the virtuous Christian woman and the corrupt oriental woman: “the contrast the text attempts to establish between the modest Christian Ianthe and the fiery Oriental Roxalana establishes a pattern of oppositions which recurs in a whole series of heroic plays, and serves a fundamental index of difference between the two cultures” (67). For Orr, the transformation of “despot” Solyman, the Turkish Emperor, is conducted through communication with the virtuous Christian woman, Ianthe, who converts Solyman to “adopt Western-style” manners: “in the first important Oriental drama, Davenant’s The Siege of Rhodes, the infidel despot undergoes a conversion, abandoning the religious and political precepts regarded as most characteristic of his culture, to adopt Western-style family values and companionate marriage” (133). In this dissertation, I posit that Davenant’s The Siege of the Rhodes is the first Restoration play, which formulates the Restoration revolutionary perception of the concept of the “cultural renegade”—what I call the “Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist.” In the play, not one of the four main protagonists Solyman, Roxalana, Ianthe, and Alphonso,

whom I consider as “cultural renegades,” converts to the other’s religion nor prefers one culture over the other. Neither Davenant the writer nor his protagonists shows ambivalence to the Islamic/Christian cultural rapprochement.

Similarly, Orr makes a problematic misreading of Dryden’s The Conquest of Granada and Don Sebastian. For example, she claims that Dryden is sympathetic with native American Indians against the tyranny of the Spanish expansion as represented in his play The Indian Emperor (1665), more than the Muslim Moors in The Conquest of Granada: “The Conquest of Granada presents a considerably more positive view of the Spanish empire than The Indian Emperor . . . , with the reconquest of European territory from the infidel Moors representing an unproblematic good for Christendom” (162). For her, the protagonist, Almanzor, whom I treat as a “cultural renegade,” undergoes:

transformation from Moorish, pagan, noble savage to Christian Arcos, [which] figures the process of conversion by which the Roman and Christian empires traditionally incorporated the *barbario*. From this perspective, Almanzor’s turbulent and contingent assumption of Christian identity suggests his affinity with the New Christians, Spanish Moors or Jews whose motives for conversion were always suspect, and who serve as exemplary instances of those perpetual strangers whose inclusion in civil society was dubious, insecure, and threatening. (163)

To assume that Almanzor transforms from oriental savagery and paganism to Christian nobility and that he represents “New Christian” convert are problematic inferences because such analysis reminds us of the Renaissance anxiety of renegades as noted earlier. Also, to assume that the play “implicitly” celebrates England’s civilizing mission to convert and enlighten the uncivilized is not correct: “the play is generally celebratory

of Christendom's, and implicitly England's, capacity to absorb and transform incivility and infidelity" (166). The notion of "implicitness" of heroic protagonists also reminds us of Plutarch's "cultural renegades," who disguise their imperial "Hellenistic mission" as noted earlier by Mayer. In this dissertation, I think that Dryden's and Davenant's heroic plays do not assume any imperial aspirations nor "ambivalence" of the value oriental Islamic culture since "ambivalence" assumes hesitation and anxiety. On the contrary, Dryden's The Conquest of Granada, as one example, deconstructs the Renaissance anxiety and fear between Islam and Christendom and calls for cultural Islamic/Christian rapprochement.

Orr's confusion between the Renaissance anxiety of the renegade and the Restoration dramatization of the renegade is clear in her analysis of Dryden's Don Sebastian. For example, she argues that the character of Dorax, a Portuguese renegade, is "perfidy personified, 'more than a Traitor' as Sebastian says, embodying a complete repudiation of religion and nation, God and Sovereign, which is morally worse than the ignorance of the savage" (168). Such negative depiction of the renegade character in Dryden's play, from Orr's point of view, reflects the western anxiety of the phenomenon of the renegades and piracy in the late seventeenth century: "Renegades were a common feature of Barbary, whose several nations were vividly present in the minds of the late seventeenth-century audiences familiar with the predations of pirates against whom the Stuarts fought four campaigns" (168). Also, for Orr, the function of the renegade in Dryden's play is to "lament" the Glorious Revolution, which dethroned the Catholic King James II and finished the "Jacobite" aspiration for England's "expansion": "The Jacobite lament for James/Sebastian, a noble sexual criminal depicted in defeat and exile, is not

only an elegy for a lost monarch deserted by his perfidious people but a despairing vision of the failure of the project of universal monarchy conceived of as Christian greatness" (166). In other words, the Glorious Revolution was as "perfidious" as the renegade, Dorax, since "for Dryden, the Revolution of '88 not only exiled the King but destroyed a potential expander of English, and Christian, greatness" (167). In his book, Dryden in Revolutionary England (1991), David Bywaters also refers to Dryden's dramatization of the renegade figure to allude to the traitorous councilors, who betrayed King James II during the Glorious Revolution: "many of Dryden's most important patrons—Dorset, Halifax, Rochester, Ormond—had deserted James, and perhaps to reflect their case Dryden has invented Dorax . . ." (48).

In this dissertation, I believe that Dryden, as anti-imperialist to all models of empires whether Christian or not and moral or tyrant, did not invent the renegade Dorax to "lament" England's aspiration for "expansion" as Orr suggests, nor to allegorize those who betrayed King James II as suggested by Orr and Bywaters; rather, Dryden celebrates the function of the renegade to bring cultural harmony between Islam and Christianity. Dryden's dramatization of the renegade Dorax in Don Sebastian continues the dramatic staging of the Restoration "cultural renegade"—the "Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist" phenomenon, which started with Davenant's The Siege of the Rhodes and reflects on the open and friendly relationships between Restoration England of Charles II and James II and oriental Turk and Moor as noted earlier. Dryden's staging of the renegade Dorax deconstructs the Renaissance anxiety and fear of the renegade since Dorax's mission in the play is to find commonalities rather than cultural differences between Islam and Christianity. Dryden the writer, in my point of view, turns Muslim

Orient and “cultural renegade” in the play, which maintains resonance between the renegade Dorax and the Catholic Dryden, who himself was rejected later in his life because of his conversion to Catholicism. Therefore, I posit that Dryden’s dramatization of the “cultural renegade” Dorax represents the writer’s worries at the time of the Glorious Revolution: whether England of the William III would continue the same Restoration England’s principles of political and cultural satisfaction with the oriental Turk and Moor or not. The end of play is a political and cultural recommendation by Dryden to the new English monarch, William III, to keep the same approach of peace and friendship with the oriental Turks and Moors as recommended in the play by the “cultural renegade” Dorax, who expresses optimistic perception of continuing western friendship with the Muslim Orient as allegorized by his friendly relationship with the new Moorish Emperor, Muley-Zeydan: “I trusted *Muley-Zeydan*, as a friend” (V.i.648).

The theme of Restoration England’s projection of inter-political and social conflicts to the oriental Turks and Moors was more developed by Matthew Birchwood in his recent book Staging Islam in England: Drama and Culture, 1640-1685 (2007), in which Birchwood points out that “Islam presented a repository of meanings apparently ripe for transposition to the particular contingencies of the time, a process that transfigured the East through the lens of English politics and vice-versa” (5). In other words, Birchwood explains how the English dramatists, during the Interregnum and Restoration, resort to the Ottomans’ monarchical rule in order to critique the politics of the age: “English fascination with the Orient may be indexed . . . to religious and political anxieties at home” (8). Thus, while Cromwell during the Interregnum was depicted by the Royalists as a tyrant Turkish monarch, King Charles II during the Restoration was depicted by the

Republicans as a despotic Turkish Sultan. This process of projection to the East, according to Birchwood, did not aim to invent the Oriental Turk as the “Other”; rather, it became a place where the warring English political parties could find a safe “transfiguration” to the Ottomans: “it is the aim of this study to trace the development of that transfiguration in the literary-political expression of the period 1640-1685” (5).

Birchwood refers to a state of complex “contradiction” in the perception of Islam in the Interregnum and Restoration England since the oriental Turks were regarded as a “military threat” and “trading partners”:

Herein lies the contradiction. By mid-century, the idea of Islam was a volatile mixture of longstanding anxieties centered upon the Ottoman Empire as a spiritual and military threat, combined with esteem for its cultural and imperial achievements. As much of the source of material for the drama suggests, the figure of the Turk was Janus-faced to an extraordinary degree, being infidel and trading partner, benighted barbarian and custodian of classical wisdom, enemy of Christianity and yet scourge of Catholic Europe. (184)

Even though I do not agree with the notion of ambivalence, anxiety, or “contradiction” in the perception of Islam in Restoration England, Birchwood’s conclusion remains valuable to the heart of this dissertation since it hints at an additional work to be done on other Restoration dramatists like John Dryden: “there is further scope for the work of other dramatists of the period—perhaps most obviously the now canonical authors Behn and Dryden” (186). However, in this dissertation, my analysis of Dryden’s drama and Restoration dramatists does not follow Birchwood’s notions of “transfiguration” nor the theme of “contradiction” of the perception of Islam; rather, it focuses on Restoration

drama's modification of the Renaissance discourse of anxiety, ambivalence, and fear of the oriental Turks and Moors by creating a new discourse of the "cultural renegade."

Even though Birchwood presents valuable historiography that indicate the Interregnum and Restoration England's complex, ambivalent, and tolerant perception of the oriental Turk and Moor, his analysis of the Restoration renegade figure, in the light and context of the Renaissance anxious perception of the renegade and conversion to non-Christian religion, represents another critical confusion between the two different concepts:

To 'turn Turk' in the context of the 1640s did not only encompass literal and figurative defections to the Anti-Christian forces of Pope or Prophet, but came to include political and ideological tergiversation within the emerging domestic conflict. . . . The image of the renegade had always carried connotations of the enemy within and, as religious anxiety concerning the influence of unseen Popish influences mounted, the intensity with which political enemies might be condemned as Turk-like traitors could only increase. (97)

In Birchwood's perspective, the renegade figure in the Interregnum and Restoration England is an accusation through which different English political parties incriminated each other with treason:

Throughout the period under consideration, then, the possibility that Englishmen might literally be turning Turk was an ever-present concern. Meanwhile, in the crisis of allegiance provoked by Civil War, this trope was accorded a newly powerful and complex significance. . . . Depending upon one's point of view, the monarch had himself turned, betraying the religious and constitutional ideals of his Protestant

people. More commonly expressed after the defeat and execution of the king, however, was the belief that the nation had been overrun with 'renegadoes,' traitors who had turned Turk and betrayed England to Cromwell's tyranny. (98)

From my point of view, the process of "transfiguration" as described by Birchwood does not always provide successful and vigorous discussion of the significance of the concept of the Restoration renegade, whom I treat as "cultural renegade," because it ignores the cultural and celebratory value of the term and focuses instead on the negative and anxious connotations, which are peculiar to the Renaissance rather than the Restoration "cultural renegade." Birchwood like Orr, based on Matar's and Vitkus's contributions to the concept of the Renaissance renegade, continues to trace incorrectly the dramatic delineation of the Restoration renegade in the context of the Renaissance uneasiness, misgiving, and suspicion of the term. For example, Birchwood refers to Nabil Matar's contribution of historicizing the western anxiety and perturbation of the renegade phenomenon in early modern drama: "As the work of Nabil Matar has shown, a spate of dramatic texts respond directly to the anxieties aroused by the figure of the renegade by constructing a fantasy of Christian vindication whereby the renegade repents his apostasy or else suffers divine retribution" (96). For Birchwood, the only development which occurred to the perception of the renegade in the Interregnum and Restoration England is the utilization of the term by different English political parties to accuse each other of treason against England during and after the Civil War as noted earlier. Therefore, Birchwood like Orr analyzes Sir William Davenant's The Siege of Rhodes in favor of conversion and transformation from Turkish tyranny to Christian chastity as represented in the character of Solyman, the Turkish Sultan: "In this final confirmation of Solyman's

altered identity, a transformation made all the more absolute by his iconic despotism, the Turkish ruler becomes the apogee of a notionally Christian ideal of kingship, the confluence of reason and compassion, honour and love” (128). As noted earlier, Davenant’s Solyman, whom I treat as a “cultural renegade,” does not convert to any religion nor transforms identities; rather, he, like all “cultural renegades” in the play—namely, Ianthe, Alphonso, and Roxalana—remains simultaneously Christian/Muslim subjects, whose dramatization ushers a newly emergent discourse of “cultural renegade,” Islamic/Christian cultural rapprochement, and deconstruction to the Renaissance anxiety of the renegade figure. In this context, as I posit in this dissertation, the figure of the renegade in Davenant’s play and Restoration drama is a cultural celebration rather than an accusation.

### **Historical Background behind the Evolution of the Restoration “Cultural Renegade”**

England and most of the European countries in the late seventeenth century redefined their political attitude from antagonism and military encounter to strengthening peace and commerce with the Turkish Empire. In his book The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe (2002), Daniel Goffman explains that the decline of the Turkish “military threat” to the west and the preoccupation of Europe over expanding colonies in the New World helped to reevaluate the Western-Turkish relationship in the late seventeenth century: “This Islamic state no longer posed a significant military threat to the rising states of western Europe. Nor were the gazes of these states any longer fixed primarily upon the Mediterranean world, for they had now become aware of the enormous opportunities to exploit the worlds of eastern Asia and the Americas” (222-23).

For example, Europe did not interfere with the war between the Turks and Venice over Candia and the island of Crete despite the latter's supplications to the West for help against the Turks: "Venice not only had to stand alone against an empire . . . but could not even rely upon the neutrality of its fellow Christian states. In 1669, the Republic finally surrendered Candia and the island of Crete passed into the Ottoman hands" (221). That "neutrality" indicated the decline of the significance of holy wars and crusades to the Islamic world, represented by the Turkish Empire, since commerce was more pivotal than military advancement and wars for the welfare of European nations. Therefore, Venice was not able to form another holy league against the Turks as was the case with the Lepanto battle in Renaissance in 1571 when Pope Pius V, who wanted to liberate Cyprus from the Turkish occupation, constituted a league mainly of Catholic powers—Rome, Spain in the time of Phillip II, and Venice—and caused a temporal defeat to the Turks.<sup>10</sup> Moreover, European countries, instead of forming a holy league against the Turks, sided with the Turks against the Venetians: "In the seventeenth century, however, not only was the Ottoman-Venetian conflict regional, but also western European powers supported the Ottomans, whom they might previously have spurned as an Islamic state" (218). The seventeenth century Europe's support to the Turks against the Christian Venice represented a historical reality of the "cultural renegade," whose alliance is not based on religious considerations.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> For more discussion of the Battle of Lepanto, see Andrew Wheatcroft's historical book *Infidels: A History of the Conflict between Christendom and Islam* (New York: Random House, 2003) 4-35.

<sup>11</sup> In this part of the discussion, McKeon's notion of the secularization of the seventeenth-century Europe from "religion" is important to understand that "religion" no longer affected the "politics" of the seventeenth-century Europe. However, McKeon's assertion that the seventeenth-century literature was "autonomous" and isolated from "politics" is problematic to the understanding of the relationship between Charles II's and James II's politics and the Restoration theater's modification of the Renaissance discourse of Orientalism as discussed earlier.

After the collapse of the Turkish military advancement, England during the Restoration period focused on improving its commercial interests and securing the Levant's activities over the Turkish land. In 1661, King Charles II renewed the Levant Charter and gave more authority to its members and promised reformation of its bonds.<sup>12</sup> The King's act of the Levant's renewal and reformation expressed the power of the British merchants in practicing pressure on the political decisions, which served the interest of trade and economic development. For example, in his book The Present State of the Ottoman Empire (1668), Paul Rycout (1629-1700), a British diplomat at Constantinople, urged King Charles II to protect peace relationships with the Turks since a "free and open Trade, and an amicable Correspondence and Friendship with this People" achieved "a most considerable benefit to this Kingdom, and gives employment and livelihood to many thousands of people in *England*; by which also His Majesty without any expense, gains a very considerable increase of His Customs" (Gg, 217). Rycout, who viewed the Turks as commercial allies and no opponent to England, emphasized the defects of waging wars against the Turks since England, which benefited from trade with the Turkish Empire, would lose its commercial foundation, represented by the Levant Company, and many British people would risk their employment:

As a Servant to that Embassie, or the obligations I have to that Worthy Company, cause me to move with the greatest sedulity and devotion possible to promote and advance the Interest of that Trade: And as some study several ways, and prescribe Rules by which a War may be most advantageously managed against the Turk; I, on the contrary, am more inclinable to give my judgment in what manner our Peace

---

<sup>12</sup> For more information about Restoration England's Levant Company, see Alfred C. Wood's A History of the Levant Company (London: Frank Cass & Co., 1964).

and Trade may best be secured and maintained; knowing that so considerable a welfare of our Nation depends upon it, that a few years of Trades interruption in *Turkey* will make all sorts of people sensible of the want of so great a vent of the Commodities of our Country. And therefore as I am obliged to pray for the Glory and Prosperity of His Majesty our gracious Sovereign . . . for the continuance of the Honour of this Embassie in *Turkey*, and the profitable returns of the *Levant* Company. (Gg, 217-18)

The Articles of Peace between the England of King Charles II and James II and the oriental Turks and Moors strengthened the British commerce, resolved the crisis of captivity of British and European merchants in the Mediterranean seas, and constituted a military alliance between England and the oriental Turks and Moors. In the treaty Articles of Peace Between his Sacred Majesty, Charles II King of Great Brittain, France and Ireland, &c. And the City and Kingdom of Algiers; Concluded by Thomas Allen Esq. Admiral of His Said Majesty of Great Brittain's Ships in the Mediterranean Seas, &c. London, Printed by Thomas Mabb, Dwelling on St. Paul's Wharff, 1664, King Charles II, who emphasized the importance of maintaining "Respect and Friendship" with the oriental Turks and Moors, prohibited any "Offence or Injury" to the newly emerging political and commercial oriental Turkish and Moorish allies since the Restoration period ushered reconciliation and British alliance with them:

That from this day, and for ever forward, there be a Good and Firme Peace between his Sacred Majesty the King of Great *Brittain* and the *Bassa, Duan*, and Governours of *Algiers*, and the Dominions thereunto belonging; And the Ships, Subjects, and People on either Party, shall not do or offer any Offence or Injury to each other, but

Treat one another with all possible Respect and Friendship. (B2, 3-4)

The Turkish and Moorish officials pledged to fight side by side with the British against piracy and captivity to the British merchants. For example, in the treaty The Capitulations and Articles of Peace between the Majestie of the King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, and the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire as they have been Augmented, and Altered in the Times of every Ambassadour: And as now lately in the City of Adrianople in the Month of January 1661 they have been Augmented, Renewed, and Amplified with Diverse Additional Articles, and Privileges, which Serve towards the Maintenance of a well Grounded Peace, and Securities of the Trade, and Trafficke of His Majesties Subjects in the Levant by His Excellency Heneage Earle of Winchilsea Embassadour Extraordinary from His Majestie Charles the Second, King of Great Brittain, France, and Ireland to Sultan Mahomet Han the most Puissant Prince, and Emperour of the Turks: Set forth, and Published by Paul Ricaut, Esquire, Secretary to his Excellencie the Lord Embassadour, Printed at Constantinople: by Abraham Gabai, 1663, the Turkish Sultan assured King Charles II and the Levant merchants that the Turks were responsible for fighting piracy: “If the pyrates . . . have robbed, or spoiled their [English merchants’] goods and faculties . . . our ministers shall with all diligence seek out such offendours and severely punish them, and . . . that all such goods, ships, money . . . shall be presently, justly and absolutely restored to them [English merchants]” (A2, 5).

The visit of the Moroccan Ambassador, Kaid Mohammad Ben Hadu, to England in 1682 was one essential factor of developing the character of the “cultural renegade.” The personality of Ben Hadu, who visited the British theaters, Hide-Park, Oxford, Cambridge, and Queen’s College, was a real representation of the cross-cultural, revolutionary and

political activist "cultural renegade," who transcended the limitations of place, religion, and nation and interfaced other cultures without losing his/her religion or culture.<sup>13</sup> Ben Hadu, who was described in The Diary of John Evelyn as "an handsom person, well featur'd, and of a wise looke, subtile, and extreamely Civile" (266), received the admiration of the British society at both the political and popular levels since he infiltrated in the British popular culture, represented by its theaters and universities. In his book Tangier: England's Lost Atlantic Outpost 1661-1684 (1912), E. M. G. Routh explains how the Ambassador and the accompanied delegates of Morocco succeeded to interact with the political and cultural aspects of British society since many British men and women were eager to see the new Moorish phenomenon over the British land:

The Moors now became the fashion of the season; the Ambassador appeared 'at the play, at the Park, at private places, and rides out as often as the weather permits him, and exercises with his lance. He is continually visited by men and women who crowd to him and he receives them all with great affability and according to their quality'. . . . The Ambassdor was so well entertained in England that he stayed for more than six months, seeing a good deal of London, and visiting Windsor, Newmarket, and both Universities. (225)

For some Moorish officials, nevertheless, the Ambassador's cultural openness and admiration by the British culture were misunderstood as signs of conversion to Christianity. Therefore, some of the Moorish opponents of Ben Hadu, who appointed a "spy" to observe his activities in England, accused the Ambassador of converting to Christianity because of his constant appraisal of the British culture:

During his [Ben Hadu's] absence . . . , his rivals for imperial favour, had kept a Jew

---

<sup>13</sup> For more discussion about the Ambassador's visit to London, see chapter four, pp. 259-64.

in England to spy upon his doings, and with the help of a gift of sixty thousand pieces of eight, had succeeded in prejudicing the Emperor against him. . . . Here they [the Ambassador and his comrades] stood in their chains for an hour, before Ismail [Moorish Emperor] deigned even to look them. He then began to abuse them with great violence . . . reproaching them for forgetting their own country and turning to the Christians. (229)

The apprehension of the Moorish Ambassador illustrates that the phenomenon of the “cultural renegade” was confused with the Renaissance concept of the religious renegade since the Ambassador’s rivals did not recognize that a “cultural renegade” praises foreign cultures and religions without losing his/her religion. Therefore, even though the Ambassador of Morocco celebrated the cultural life of England, he remained Muslim. Thus, he was a similar example of the “cultural renegade,” as was dramatized by the Restoration dramatists and entertained by audience at theaters, which the Ambassador attended, as noted earlier.

Also, the appearance of Christian Unitarianism in the late seventeenth century reinforced the concept of the “cultural renegade.” Unlike the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, Islam in Restoration England was reevaluated and redefined from paganism, as was the case in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, to a monotheistic religion like Christianity and Judaism. In his book The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and Its Enemies, 1660-1730 (1992), Justin Champion illustrates the drastic change of England’s perception of Islam since the Middle Ages to the Restoration period: “During the medieval period most of the invective directed against the Moslem religion was based upon false and manipulated information. Islam was treated as a Christian

heresy. . . . The medieval canon was to persist in the popular mind until the Unitarian arguments of the late seventeenth century” (104). The Unitarians’ or the Socinians’ writings praised Islam and its Prophet and corrected many medieval and Renaissance stereotypes about Islam. For example, in his Brief History of the Unitarians, Called also Socinians (1687), Stephen Nye (1648-1719), a Unitarian, corrected, as noted by Champion, the stereotypical accusation that Islam was spread by force: “Mahomet’s success in converting Asia, Africa and part of Europe was not to be attributed to the force of arms but to ‘that one truth in the Alkoran, the unity of God’” (qtd. in Champion 110). Also, in his book An Account of the Rise and Progress of Mahometanism with the Life of Mahomet: And a Vindication of him and his Religion from the Calumnies of the Christians (1671-1676), Henry Stubbe (1632-1676) praised Islam, Prophet Mohammad, and the Holy Koran since the teachings of Islam emphasize rationality and monotheism: “I was asked . . . whether the Alcoran as it is of its self had so much in it as to work anything upon a rational belief? I said yes” (158). Stubbes, who accused medieval and Renaissance Christian theologians of falsifying many misconceptions about Islam and its Prophet, insisted on deconstructing these stereotypes:

Having in the preceding Chapter exposed and confuted several of the Errors and falsities publish'd by the Christians concerning Mahomet and his Religion, which . . . were greedily swallowed by the fond credulity of those Ages and handed down as authentic without being in the least questioned till within these last hundred years, I shall now proceed to give an Account as different from theirs as truth from falsehood, of several matters to which these stories of theirs relate. (156)

Just as the Ambassador of Morocco was accused of converting to Christianity due to his appraisal of the British culture, Unitarians were similarly attacked by the followers of the Church of England since the Unitarians' unprecedented estimation of Islam was viewed as a sign of betraying the teachings of the Church of England and converting to Islam. For example, in his Socinian Controversy Discussed, which was composed of different letters in 1694 and 1697, Charles Leslie (1650-1722) called the Unitarians "as scouts amongst us for Mahomet" since they can "in no propriety be called Christians; that they are more Mahometans than Christians and far greater enemies to Christianity than the Mahometans" (qtd. in Champion 113). Similarly, in his Socinian Creed, John Edwards (1637-1716) incriminated Unitarians that they were in "mere complacency with those infidels" (qtd. in Champion 111). Edwards in his Socinianism Unmasked charged John Locke (1632-1704), a Unitarian, with conversion to Islam: "It is likely I shall further exasperate this author when I desire the reader to observe that this lank faith of his is in a manner no other than the faith of a Turk" (qtd. in Champion 111). In his book A Seventeenth-Century Defender of Islam: Henry Stubbe (1632-76) and His Book (1972), P. M. Holt contextualizes the radical position of Unitarians and Henry Stubbe in particular in their opposition to the Church of England's orthodox views of Islam: "The writer defends, not a weak sect which, however radical and unconventional, was Christian in its origins and inspiration, but the powerful Muslim community and its Prophet, whom for a millennium Christians had viewed as a precursor of Antichrist" (28).

Also, some representatives of Unitarians welcomed the Ambassador of Morocco and attempted to submit to him Unitarian writings, which called for religious reconciliation between Islam and Christianity: "A 'cabal of Socinians in London' took

the opportunity to attempt to present the Moroccan ambassador with an address of theological unity” (110 Champion). According to Champion, the Unitarian representatives, who wanted to affirm to the Ambassador that both Islam and Christianity call for worshiping the same God, denominated the Ambassador as:

A representative of the ‘fellow worshippers of that sole supreme Deity of the Almighty Father and Creator.’ Although the Epistle admitted that there were differences between Unitarianism and Islam the work insisted that they shared the necessary common truth in accepting ‘the religion of an only one Godhead’ which brought them to a closer fraternity with each other. (111)

Unitarians, in this sense, functioned as real representation of “cultural renegades” because they praised Islam and its Prophet without losing their Christian faith. Their radical argument broke the Middle Ages and Renaissance religious rigidity towards Islam and revolutionized scholarly research beyond the control of the Church of England.

The religious and political anxiety of the power of the oriental Turks and Moors hampered the evolution of the concept of the “cultural renegade” in the Renaissance. In his book The Generall Historie of the Turkes from the First Beginning of that Nation to the Rising of the Ottoman Familie: With all the Notable Expeditions of the Christians Princes against them. Together with the Lives and Conquests of the Othoman Kings and Emperours Faithfullie collected out of the best Histories, both Ancient and Moderne, and Digested into one Continuat Historie Until this Present Year 1603, Richard Knolles (1545-1610), the first English Renaissance historian and author of the Turkish affairs, compared allegorically the power of the Turkish Empire to the fierce and “greedie lyon”: “the Turke, who like a greedie lyon lurking in his den, lay in wait for them [conquered

nations] all” (To the Reader). Knolles lamented the weakness of Christian countries, whose disunity and dissention enabled the Turkish “lion” to “devour” them:

They [Christian countries] have ever and even yet at this time are so divided among themselves with endless quarrels, partly for questions of religion . . . , partly for matters touching their own proper state and sovereignty, and that with such distrust and implacable hatred, that they never could as yet . . . join their common forces against the commonemie [the Turk]: but turning their weapons one upon another and . . . opened away for him to devour them one after another. (To the Reader)

Thus, Knolles’s notion of the Turkish fierce and “greedie lyon” circulates in selected Renaissance plays—William Shakespeare’s Othello (1604), John Mason’s The Turke (1607), and Robert Daborne’s A Christian Turned Turk (1612). In Shakespeare’s Othello, Iago, who does not accept the conversion and “baptism” (2. 3. 317) of Othello for racial bias, extends the use of the notion of the fierce “lion” to designate not only the Turks but also the Moors. In the play, Iago, who urges Cassio to seek Othello’s forgiveness, compares Othello to an “imperious lion”:

What, man, there  
are more ways to recover the general again. You [Cassio] are but now  
cast in his [Othello’s] mood—a punishment more in policy than in mal-  
ice, even so as one would beat his offenceless dog to affright an  
imperious lion [emphasis added]. Sue to him again, and he’s yours. (II.iii.253-57)

For Iago, Othello’s “punishment” of Cassio is not motivated by malicious intent; rather, it is a political intimidation and “public example” to other soldiers to fear the Moorish

leader, Othello, the “imperious lion.”<sup>14</sup> In John Mason’s The Turke (1607), the Turk, Mulleasses, who enthrones and dethrones Christian princess and enforces his imperial love to Julia, Duchess of Florence, resembles himself to a fierce “lyon”: “Now me thinks I stand / Like a proud Lyon [emphasis added] with a richer prize” (V. iii. 2292-93). Mason’s play depicts the disunity of Christian countries, which I think is represented by the quarrels between the Duke of Ferrara and Duke of Venice over the love of Julia, who represents Christendom. In other words, the play reflects upon Knolles’ notion of Christian countries’ warring among themselves over the “sovereignty” of the West, while ironically “Cyprus,” as noted by the character of Eunuchus, is still under the Turkish domination. Furthermore, in Robert Daborne’s A Christian Turned Turk (1612), Ward, a British renegade in Tunis, describes his conversion from Christianity to Islam as: a “lamb is turned a lion” (Scene 13, 163). Ward’s allegorical commentary of the Turkish “lion” explains the material success and self-reliance, which he receives from the Turkish Empire, which, unlike his country, England, promotes him to high positions and wealth for his conversion. Ward laments the restraints and complexities he finds in his country, England, where poverty and marginalization impede self-realization and progress: “My name is scandalled? What is one island [England]/ Compared to the Eastern monarchy? This large, / Unbounded station shall speak my future fame” (Scene 7, 181-83). Also, Ferdinand, a French merchant captive, refers to the impotency of resisting the power of the Turkish “lion”: “We must, as did that captain, so much famed, / Lick the fierce lion’s [emphasis added] feet till happier times / Do give us freedom in his punished crimes” (Scene 1, 107-09).

---

<sup>14</sup> See the Walter Cohen (editor of the play) footnote, which explains these lines: “dismissed in anger—a matter of policy (of public example)” p. 2147.

The Restoration theater was not isolated from the politics of change in the later seventeenth century towards the oriental Turks and Moors, with whom King Charles II and James II signed peace treaties and warned the English public of violating the terms of “Respect and Friendship,” which the British, Turkish, and Moorish officials undertook to maintain. For example, in the royal pamphlet By the King, A Proclamation Touching the Articles of Peace with Argiers, Tunis, and Tripoli, London: Printed by John Bill and Christopher Barker, Printers to the Kings most Excellent Majesty, 1662, King Charles II ordered a severe “punishment” to the breakers of the Peace Articles: “Articles Of Peace . . . be by all his Majesties Subjects of what degree or quality so ever, observed and performed, upon pains of the most severe punishments due to the contemnners of his Majesties Commands, and violators of Publick faith.” Also, James II renewed the same bonds of prohibition and punishment to the infringement of the Articles of Peace. In the peace treaty Articles of Peace and Commerce between the most Serene and Mighty Prince James II by the Grace of God, King of Great Britain, France and Ireland, Defender of the Christian Faith. And the most Illustrious Lords, the Douletli Basha, Aga and Governours of the Famous City and Kingdom of Algiers in Barbary: Ratified and Confirmed by Sir William Soame Baroner, His Majesties Ambassador to the Grand Signior, on the Fifth of April, Old Style, 1686. Published by His Majesties Command. Printed by Thomas Newcomb in the Savoy. 1687, King James II commanded that the violators to be punished without affecting the validity of the Articles of Peace between England and the oriental Turks and Moors: “if the Fault was committed by any Private Subjects of either Party, they alone shall be punished as Breakers of the Peace, and Disturbers of the Public Quiet” (C, 18).

Therefore, the Restoration theater's dramatization of the phenomenon of the "cultural renegade"—that is, the "Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist"—maintained the royal authority of the "discursive statement," in Foucault's terminology, of "Respect and Friendship" with the Turks and Moors. For example, in William Davenant's The Siege of Rhodes (Parts 1/2) (1656-1663), Solyman the Magnificent, the Turkish Sultan, embodies the principles of the "cultural renegade" since he celebrates the Christian valor of the Rhodian knights and grants Turkish citizenship to the Christian Ianthe, wife of Alphonso, who in turn celebrates Islamic culture. In John Dryden's The Conquest of Granada (Parts 1/2) (1672), Almanzor, a Christian knight brought up over the Moorish land, is another figure of a "cultural renegade" since he celebrates both Christian and Islamic cultures and falls in love with the Muslim heroine, Almahide. In Dryden's An Evening's Love (1668), both the Christian Wildblood and Jacinta, a Moorish heroine, act as "cultural renegades" since their love reconciles East and West and moves beyond religious prejudice. In Dryden's Amboyna (1673), the virtuous love between Towerson, a British captain, and Ysabinda, a citizen of Amboyna in the East, is a dramatic example of the "cultural renegade." In Dryden's Don Sebastian (1689), John Dryden turns a Muslim Orient since his personal life, as a Catholic convert in Protestant England, resembles the dramatic plot of the "cultural renegade" Dorax, a Christian Portuguese, who resorts to the Moorish land to seek justice after being dismissed in Portugal. In Henry Neville Payne's The Siege of Constantinople (1675), the "cultural renegade" Thomazo maintains friendship with the Turkish Sultan, who in turn, expresses impressive gratitude to the valor of the Christian hero. Thus, in all of these plays, the

“cultural renegade” never quits his/her religion in the literal sense; rather, he/she transcends religious prejudice to interface other cultures and religions.

### **Restoration Drama’s Deconstruction of the Renaissance Identification with the Greco-Roman Imperial Past**

Just as Restoration dramatists revised and modified the Renaissance discourse of the religious renegade by introducing a newly emergent discourse of the “cultural renegade,” defined throughout this dissertation as the “Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist,” they also deconstruct the Renaissance mystification of the Greco-Roman imperial past. Whereas the Renaissance idealized and adopted the Greco-Roman cultural and political heritage, the Restoration, represented by the drama of John Dryden, demystified and disparaged identification with the imperial mission of the Greco-Roman past. The notion of the Renaissance “revival” and identification with the Greco-Roman past has been well-established by many modern scholars—for example, in his book The Renaissance, the Reformation, and the Rise of Nations (2005), Andrew C. Fix refers to the Renaissance mystification of the Greco-Roman legacy: “Italian intellectuals saw the era of ancient Greece and Rome as a golden age of civilization, as a great period of culture. . . . That they could improve their society by returning to the golden age of antiquity” (41). Also in his historical book, The Renaissance in Rome (1985), Charles L. Stinger elucidates that Pope Julius II, who was perceived as “the second Julius Caesar” (12), was ambitious to inherit the imperial role of the Roman Empire to expand the authority of the Roman Church: “As heir to the civilizing achievements of the Roman Empire—and destined to surpass them in universality—renewed Rome and the restored Roman Church could find only in the classicism of

imperial Rome the forms suitable to express these overarching ambitions” (11). It is significant to examine whether Restoration drama, as represented by John Dryden’s drama, continued the same Renaissance glorification of the Greco-Roman imperial past or not. Also, it is important to explore the chronological coincidence between Dryden’s modification of the Renaissance anxious perception of the renegade, Restoration England’s Articles of peace, which emphasized “Respect and Friendship” with the oriental Turks and Moors as noted earlier, and Dryden’s condemnation of the Greco-Roman dramatic colonization of the East (Egypt and Troy) as represented by his plays—All for Love (1678), which adapts William Shakespeare’s Antony and Cleopatra (1607), Tyrannick Love (1669), and Troilus and Cressida (1679), which adapts William Shakespeare’s Troilus and Cressida (1602).

Returning to Birchwood’s valuable recommendation for “further” study of Dryden’s works, which he does not tackle in his book, in the light of the complex perception of Islam in Restoration England, I notice that there is still another aspect of critical confusion among modern scholarship to read Restoration drama as a continuation of the Renaissance fascination with the Roman imperial heritage. For example, Bridget Orr argues that Restoration England celebrates “implicit” identification with the Roman imperial Past and an “explicit” glorification of the “the English inheritance of the *translatio imperii*” of the Romans “after 1688” (259), which was the date of the Glorious Revolution. Orr does not determine Dryden’s use of the Roman imperial past other than his adaptation to the Shakespearean plays contributed to the “establishment of a national canon” (258). In this dissertation, I argue that Dryden’s adaptation to the Shakespearean plays—namely, All for Love and Troilus and Cressida—along with his play Tyrannick

Love corresponded with the politics of King Charles II and James II of establishing new discourse of “Respect and Friendship,” as mentioned in the Articles of Peace, since these plays depict the tyranny and hypocrisy of the Greco-Roman colonization of the East, as represented by Egypt in All for Love and Tyrannick Love, and Troy in Troilus and Cressida. Dryden’s odium of the Greco-Roman colonization of the East does not hide an implicit nor ambivalent lure to the Roman civilizing mission; rather, he repudiates Restoration England to be heir of the Roman empire as was the case in the Renaissance.

### **John Dryden and the Deconstruction of the Renaissance Anxiety of the Notion of the “Trojan Turk”**

Just as Restoration dramatists like Sir William Davenant, John Dryden, and Henry Neville Payne modified and excluded the Renaissance discourse of anxiety of the religious renegade by introducing the “cultural renegade”—that is, the “Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist,” Restoration drama as represented by John Dryden’s drama disenchanting Renaissance mystification and identification with the Roman imperial legacy. In this part of the discussion, it is also important to examine how Dryden deconstructed the Renaissance anxiety of acknowledging the Turks as the descendants of the Trojans or what Margaret Meserve in her historical book, Empires of Islam in Renaissance Historical Thought (2008), calls the “theory of the Turks’ Trojan ancestry” (16). Meserve’s book introduces valuable Renaissance historiography, which demonstrates the Renaissance aversion to acknowledge the Turks as descendants of the Trojans but as “barbarians from Scythia” (16). As demonstrated by Meserve, the military power of the Turkish Empire caused the “Turkish ‘problem’” for Renaissance “humanists,” who reduced the Turks to savages rather than “Trojans”:

But even as they expressed interest in and alarm at the formidable efficiency of Turkish military, political, and religious culture, European authors voiced their strongest concern over a much more basic element of the Turkish character as they saw it: an inborn ferocity which seemed to propel the Turks to acts of barbarous cruelty and violence unprecedented in human memory. Such savagery also placed them firmly outside the family of historically civilized nations. Trojans or otherwise. (65)

Based on Meserve's historical argument of the notion of the "Trojan Turk" as represented in Renaissance historical narratives, I trace the concept of the "Trojan Turk" in Restoration fictional narrative as represented by John Dryden's Troilus and Cressida, which adapts Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida (1602). Dryden, dismantling the Renaissance anxiety of the notion of the "Trojan Turks," acknowledges and celebrates the virtuous Trojan heroes and heroines as part of the East, rather than "outside the family of historically civilized nations" as Meserve observes in Renaissance context. Dryden's versions of the virtuous Cressida and Troilus indicate that Restoration England's discourse of Orientalism no longer accepts misrepresentation or anxiety to the East, of which the oriental Turks and Moors were part.

### **Summary of Chapters**

Chapter one, "The Western Anxiety of the Oriental 'Lion' in the Writings of the Renaissance," analyzes the circulation of the discursive statements of Knolles's notion of the fierce and "greedie lyon" and the rejection of the religious renegade, as represented in Renaissance selected plays—William Shakespeare's Othello (1604), John Mason's The Turke (1607), and Robert Daborne's A Christian Turned Turk (1612). This chapter

includes many Renaissance historiographies, which reflect on the effect of the imperial expansion of the Turkish Empire and the Moorish kingdom on the Renaissance dramatization of the oriental Turk and Moor.

Chapter two, “The Concept of the ‘Cultural Renegade’ in Restoration Drama,” introduces the religious and political historical background behind the emergence of the phenomenon of the “Cultural Renegade”—or what I call the “Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist” in Restoration selected drama— Alphonso, Solyman, Ianthe, and Roxolana in William Davenant’s The Siege of Rhodes (Parts 1/2) (1656-1663), Almanzor and Almahide in John Dryden’s The Conquest of Granada (Parts 1/2) (1672), Wildblood and Donna Jacinta in Dryden’s An Evening’s Love (1668), Dorax in Dryden’s Don Sebastian (1689), Towerson and Ysabinda in Dryden’s Amboyna (1673), and Thomazo in Henry Neville Payne’s The Siege of Constantinople (1675)—which deconstructs the Renaissance concept of the religious renegade.

Chapter three, “The Greco-Roman Perception in Renaissance and Restoration Thought,” uses a Post-Colonial Theory to examine Restoration England’s modification and demystification of the Renaissance discourse of fascination with the Greco-Roman imperial legacy. The resonance between the Greco-Roman literature, glories and imperial expansion and the Renaissance aspiration to revive the classical empire was deconstructed by Restoration England, as represented by Dryden’s selected plays—namely, All for Love (1678), which adapts William Shakespeare’s Antony and Cleopatra (1607); Tyrannick Love (1669); and Troilus and Cressida (1679), which adapts William Shakespeare’s Troilus and Cressida (1602). Also, the notion of the “Trojan Turk,” which

was rejected by Renaissance historiography, is acknowledged and celebrated in Dryden's Troilus and Cressida (1679).

Chapter four, "The Archaeological Transformation of the Discourse of Orientalism in Restoration Politics and Culture," analyzes the notion of Orientalism in Restoration England, based on Foucault's analysis of discourse, as a discourse of transformation and modification, rather than of fixity and unchangeability. While this chapter discusses Foucault's notion of discourse and discourse mechanism in his theoretical works—"What is an Author," "The Order of Discourse," The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language, and Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison—this study emphasizes the effect of the politics of King Charles II and James II of "Respect and Friendship," as represented in the Articles of Peace with the oriental Turks and Moors and on the production of the discourse of the "cultural renegade" upon the Restoration stage. The Restoration discourse of the "cultural renegade" modified, transformed and excluded previous antagonistic discursive statements about the oriental Turk and Moor in Renaissance. The drama of John Dryden and Sir William Davenant, who performed the function of the "founders of discursivity," in Foucault's terminology, influenced the drama of other Restoration dramatists such as Elkanah Settle, whose plays The Empress of Morocco (1673) and The Heir of Morocco (1673) imitate the discursive rules of dramatizing the "cultural renegade," as established by Dryden and Davenant.

**CHAPTER ONE**  
**THE WESTERN ANXIETY OF THE ORIENTAL “LION” IN THE WRITINGS**  
**OF THE RENAISSANCE**

This chapter, while discussing the image of the Oriental Turk and Moor in Renaissance drama, aims to introduce the historical background behind the stereotypical and hostile depiction of the Oriental Turk and Moor and the character of the Renegade in Renaissance drama and historiography. At the heart of this chapter are the realizations that both Renaissance and Restoration periods were interrelated in their representation of the Oriental Turk, Moor, and the renegade on the stage and that those depictions differ significantly in the two periods. Whereas Renaissance drama, embodied in plays like William Shakespeare’s Othello (1604), John Mason’s The Turke (1607), and Robert Daborne’s A Christian Turned Turk (1612), constructs the image of the Oriental Turk and Moor as a terroristic “greedie lyon,” in Richard Knolles’ terminology”, and the renegade as a treacherous miscreant “religious renegade”, who prefers one religion and culture over the other as noted earlier in the introduction, the Restoration drama deconstructs such stereotypical and anxious depiction in celebrating instead the “cultural renegade” or what I call the “Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist”—a cross-cultural, revolutionary and political activist, who transcends the limitations of place, religion, and nation and interfaces other cultures without losing his/her religion or culture. Moreover, the analytical approach of the study focuses more on the politics of the age and the exploitation of religion—Islam and Christianity—for political ends.

Richard Knolles, in his book The Generall Historie of the Turkes from the First Beginning of that Nation to the Rising of the Ottoman Familie: With all the Notable

Expeditions of the Christians Princes against them. Together with the Lives and Conquests of the Othoman Kings and Emperours Faithfullie Collected out of the best Histories, both Ancient and Modern, and Digested into one Continuat Historie Until this Present Year 1603, referred to the threat and terror of the Ottoman Empire to the West and Christendom. In his preface “To the Reader,” he pointed out that the Ottoman Empire “holdeth all the rest of the world in scorn, thundering out nothing but still bloud and warre, with a full persuasion in time to rule over all, presiding unto itself no other limits than uttermost bounds of the earth, from the rising of the Sun unto the going down of the same” (“To the Reader”). Knolles described the imperial ambition of the Turks in conquering Christendom and enslaving “many millions of the poor oppressed Christians” as a fierce and “greedie lyon [emphasis added] lurking in his den, lay[ing] in wait for them all” (“To the Reader”).

This gruesome portrait of the Turks reflected the western consternation towards the growing power of the Ottoman Empire during the Renaissance. Suleiman the Magnificent, reigning from 1520-1566, represented the peak of the Ottoman Empire’s universal mission of uniting the entire world under the rule of the Turks. In his book The Ottoman Centuries: The Rise and Fall of the Turkish Empire (1977), Lord Kinross compares the imperial aspiration of Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent to conquer the whole world to the imperial quest of “Alexander the Great”: “Immersing himself in the story of Alexander the Great, it became Suleiman’s ambition to unite, as Iskander had sought to do, the lands and peoples of East and West. In pursuit of a comparable world empire, he would penetrate far beyond the present Ottoman fringe of eastern Europe, right into the heart of central Europe itself” (175). The notion of the Turkish fierce

“lyon,” in Knolles’s description, became evident when Suleiman’s imperial ambitions were realized as the city of Belgrade and the Island of Rhodes fell to Turkish dominance. Because the Turkish artillery and gunpowder were the “best in the world,” the Island of Rhodes could not stand the Turkish long siege of 145 days and underground mine explosions, which resulted in the Rhodian knights leaving the island under the permission of Suleiman in 1523.<sup>15</sup>

The conquest of Cyprus in 1571 again reverberated the bells of danger throughout Christendom. The Turkish Sultan, Selim II (1566-1574), son of Suleiman the Magnificent, not quitting the policy of the Turkish “lion,” persisted in the path of his father and resolved to capture Cyprus by the Turkish doom. The defenders of the Island could not endure the power of the Turkish army, led by Lala Mustafa, who severely persecuted the governor, Bragadino:

Bound in chains, then forced to stretch out his [Bragadino’s] neck while Mustafa, so it was asserted, cut off his right ear and his nose. After ... refusing conversion to Islam, he was flayed alive. His body was dismembered and displayed for all to see. Then on Mustafa’s orders his skin was cured, stuffed with straw, and carried through the city on the back of a cow. (Kinross 266)

Such appalling torture not only terrified the city’s inhabitants but also warned Christendom of possible future invasion and havoc. The Venetian Conte Nestore Martinengo in his pamphlet, The True Report of all the Success of Famagosta, of the Antique Writers Called Tamassus, a City in Cyprus in which the Whole Order of all the Skirmishes, Batteries, Mines, and Assaults Given to the Said Fortress, may Plainly

---

<sup>15</sup> For more information about the Turkish siege of the Island of Rhodes, see Lord Kinross’s The Ottoman Centuries: The Rise and Fall of the Turkish Empire (New York: Morrow Quill Paperbacks, 1977) 176-79.

Appear. Moreover the Names of the Captains, and the Number of the People Slain, as well of the Christians as of the Turks: Likewise of them who were Taken Prisoners: From the Beginning of the Said Siege until the End of the Same. Englished out of Italian by William Malim. With Certain Notes of his and Expositions of all the Turkish Words herein Necessary to be Known, Placed in the Margent, with a Short Description also of his of the Same Iland, Imprinted at London: By John Daye, An. 1572, revealed the ferocity of the Turks in assaulting Cyprus, which was defeated by the sixth assault when Famagusta finally surrendered to the power of the Turkish leader, Mustafa in 1571.<sup>16</sup> The English translator, William Malim, dedicated the translated pamphlet to the Earl of Leicester to “remember the loss of those 3 notable islands to the great discomfort of all Christendom, to those Hellish Turks” by “the barbarous Mahometittes,” being the “ancient professed enemies to all Christian religion” (“Dedicatory”). Martinengo, who took part in the defense against the Turks, numbered the large numbers of the Turkish soldiers at “200 thousand persons of all sorts and qualities” because “Mustafa had distributed a rumour, through the Turks Dominion, that Famagosta was much more wealthy and rich” (F.iii, 15).

According to Martinengo, the Turkish leader, Mustafa, was hypocritical when he broke his “promise” of safe deliverance of the Venetian noble-men, leaders and captives because Mustafa humiliated the governor, Bragadino, by “forc[ing] him to kiss the ground . . . to show him to all the Christian soldiers and slaves.” The governor was finally “cruelly flayed quick . . . recommending his soul into almighty God” (F.ii, 14). The

---

<sup>16</sup> Conte Nestore Martinengo’s pamphlet was translated from Italian into many European Languages: French, German, and English. The Original Italian title is L’ Assedio et Presa di Famagosta, which was published in Verona in 1572 and was translated into English by William Malim as the title indicates. For more information, see Robert Ralston Cawley’s “George Gascoigne and the Siege of Famagusta.” Modern Language Notes, vol. 43, No.5 (May, 1928), 26 December 2009 <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2914136>>.

Venetian writer, Martinengo, related this story of captivity in order to demonstrate the truth of his report that he was victimized by the cruelty of the Turks and to illustrate the tribulation of the Christian captives over the Turkish lands. In his report, Martinengo listed many noble-men and leaders who fell to the cruel slavery of the Turks. He explained how Providence was the reason behind his escape from the Turkish slavery when he paid “500 Zechins” as “ransom” (F.iii, 15) for his deliverance and was carried on a “French ship called Santo Vittor” (F.iii, 16). In this sense, the fall of Cyprus in 1571 constituted a warning to the West and widely disseminated the growing danger of the Turks, since Martinengo’s report was translated into many European languages.

The Battle of Lepanto in 1571 was in part a temporal success to fend off the Turks. The conquest of Cyprus warned Christendom of the necessity of forming a holy league against the Turks. Dorothy M. Vaughan, in her book Europe and the Turk: A Pattern of Alliances 1350-1700, explains how “Venice . . . refused a demand for its [Cyprus’s] cession and appealed for help to Spain, as the chief naval power of Christendom and to the Pope as its head” (157). Pope Pius V constituted a league mainly of Catholic powers—Rome, Spain in the time of Phillip II, and Venice. Protestant England, during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, was excluded from the League because Pope Pius V “was about to declare excommunica[tion]” to Queen Elizabeth when England was “disqualified for an invitation” (Vaughan 157). Also, Pius chose the famous Christian leader, Don John of Austria, to lead the league, who was “aged 24, fresh from his triumph over the Moriscoes” (Vaughan 159). The huge naval power of the Christian league, “over 200 vessels, of which about half were Venetian and a third Spanish,” caused severe damage to the Turkish navy and led to the capture of many Turks (159). For many

historians, the Battle of Lepanto was the last Christian crusade against the Muslims. Daniel Goffman, in his book The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe (2002), comments on the futility of waging subsequent holy crusades against the Turks since even the Battle of Lepanto did not achieve its goals in rooting out the Turkish Empire:

The fact remains in subsequent years the victors were not to press their advantage, and that this great achievement did not goad the alliance of Catholic states forward. Indeed, Lepanto terminated the making of holy leagues against the ‘Turks’ (although not aspirations to do so), and in fact constituted the last great naval encounter between Christian and Muslim powers. It may be seen as proof that ‘control of the seas’ was an impossibility (and perhaps not even a strategy) in the age of the galleys. (161)

Not only did the Catholic holy league not liberate Cyprus from the Turkish dominance, but also the Turkish navy was rebuilt soon afterwards: “In the following spring the state launched an armada that, symbolically perhaps, was said to have reproduced exactly the number and draft of ships lost” (Goffman 161). In other words, the holy league could not stop the imperial ambitions of the Turks from conquering Christendom. As Andrew Wheatcroft observes in his book Infidels: A History of the Conflict between Christendom and Islam (2003), the Turks did not lament the loss in Lepanto because “it was not the Ottoman tradition to make a lasting memorial out of victory or to chasten themselves with the remembrance of defeat. Triumph or catastrophe were in the hands of God” (31). When Venice eventually ceded Cyprus to the Turks, the Turkish Grand Vezir, Sokollu, underestimated the Christian victory in Lepanto because it was only temporal: “In wresting Cyprus from you, we have deprived you of an arm; in

defeating our fleet, you have only shaved our beard. An arm when cut off cannot grow again; but a shorn beard will grow all the better for the razor” (qtd. in Wheatcroft 31).

The news of victory was celebrated all through Europe despite the fact that the battle did not greatly diminish Turkish power. Sermons of praise, prayers, poems and bonfires were evident not only in the European Catholic countries, which participated in the holy league, but also in countries which did not join in the league such as France and England.<sup>17</sup> John Foxe’s sermon, “The Sermon of Christ Crucified, Preached at Paules Crosse the Friday Before Easter, Commonly Called Goodfryday Written and Dedicated to all such as Labour and be Heavy Laden in Conscience, to be Read for their Spiritual Comfort/ By John Foxe; Newly Recognized by the Author. At London: Imprinted by John Day, over Aldersgate, 1570,” illustrated the dilemma of the Turkish and Roman Catholic animosity toward the Protestant England and Scotland at the time of Queen Elizabeth I. The preacher, John Foxe, considered both Turks and Catholics as enemies to England. Even though John Foxe prayed for the annihilation of the Turkish Empire, which threatened Christendom, he also prayed for Christ to hinder the Papists’ conspiracies and plots against Protestant England and Queen Elizabeth. He started his prayer by evoking the danger of the Turks and the destruction of their empire:

Much need of thy gracious help. First the Turke to his sword, what lands, nations, and countries, what empires, kingdoms, and provinces, with Cities innumerable,

---

<sup>17</sup> Charles IX of France did not support the holy league against the Turks because he was afraid of Spain’s imperial ambitions and power after the defeat of the Turks and of Spanish support of the Catholic Guises against him. For more information, see Dorothy M. Vaughan’s Europe and the Turk: A Pattern of Alliances 1350-1700, p.157. Also, for more information about Europe’s revels of victory and England in particular, see Samuel G. Chew’s The Crescent and the Rose: Islam and England during the Renaissance (1937; repr., New York: Octagon Books, 1965) 125-30. Also, see Lord Kinross’s The Ottoman Centuries: The Rise and Fall of the Turkish Empire, 270-71. For more discussion on the history of Lepanto, see Andrew Wheatcroft’s Infidels: A History of the Conflict between Christendom and Islam (New York: Random House, 2003) 4-35.

hath he wonne, not from us, but from thee. . . . There now reign barbarous Mahumet in his filthy Alcoran. . . . In all Asian and Africa, thy Church hath not one foot of free land, but all is turned either to infidelity, or to captivity. . . . Now in Europe a great part also is shrunk from thy Church. All Thracia with the Empire of Constantinople, all Grecia, Epyrus, Illyricum, and now of late all the Kingdom almost of Hungaria, with much of Austria, with lamentable slaughter of Christian blood is wasted and all become Turks. (I.ii)

Foxe seemed reluctant to celebrate the power of the Catholic Holy League against the Turks because the Catholics were still enemies of Protestant England. Foxe realized that the Catholic Holy League might wage yet another devastating war against England and the Protestants, especially since the Pope had declined their participation in the Holy League against the Turks. That exclusion of England was clear evidence for Foxe that Protestant English had two enemies: the “sword” of the Turk and the errant theology of the Catholics. Foxe pointed out, “for the Turk with his sword is not so cruel, but the Bishop of Rome on the other side is more fierce and bitter against us. . . . His considerates conspire our destruction, setting kings against their subjects, and subjects disloyally to rebel against their princes” (I.iii). Therefore, Foxe attributed the disunity among Christians and the power of the Turk as the works of Satan: “Such dissension and hostility Satan hath set amongst us, that Turks be not more enemies to Christians, than Christians to Christians, Papists to Protestants” (I.iii).

Even though Foxe considered the “Papists” more dangerous than the Turks, he still defined them as “Christians,” whereas he dismissed the Turks as infidels and pagans. The notion of the infidelization of the Turks by not calling them Muslims is addressed by

Bernard Lewis, in his book Islam and the West (1993): “Europeans in various parts of the continent showed a curious reluctance to call the Muslims by any name with a religious connotation, preferring rather to call them by ethnic names, the obvious purpose of which was to diminish their stature and significance and to reduce them to something local or even tribal” (7). This process of alienating Muslims from any religious affiliation further demonstrates the Western anxiety during the Renaissance towards the powerful Turks, since the reception of Islam in the Renaissance was associated with the image of their power and might: “Europeans called the Muslims Saracens, Moors, Turks, or Tartars, according to which of the Muslim peoples they had encountered. ‘Turk,’ the name of by far the most powerful and important of the Muslim states, even became a synonym for Muslim, and a convert to Islam was said to have ‘turned Turk’” (Lewis 7).

King James VI of Scots wrote a poem about the Battle of Lepanto, which was later published as “His Majesties Lepanto, or Heroicall Song being Part of his Poetical Exercises at Vacant Hours. Imprinted at London: By Simon Stafford, and Henry Hooke, 1603,” which praises the Christian victory of the Lepanto against the infidel Turks. Again, in his “Author’s Preface to the Reader,” King James, as a Protestant, expressed his dilemma of praising a Catholic victory over the Turks: “And for that I know the special thing misliked in it, is, that I should seem far contrary to my degree and Religion, like a mercenary Poet, to pen a work . . . in praise of a foreign Papist bastard” (A2). In this context, King James VI, like John Foxe, wavered in his view that the Catholic triumph over the Turks was an authentic Christian victory or not. However, King James resolved the contradiction by shedding light on the heroic aspects of the victory symbolized by the character of Don John and celebrated, in turn, the victory as a holy crusade against the

pagan Turks: “I name not Don-John, neither literally nor any ways by description, which I behaved to have done, if I had penned the whole poem in his praise” (A3).

Moreover, King James showed discretion in not bestowing excessive praise on ordinary men; however, he rationalized the commendation due to the importance of the victory and the valor of Don John; thus, King James wanted only to “speak the truth of him [Don John]. For as it becomes not the honour of my estate, like a hireling, to pen the praise of any man” (A3). The poet—no less than King James himself—invokes the “holy Spirit” as his “Muse” (line 21) in guiding him “to magnify thy [God’s] name” (24). King James’s poem fastens a kind of holy crusade import to the Battle of Lepanto, which he sings as a “wondrous worke of God” (1) fought “Betwixt the Baptiz’d race, / And circumcised Turband Turkes” (10-11). The poet, on the one hand, always associates Turks and Satan, and on the other God and Christians. God’s tutelage to the Christians was the main factor behind the victory: “No more shall now these Christians be / With Infidels opprest” (81-82). King James refers to the event of the western churches’ prayers for the salvation and deliverance of the city of Cyprus from the “Mahometists” (143): Turks “Had moov’d each Christian King, / To make their Churches pray for their / Relief in everything” (150-52). Because the notions of “Mohamet” as god and Muslims as “Muhametans” were prevalent in the Middle Ages and lasted into the Renaissance, King James adopted the same misconception about Islam.<sup>18</sup> Again, King James refers to the European celebration of the victory over the infidel Turk: “This victory shall Europe make / To be your conquest pray” (533-34). King James’s poem shows antagonism to the

---

<sup>18</sup> Prophet Mohammad was misrepresented in the theological writings of the Middle Ages as the god of Muslims because they considered him a “heretic,” who deceived his clansmen when claiming he was a messenger from God, whereas it was his religion and not God’s. Such stereotypes persisted throughout Renaissance writings. For more information, see Byron Porter Smith’s Islam in English Literature, 2-19.

power and threat of Islam, represented by the super power of the Turkish Empire, which devoured many Christian lands and led many people into captivity; therefore, he expresses his grief for the Christian victims killed at the hands of the Turks:

My pen for pity cannot write,  
My hayre for horroure stands,  
To think of how many Christians there  
Were killed by Pagan hands. (761-64)

England's foreign policy towards the Turks differed between the reign of Queen Elizabeth I and King James I. Whereas Queen Elizabeth I found the Turk a possible military ally against both Spain and Catholic Rome, King James I preferred peace with Spain and closed relationships with the Turkish Porte. Samuel Chew further differentiates between Queen Elizabeth's policy and that of James's: the former "did not scruple to describe herself to the image-hating Moslem as one who shared his [Sultan's] detestation of the worshippers of idiots, that is, the Roman Catholics," whereas King James I was "reluctant to receive an emissary from the Sultan on the ground that to welcome an infidel would be unbecoming to a Christian Prince" (Crescent 152). In his "A Description of a Voiage to Constantinople and Syria, Begun the 21 of March 1593 [n.s.1594], and Ended the 9 of August 1595, Wherein is Shewed the Order of Delivering the Second Present by Master Edward Barton, Her Majesties Ambassador, which was Sent from Her Majestie to Sultan Murad Can, Emperor of Turkie," Richard Wragge revealed the political intimacy and presents exchanged between Queen Elizabeth and Sultan Murad

III.<sup>19</sup> Wragge explained that the Queen’s Ambassador, Edward Barton, delivered “12 goodly pieces of gilt plate, 36 garments of fine English cloth of all colours, 20 garments of cloth of gold, 10 garments of satin, 6 pieces of fine holland, and certain other things of good value” to Sultan Murad III as a sign of her willingness to expand “peaceable trade of our nation into his dominions.” Sultan Murad, moreover, accepted the Queen’s “demands” and welcomed her Ambassador (57).

What is also remarkable in Wragge’s report is that Queen Elizabeth exchanged letters and gifts with the Sultana, Sultan Murad’s wife, who gave the Ambassador a letter to be delivered to Queen Elizabeth. The Sultana’s letter expressed gratitude to the Queen and described the power of the Turkish Empire and its Sultan as the “Emperor of 7 climates and of the 4 parts of the world, the invincible king of Greece, Hungary, Tartary, Wallachia, Russia, Turkey, Arabia, Baghdad, Caramania, Abyssinia . . .” (59). However, the letter illustrated the commitment of both Sultan Murad III and his Empress to expand trade with England and to provide security to the Levant merchants; therefore, the Turkish Sultana promised assistance to Queen Elizabeth to achieve the demands of the Queen—specifically, “to gratify Your Majesty to my power in any reasonable and convenient matter, that all your subjects’ business and affairs may have a wished and happy end” (59). According to Bernard Lewis, Europe’s commerce with the Turks came as a result of the latter’s interest in exporting arms from Europe when the Turks needed weapons to fight against the Persians and other Christian countries in the sixteenth century. During this era many “European writings were full of accusations and

---

<sup>19</sup> The story was taken from Richard Hakluyt’s The Principall Navigation Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation, 1598, Vol. 2, 303-07. See the modern edition, cited here, in Kenneth Parker’s Early Modern Tales of Orient: A Critical Anthology (London: Routledge, 1999) 54-60.

recriminations by various Christian governments, each accusing the other of supplying both weapons and military skills to the Turks” (Islam 75).

In 1527, the Pope, Clement VII, excommunicated all European countries that exported weapons to the Turks, “all those who [took] to the Saracens. Turks and other enemies of the Christian name, horses, weapons, iron, iron wire, tin, copper, bandaraspata, brass, sulfur, saltpeter, and all else . . . with which they fight against the Christians” (qtd. in Lewis 75). The introverted England of James I did not seek any alliance or assistance from the Turks; rather, his poem “Lepanto” reflects the King’s hatred of the Turkish threat to Christendom, that shows no preference of the Turkish “infidels” over the Catholics and celebrates the victory as a holy crusade against “Satan’s” followers, the Turks. Even though Queen Elizabeth sought alliance and commerce with the Turks, the Church of England and the common citizenry were sympathetic with all Christian countries, Catholic or Protestant, invaded by the Turks and expressed Turkophobic antagonism towards them. As Daniel J. Vitkus observes in his article, “Early Modern Orientalism: Representations of Islam in Sixteenth-and-Seventeenth Century Europe,” the Catholics and Protestants shared the same antagonism to the Turks since “both continued to call for a united crusade against the real Turks” (213).

The Church of England in 1565 published a prayer, “A Form to be Used in Common prayer every Wednesday and Friday, within the City and Dioces of Norwich to Excite all Goodly People to Pray Unto God for the Delivery of those Christians, that are now Invaded by the Turks., Imprinted at London: By John Waley, [1566]” for the salvation of Christianity from the invasion of the Turks to the Island of Malta and all

Christian countries. In the Preface, the Church officials illustrated how the Isle of Malta was important as the place of “S. Paule” and how it was “invaded with a great army and navy of Turks, Infidels, and sworn enemies of Christian religion,” whose “danger” affected “all the rest of the countries of Christendom adjoining” (I.ii). The Church decided to assist the invaded Christians with “spirituall aid” to save them from the “rage and violence of Infidels, who by all tyranny and cruelty labour utterly to root out not only true Religion: but also the very name and memory of Christ our only Saviour, and all Christianity” (I.ii). The church, worried about the further expansion of the Turkish Empire over Christendom, thought it disastrous if Christians could not obstruct the Turks’ progress: “if they would prevail against the Isle of Malta, it is uncertain what further peril might follow to the rest of Christendom” (I.ii).

The anonymous pamphlet, The Estate of Christians, Living under the Subjection of the Turke and also the Warres between the Christians and the Turke, beginning 1592. And Continuing till the End of 1593, London: Printed by [T. Scarlet for] John Wolf, 1595, illustrated the ordeal of Christians’ “captivity” during the Turkish invasions to Christendom. The writer explained how the Turks “oppressed” “many thousands of Christian subjects,” whose “male” children at the age of “ten or twelve” were conscripted to “serve in war” and changed to be “enemies to God, and their own fathers and mothers, and kinsfolk” (A2-A3). Moreover, the writer, noting that the Turks did not follow clear policy of accepting “ransom” for the release of the “fugitives,” sometimes preferred to “to put them [fugitives] to death” rather than accepting the ransom (A3, 2). However, the Turks used to punish severely any “Christian” who gave “assistance to another Christian fugitive” who had been taken prisoner, and besides the loss of all his goods and

possessions, kept in extreme misery, and most barbarously handled till he pay for his ransom as much as they [Turks] shall appoint” (A3, 2). The writer described the various kinds of physical torture that the Christians suffered from the conquering Turks:

Some Christians are tied hand and foot, and laid on the ground, with a stone almost of insupportable weight on their backs. Others are put in gallies, where they be galled indeed and used most doggedly. Others they tie hand and foot and lay them on their backs, and let a long rag of cipres or fine linen dipped in pickle or salt water, sink by little and little into their throats, till it reach down to their stomachs, and then they pluck it out again, and so put the poor Christians to unspeakable pain and torment. (A2-A3)

In his pamphlet, the writer dedicated, “A Prayer unto God for the Peace of Christendom, to Defend and Preserve it from Turkish Invasion, to the Destruction and Overthrow of all Infidels,” and lamented the degeneration of the Christian countries and the “pride” of the Turks as a consequence of God’s “temporal punishment” to the Christians for their “manifold wickedness” (A3, 4).

The anonymous writer utilized the symbol of the “sword,” which in Renaissance writings constituted a symbol of the Turkish empire expansion and progress towards conquering Christendom, to indicate Turkish pugnacity which metamorphosed in time into a “discourse” of brutality and Turkophobia: “When the Turks have taken any City or fort of the Christians, or have overcome any great army, they lead all them that they put not most cruelly to the sword, into most lamentable captivity . . .” (Estate A3, 3). Again, the writer relies on God to bring unity among the Christian “Kings” and “rulers” in order to “consider and perpend how dangerously we are menaced and threatened by those that

being worse than the worst of badness, esteem of thy servants as of dogs, and how like we are to become the subjects of their [Turks'] wrath and fury" (A3, 5). The writer also refers many times to the "pride" of the Turks as they interface with the Christians and maintain their Islamic cultural superiority over other cultures and religions like Christianity, which the Turks perceived as pagan. Similarly, Bernard Lewis explains the Turkish unwillingness to acknowledge the cultural aspect of the Western civilization since the Turks felt proud of their religion and culture; therefore, the Turkish admiration of the West was confined instead to the materialistic development of the West, rather than to its culture or religion: "Turkish Muslims were ready to adopt, or at least consider, elements of European technology—but not European civilization" (Islam 26). In this sense, the cultural "pride" of the Turks, as reflected by the writer, stemmed from their certainty of the truthfulness of the Islamic culture and religion over all other religions.

In "The Strangling and Death of the Great Turke, and his two sons with the Strange Preservation and Deliverance of his Uncle Mustapha from Perishing in Prison, with Hunger and Thirst, the Young Emperor Now Three Days before Having so Commanded. A Wonderful Story, and the Like never Heard of in our Modern Times, and yet all to Manifest the Glory and Providence of God, in the Preservation of Christendom in these Troublesome Times. Printed this Fifteenth of July, London: Printed by I. D[awson] for Nicholas Bourne and Thomas Archer, and are to be Sold at their Shops at the Exchange, and in Popes-Head Pallace, 1622," the anonymous author makes another prayer to God to save Christians from the terror of the great Turk at a time when Europe was an easy prey for impending Turkish attacks. The writer cites the story of the Turkish Sultan, Osman, as an example of Turkish tyranny and cruelty for imprisoning his uncle, Mustafa, who

later avenged his humiliation by killing his young nephew, Osman. Again, the theory of the “sword” and reliance upon it and regicide figures prominently in the anti-Turk narrative. However, the writer, in the “Printer to Reader,” explains the main goal of his pamphlet, which was a warning against the jeopardy of the fierce Turks: the writer wishes “the great Turk is dead so opportunely, whereby there is hope, that Europe shall be preserved from their invasion and those affrightings” (A3). Furthermore, the writer laments the weakness of war-ravaged Europe, which led, in turn, to the ferocity and victory of the Turks; therefore, the writer prays for the unity and “peace” of Christendom: “take pity likewise on the particular passions of Princes, that they rage not in their revenges, nor run too violently forward in their race of blood and destruction; but admit of peace and pacification to the eternal memory of their virtues, and worthiness” (A3).

The Renaissance historicists were interested in the Turkish Sultans’ letters sent to the Christian princes and kings. The Renaissance historicists, in commenting on those letters, illustrated the invincible power of the Turks against weak and devastated Christendom. The letter of Sultan Murad IV, sent to the King of Poland, serves as an example of the Turkish pride and power in dealing with Christian Kings when the Sultan threatened to bring destruction to Poland and its churches. The letter included a characteristically lengthy title: “A Vaunting, Daring, and a Menacing Letter, Sent from Sultan Morat the Great Turk, from his Court at Constantinople, by his Embassadour Gobam, to Vladisllaus King of Poland, &c. Which letter was Sent to the Christian, since the Truce Concluded between the Turke and the Persian in March Last; as by Many Copies whereof, may Appear, as it was Sent out of Poland. Wherein he Declares himself a Mortal Enemy to the Said Christian King, Threatening to invade his Kingdoms and

Territories, with all Manner of Hostility. Whereunto is Annexed a Brief Relation of the Turkish Present Strength, both of Horse and Foot: With all the Victories the Turks have Prevailed against the Christians these Last Three Hundred Years. As also what Glorious Victories the Christians have Won against the Turkes, till this Present Year. 1638.

Published by Authority, London: Printed by I. Okes, and are to be Sold by I. Cowper at his Shop at the East-End of St. Pauls Church, at the Sign of the Holy Lamb, 1638.” The themes of the treaty center on the threat of the great Turk, the disparity of the Christian countries, and the advantages of the Christian unity in overthrowing the infidel Turk. The writer traced the Turkish triumph over Christendom for “three hundred years” till 1638. When the “Christian Kings and Princes [were] at variance one against the other . . . and infesting each other with deadly hatred and bloody wars,” whereas the “Turke, their common Adversary, hath taken advantage of their unnatural dissensions, and by force taken from them . . . more kingdoms, Empires, Principalities, large Territories and Signiories, from the Christians, than all the rest of Christendom besides” (2).

In the letter, Sultan Murad IV accused the King of Poland of conspiracy with the “enemy” of the Turks and threatened to “renounce” all “conditions of Peace” with the King (3). Furthermore, the Sultan got outraged when he found out that the King of Poland “contemptuously slighted and scorned our [Turks’] Great and Unconquerable forces” (3). The imperial speech of the Sultan conveyed the power of the Turks in deciding the times of wars and peace with Christendom and their upper hand in confirming the terms of those agreements. The Sultan reminded the King of Poland of the imperial and invincible power of the Turks: “Know thou, that our strength and terrour doth reach and extend further than our ample Dominions, for our imperial commanding

[emphasis added] name is dreadful, and famous through the whole World, or Universal Globe of the Earth, from the rising of the Sun, to the setting of the same” (B2, 7). In a prefatory statement, the anonymous author gives the reader a glimpse of the historical tension between the Turks and Christendom and the historical massacres the Turks inflicted on the Christians. For example, he called Suleiman the Magnificent, “the mighty invader and spoiler of Christendom” because he brought “blood and slaughter, and carr[ied] away many people into perpetual slavery,” and he could enslave a huge number of Christians—“16000 poor Christians into captivity to Constantinople, [in] 1537” from some “places in Italy” (C2, 15).

Then, the writer talked about Selimus II, who conquered Cyprus at the time of Queen Elizabeth I, and his “extremist barbarous cruelties” (C3, 16). The writer referred to the reign of Amurath III, contemporary also to the reign of Queen Elizabeth, when the Turkish progress towards the West was suspended because the Sultan “was almost wholly busied in wars against the Princes of the Eastern parts of the World, as the Persians, Arabians, Armenians, and others of the Oriental Nations” (C3, 16). The writer warned that the Turks could bribe some Christians against their countries and princes, as was the case in “1605 [when] the famous and strong city of Strigonium, in Hungaria, was taken by the Turks” when “sometimes the Governours and commanders were corrupted with gifts, given them by the Turkes” (C3,17).

### **The Persians**

The Persian Empire was a hindrance towards the Turkish ambition and progress towards expanding their empire Westwards as well as Eastwards. Even though both of the Turks and Persians were Muslims, they had different religious affiliations: whereas

the Turks were Sunni—that is, Orthodox Muslims—the Persians were Shi’i. The conflict between the Turks and Persians continued throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and the Persian power was observed by the European countries which were interested in establishing an alliance with the Persians against the great Turk. In his book A History of the Ottoman Empire to 1730 (1976), V. J. Parry describes how the Persian military power of the “Shah” was perceived by the West: “an apt instrument [it] might be found to hinder the Ottoman advance against Christendom [and] ingrained in the political consciousness of Europe” (111). However, the assumed alliance was not successful and remained merely a theory: “There was from time to time an exchange of ambassadors and of diplomatic correspondence between Persia and such states as Austria, Venice and Spain, but difficulties of communication made it almost impossible to organize a united front against the Ottomans” (111). The Turks considered the Persian Shi’i, as they did the Christians and Jews, as heretic unbelievers and “declared it lawful therefore to sell as slaves, Shi’i Muslims captured in war,” due to the Turkish “legal pronouncements, i.e. fetwas, which equated the Shi’i with the Christians as enemies of the true faith” (Parry 112). The Turkish-Persian struggle lasted from the time of Selim I (d. 1520) into the reign of Sultan Murad IV when a “peace” treaty was signed between the two sects in 1639 as “Zuhab,” which resolved the frontier’s antagonism between the two sects: “Erivan and the adjacent territories would remain under the Persian control, while Iraq was to be Ottoman” (Parry 147). The Persian Empire’s religious and political dispute with the Turks was celebrated among Christian political thinkers. For example, Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq, described the benefit of the Persians in the “delay” of the Turkish conquest to Christendom: “Persia is only delaying our fate; it cannot save us. When the

Turks have settled with Persia they will fly at our throats, supported by the might of the whole East; how unprepared we are I dare not say” (qtd. in Lewis 16).

England in the Renaissance shifted its political alliance from the Turks, during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, to the Persians during the reign of King James I. Matthew Dimmock, in his book New Turkes: Dramatizing Islam and the Ottoman in Early Modern England (2005), maintains that Christopher Marlowe’s Tamburlaine served a subtle critique of Queen Elizabeth’s foreign policy of alliance with the Turks at the expense of not utilizing the Persian power against the Turks:

Marlowe crucially inverts the prevailing tenets of late Elizabeth foreign policy, which . . . sought primarily to supply the continual Ottoman demand for arms and armaments with which to combat the Persians and subsequently to draw the Ottomans away from such a war and into a militant anti-Spanish coalition following the conquest of Portugal in 1580. In doing so, he [Marlowe] also presages the policies of James I, who famously favoured the Persian over the Ottomans to whom the King ‘denied absolutely’ even to sign commercial letters. (141)

Moreover, the English Renaissance writings often expressed an awareness of the Turko-Persian struggle and antagonism and hoped that the struggle would continue for the sake of the West’s safety from future invasion and acts of hostility on part of the Turks. In The Preachers Travels wherein is Set down a True Journal to the Confines of the East Indies, through the Great Countries of Syria, Mesopotamia, Armenia, Media, Hircania and Parthia. With the Authors Return by the Way of Persia, Susiana, Assiria, Chaldaea, and Arabia. Containing a full Survey of the Kingdom of Persia: And in what Terms the Persian Stands with the Great Turk at this Day: Also a True Relation of Sir

Anthony Sherleys Entertainment there: And the Estate that his Brother, M. Robert Sherley Lived in after his Departure for Christendom. With the Description of a Port in the Persian Gulf, Commodious for our East Indian Merchants; and a Brief Rehearsal of some Gross Absurdities in the Turkish Alcoran. Penned by I. C. sometimes Student in Magdalen College in Oxford. London: Printed [by William Stansby] for Thomas Thorppe, and are to be Sold by Walter Burre, 1611, John Cartwright explained the advantages of the Turkish-Persian wars in the preservation of Christendom: “a war . . . very commodious and of great opportunity to the Christian Commonwealth: For that it doth grant and give leisure to diverse parts of Christendom to refresh themselves, and to increase their forces, much weakened, both by the Great Turks wars” (Epistle, A2). Cartwright explained the religious clash between the Turks and Persians based on the principle of Imamate (successorship): Whereas the Persian Shi’i believed in the right of Imam Ali to be the true caliphate of Muslims after the death of Prophet Muhammad, the Turks Sunni believed in the legitimacy of a caliphate of the Prophet’s followers—Abu Bakir, Omar, and Othman: “In their [Persians’] prayers do commonly say, Cursed be Abubachar, Omar, Ottaman, and God be favourable to Aly, and well pleased with him. Which their difference about the true successor of their Prophet . . . is, one of the greatest causes of the mortal wars between the Turks and the Persians” (H3, 52).

The visit of Sir Anthony Sherley (1565-1635) to Persia was celebrated by the Renaissance Western politicians and historicists due to his great efforts in enhancing trade and alliance with the Persian. Cartwright referred to the great reception that Sir Anthony Sherley received from the Persian Emperor, Shah Abas: “To this great Monarch [Persian Emperor], came Sir Anthony Sherley Knight, with six and twenty followers, all

gallantly mounted and richly furnished; whose entertainment was so great.” Moreover, the ceremony held for Sir Anthony Sherley was supreme when the Persian Emperor “sent him forty horses, furnished with saddles, and very rich trappings; four of them fit for the proper use of any Prince, twelve Camels for carriage, together with six Mules, four and twenty carpets, most of them rich and fair . . . and lastly six men laden with silver” (K2, 67). Cartwright explained that the ideological concordance and spiritual harmony between Sir Anthony Sherley and the Persian Emperor resulted from the peril of the Turkish Empire not only to Christendom but also to the Persians; therefore, the Turks were recognized as the “common enemies” for both the Christians and the Persians (K3, 69). Sir Anthony Sherley warned the Persian Emperor of the necessity of taking an action against the imperial ambition of the Turks; otherwise, both Christians and Persians would fall victims to the “cruelty” of the Turks: “The Turk if he should overrun Hungary, would forthwith turn his victorious arms upon him [The Persian Emperor] and his kingdom,” because the imperial policy of the Turks was so universal and extensive that “the end of one war (as he said) was but the beginning of another; and that the Turkish Empire could never stay in one state; and it were good that his highness should observe not the Turk’s words but his deeds” (K3, 68).

Sir Anthony Sherley’s plan was to convince the Persian Emperor of joining the Christians in Hungary whose “wonderful preparation . . . [could] persuade the King with all his power to invade the Turk, then altogether busied in the wars of Hungary, and to recover again such parts of his kingdom as his predecessors had lost” (K3, 68). The Persian Emperor was delighted to appoint Sir Anthony Sherley as coordinating Ambassador between him and “Queen Elizabeth of famous memory; to King James our

dread sovereign; to the French King, to the Emperor, the Pope, the King of Spain, the Senate of Venice, and the Duke of Florence” for the purpose of making an alliance and a “general peace among themselves, and between the Persian and our Christian world” (K3, 69). The Persian Emperor pledged that “if the Christian Princes would bring an hundred thousand fighting men into the field, he would bring two hundred thousand” (K3, 70). Therefore, the Persian Emperor and Sir Anthony Sherley were enthusiastic enough to bring Christian-Persian unity against the Turks in order to bring relief from, what Cartwright called, “the monster of Turkish Tyranny” (K3, 71). Cartwright reminded the Christian Princes of the “miserable captivity of many thousands of poor Christians that are subject unto the Turkish tyranny”: only the aspired “combination of so great forces together would soon have delivered many poor Christians of their miseries” (K3, 71). Cartwright described the antagonism to the Turks as universal since all “mankind” suffered from the Turkish “monster,” and the alliance with the Persians excluded the war from its religious value when foreigners like the Persians could be looked at as partners of wars against the “common enemy.” In this context, Cartwright called for the advantageous merger with the Persians in their attack on the Turks; otherwise, Christendom would lose a rich opportunity: “never did Christendom miss times of more advantage, to have prevailed much against the Turk, not only to have held their own (which they do not in Hungary) but to have recovered some good part of their losses before received also” (L3, 77).

### **The Moor**

The Moors’ existence in Christendom stems back to the time of the Muslim Caliphate in the Iberian Peninsula and Septimania, or what was called, Al-Andalus from

711-1492. It was only in 1492, during the reign of King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella, that the last phase of the Reconquista was witnessed when the last Muslim ruler, Muhammad XII, known as Boabdil, was defeated and forced to cede Granada to the Spanish Catholic monarch, Ferdinand II of Aragon and Isabella I of Castile.<sup>20</sup> The Muslim Moors were subject to the racism and tyranny of the newly elected Spanish monarch when the creation of the Spanish Inquisition aimed to unite Spain in one religious sect, Catholicism, and to expel other heretic religions such as Islam. In his book Inquisition (1988), Edward Peters explains how Ferdinand and Isabella relied on the Pope to get the Papal permission for the Inquisition in Spain in order to purify Catholic Spain of heretic minorities like the Muslim Moors and Jews: “In 1478 Isabella and Ferdinand requested a Papal bull establishing an inquisition, and on November 1, 1478, Pope Sixtus IV permitted the appointment of two or three priests over forty years of age as inquisitors, their choice to be left to the crown of Castile” (85). Because Ferdinand and Isabella desired to increase the number of the Inquisitors and to link the decision of the Inquisition to the crown, “in 1483, Isabella and Ferdinand established a fifth state council . . . ‘the council of the Supreme and General Inquisition.’” As Peters explains, “Ferdinand began . . . taking steps to tie it firmly to the crown of Aragon rather than to one of the Orders, to the bishops, or to the Pope” (85-86). In this context, the Muslim Moors were forced to convert to Catholicism in order to avoid the tyranny of the Inquisition. However, as Anouar Majid observes in his historical book, We are All Moors: Ending Centuries of Crusades against Muslims and Other Minorities (2009), the converted

---

<sup>20</sup> For more information about the history of the Reconquista, see Derek W. Lomax’s The Reconquest of Spain (London: Longman, 1978).

Moors, called Moriscos, did not enjoy the privileges of the Spanish Catholics because of “racial” considerations:

Even after they converted to Catholicism, the Moriscos were denied full membership in the community because the *Limpieza de sangre* (purity-of-blood) statute of 1449 had turned faith into a racial category. (The Pope initially objected to the statute, as it contravened the evangelical mission of the Roman Catholic Church.) The Moors had no genealogical claims to Catholicism, making their conversion suspect and incomplete in the eyes of Spanish authorities. (33-34)

The expulsion of the Muslim Moors came under the reign of Phillip III between 1609 and 1614. The new king, more enthusiastic to follow a more racist policy towards the Moors and the Moriscos, excluded them from public life. To him, the prevention of Moriscos from holding Spanish citizenship was not enough to convince the King to keep them inside Spain. Therefore, he declared, “all Moriscos who have not left or have returned must leave under the pain of slavery in the galleys and confiscation of goods. If it be a woman or very old to be whipped with 200 lashes and branded” (qtd. in Majid 40-41). In his book *Moorish Spain* (1992), Richard A. Fletcher estimates the number of the expelled Moriscos between 1601 and 1614 at “something like 300,000” (168). Moreover, Fletcher observes how the expulsion of the Moriscos had serious disadvantages on the Spain of Philip III, including economic and political drains: “the Moriscos were famous for industry and thrift in the callings they followed—artisans and craftsmen, muleteers, small traders, peasant farmers. Their expulsion cost the sagging economy of seventeenth-century Spain very dear” (169).

Regarding the political disadvantage, the expelled Moriscos levied the Moroccan army in North Africa to take revenge of their past humiliation and to wage wars with Spain when possible:

Al-Maqqari, who composed his great history of Spanish Islam some twenty years after the expulsion, noted . . . that some of the Moriscos entered the service of the Sultan of Morocco who ‘allotted them for their residence the port of Sale [on the Atlantic coast], where they have since made themselves famous by their maritime expeditions against the enemies of God.’ This was the origin of the infamous ‘Sallee Rovers’ who were to terrorize the Atlantic coasts of Europe from the Tagus to the Bristol Channel for the next two centuries. (169)

The England of Queen Elizabeth sought commerce and military alliance with the Moors of North Africa. The Moorish ruler, Ahmad Almansor (1578-1603), exchanged diplomatic ambassadors with Queen Elizabeth in order to reinforce an English-Moorish military alliance against their common enemy, Spain. Nabil Matar, in his book Britain and Barbary (2005), explains how the Moorish ruler was enthusiastic to draw England into an open war with Spain in order to revenge the humiliation of the Moors in Spain and to restore Al-Andalus: “On 12 January 1589,” the Moorish ruler, Mulay al-Mansor sent his ambassador, “Ahamd Bilqasim . . . to negotiate supplies and financial support to the queen in her attempt to reinstate Don Antonio, the claimant to the Portuguese throne, in return for logistical and naval support to al-Mansur in his hope to conquer the Andalus” (14). According to Matar, the Moorish ruler anticipated England’s joining him as a military “ally” against Spain; therefore, it was only after “England’s victory over the Spanish Armada, ten years later, that made al-Mansur seriously view the Queen as a

potential military and diplomatic ally” (13). Even though the military alliance against Spain did not succeed, the North African Moors were strong enough to draw the attention of Western monarchs, like Elizabeth I, from whom they could seek support. As Matar observes, the English public opinion, however, was reluctant and antagonistic to the military cooperation with the Moors for “religious” reasons: “when official announcements for the expulsion of Moors were made in 1596 and 1601, there was emphasis on religious rather than racial difference,” the Moors being accused of their “ignorance of Christianity” (33).

Furthermore, the reign of King James I witnessed the termination of the Anglo-Moorish military league when the English interest, instead, shifted to conquer Morocco. Jack D’Amico, in his book The Moor in English Renaissance Drama (1991), points out, “an important change took place in the relations between the two countries with the deaths of el-Mansour and Elizabeth. The Anglo-Spanish peace under James I put an end to the dream of an alliance between England and Morocco. The resume of report to James . . . proposed . . . the conquest of Morocco” (38). As noted earlier, the only link between England and the Muslim Turk and Moor was the anti-Spanish sentiment which came to an end when King James I signed a peace treaty with Spain, indicating that he not only terminated military alliance with the Moors but also with the Turks. The Renaissance, in short, did not see any religious tolerance towards Islam even though commerce was a priority to the English decision-makers, because Islam, in their minds, was always associated with notions of threat and fear, as allegorized in Knolles’ notion of the Turkish “greedie lyon,” of future invasion to Europe.

## The Christian in the Oriental Cage

During the Renaissance, the Christian merchants, soldiers and sailors were subject to the Oriental Turks' and Moors' captivity and slavery when many of the Christian captives converted to Islam, served their Turkish or Moorish master, and sometimes were even subjected to physical torture.<sup>21</sup> Even though the exact numbers of Christian slaves were unknown, historicists refer to large numbers of Christian renegades in the Oriental cage. In his book Islam and Britain 1558-1685 (1998), Nabil Matar, for example, explains how "J. B. Gramaye . . . wrote in 1619 that in the Kingdom of Algiers, there were 200,000 Christians most of whom were 'Renegados or Apostatas'" (16). However, Samuel Chew explains that the number was sometimes "exaggerated" by ransom collectors in order to arouse the pity of the English people: "there was a natural tendency on the part of those engaged in the work of redemption to appeal to Christian charity by exaggerating the number of these unfortunates" (Crescent 378).

Moreover, the destiny of those captives varied from one to another depending on the nature of their craftsmanship and social class. As Matar illustrates in his "Introduction: England and Mediterranean Captivity, 1577-1704," certain factors determined the pricing of Christian captives at the "slave-markets,": "the Captives were

---

<sup>21</sup> For more information about the issue of piracy and conversion to Islam, see Samuel C. Chew's The Crescent and the Rose (1937), especially, chapter VIII "The Throne of Piracy" 340-86. See Nabil Matar's Islam in Britain 1558-1685 (1998); Matar's Turks, Moors and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery (1999); and also Matar's "Introduction: England and Mediterranean Captivity, 1577-1704" (2001). See also Daniel J. Vitkus's Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean (2003). Despite the fact that these scholarly works analyze the effects of piracy on the English Renaissance culture, I will focus on some historical manuscripts in the Renaissance that either have been surveyed dismissively or left undiscussed altogether; moreover, my analysis of the Renaissance plays— Shakespeare's Othello, Daborne's A Christian Turned Turk, and John Mason's The Turke— is different from and complementary at the same time to the above-mentioned scholars. Also, as my study compares and contrasts the Renaissance and Restoration drama with respect to the depiction of the Orient and the Renegade, I note that there is either confusion among scholars in not distinguishing between the depiction of the renegade in the Renaissance and the "cultural renegade"—that is, the "Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist"— in the Restoration drama (as is the case with Chew and Matar), or lack of analysis to the Restoration drama (as is the case with Vitkus) who focuses on the Renaissance period.

then sold in open auctions into private slavery. Captives' prices at market were usually an estimate of both the ransoms they could command and, for men, their professional value" (17). In this context, the richer and nobler the captive was, the higher the price which the oriental owners demanded. Also, the most desired craft for captives was the "Gunner," which was a "profession in great demand in North Africa" (17). In this sense, the Oriental cage could be lucrative to some Christian captives while unfortunate to others, depending on the owner of the cage. Some Christian captives even held high positions in the Oriental lands: "Captivity clearly varied in its conditions, from cruel enslavement to well-paying employment and from professional labor to ambassadorial opportunity" ("Introduction" 19).

The ransoms of the British captives caused a political and economic impasse on the parts of the English governments from the time of Queen Elizabeth to Charles I, because the English government had to prove its commitment to the freedom of its citizens by paying for the captives' release, even though it was not able to pay for everyone's deliverance due to the large numbers of the captives and to the futility of the military choice. "Not until the strong arm of Oliver Cromwell, through the instrument of Admiral Blake's fleet, inflicted severe punishment upon them did their power in the open ocean begin to decline" (Chew 373). As Matar remarks, England, unlike the "generosity" of the Spanish and French governments, was the European country least interested in paying ransoms to its captive citizens, because the "British captives were part of the commercial enterprise in the Mediterranean; and neither the monarchy nor the Privy Council felt under any moral or religious obligation to extend financial help to the captured employees of the Levant and the East India companies," as long as the "French and

Spanish kings and their subjects willingly offered contributions because they saw the captives as soldiers in the Christian war against Islam (“Introduction” 29).

The Oriental piracy not only captured Christian captives but also introduced the Christians to Islam, the main rival of Christianity in that day. Stories of conversion to Islam, spread all throughout Britain, became part of the day-to-day Renaissance reality. Because the Oriental environment offered new opportunities to the captives, some of them preferred the Oriental cage over their homeland. Matar explains the economic motif behind the captives’ conversion to Islam: “some of these captives never returned to their homes; instead, they converted to Islam and settled permanently in the Muslim world. At a time when ‘every major European town and city’ had ‘thousands of poor,’ many viewed conversion to Islam and emigration to the Muslim dominions as the only way to start new lives” (“Introduction” 2). In fact, Oriental Muslims were so satisfied with their religion, Islam, and with their rich countries that they did not seek either religious or economic compensation from Christendom whose subjects often envied the Oriental richness and strong civilization. Daniel J. Vitkus, in his article “Early Modern Orientalism: Representations of Islam in Sixteenth-and-Seventeenth Century Europe,” helpfully remarks that “conversion to Islam was widespread in the Mediterranean while conversion to Christianity was extremely rare” (216).

Islam not only supported the renegades with spiritual requital but also with materialistic remuneration. Samuel Chew speaks to the reason behind the British soldiers’ and retirees’ unemployment and willingness to join piracy in the Mediterranean:

The policy of peace with Spain, initiated by James I and pursued till near the end of his reign despite popular opposition, was directly responsible for making the

Barbary ports nests of desperate English outlaws. . . . These desperadoes did not confine their activities to raids against Spanish commerce but plundered French, Venetian, and even English shipping, and because [as Captain John Smith confirmed] ‘they grew hateful to all Christian Princes, they retired to Barbary.’

(343)

In other words, the Oriental land eventually became the desired destination to those poor Christians whose loyalty to their political governments and religion was lost when they found and benefited from the rich and generous hand of the Orient. Matar supplements this notion: “Islam projected an allure that promised a common Briton social and political power, and turned a poor European soldier into a well-paid *rais* (corsair captain: it was the allure of an empire that changed an Englishman’s hat into a turban—with all the symbolism of strength associated with the Islamic headdress” (Islam 15).

The religious discourse in the Renaissance, which aroused antagonism and excommunication to the renegades who replaced Christianity with the “infidel” religion, prohibited the phenomenon of the Renaissance “religious renegade.” In his church sermon, “A Recovery from Apostacy Set out in a Sermon Preached in Stepny Church Neere London at the Receiving of a Penitent Renegado in the Church, Octob. 21. 1638. By William Gouge D.D. and Min. in Black-Friers London Herein is the History of the Surprizall and Admirable Escape of the Said Penitent., London: Printed by George Miller, for Ioshua Kirton, and Thomas Warren, at their Shop in Paul’s Church-Yard, at the White Horse, 1639,” William Gouge (1578-1653) warned against the phenomenon of the renegade who had both denied Christ and home in favor of Turkish wealth and luxury. The sermon served as the equivalent of the penance of a British renegade,

“Vincent Jukes,” who had been captured by the Turkish pirates at “Genoway” and sold at the “Market place” in “Algiers.” The King had owned him as his “slave” for a while, then sold him to a “Negro,” who in turn “used him most cruelly: and by daily threatnings and soar beatings forced him to renounce his Christian Religion, deny Christ, acknowledge Mahomet to be a great Prophet, and in testimony thereof to be circumcised and to conform himself to the Turkish rites, and attire” (B2, 2-3). The British renegade along with other “two renegadoes” could escape the slavery of the Turks after enslaving and selling them in Spain “for six hundred pounds.” Gouge explained the religious repentance of Vincent Jukes when he left Spain and the Oriental “infidel” religion and came into England where “reformed religion” existed. Gouge noted the British renegade state of contrition in which he indulged while a “Mohametan”: “He professeth that he was much troubled night and day, and that he could not well sleep through horreur of conscience for denying his Christian Faith” (B3, 5).

Gouge described the state of the repentant renegade in emotionally charged language: “*He was lost, and is found.*” Gouge repeated this biblical verse throughout the sermon in order to demonstrate the infidelity and the “loss” of the renegades unless they returned and combined with the true religion of Christ. Gouge’s sermon came at a time when the English Renaissance church allied with the British government to form an anti-Islamic and anti-conversion propaganda. In his book Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630, Daniel Vitkus accentuates the increasing important function of sermons: “faced with the growing problem of Christian captives who ‘turned Turk’ in order to gain their freedom, the English authorities adopted a strategy to prevent such conversions, using sermons to condemn the practice of

conversion to Islam” (83). Gouge considered the state of a slave as less dangerous and more comfortable than of the renegade because it was the renegade rather than the slave who was “*lost*.” In other words, Gouge praised the destiny of the slave over the renegade who deserved God’s and the nation’s damnation. He proceeds to explain the meaning of the biblical verse “*He was lost*”:

*He was lost*, not when he first set to sea: nor when the Turkish Pirates set upon the ship wherein he was: nor when they took him captive: nor when they sold him for a slave: nor when he was under the harsh and hard handling of the cruel Negro. The basest slave that can be under man, believing in Christ, and fast-holding his Christian faith is . . . not lost. . . . But he was lost when he became a Renegado: When he renounced his Christian faith: When he acknowledged Mahomet to be the great Prophet; when he yielded to be circumcised, and have all his hair shaved off, and to put on a Turkish attire, and when he professed himself a Mahometan, then *He was Lost*. (C3, 12)

Exhorting the Christians to endure torment rather than surrender to the wealth of the Turkish “turbant,” Gouge insistently condemned all renegades who turned Turks unless they were forced by cruel torture to convert: “if perforce the Turkish turbant or tuffe had been put upon his head, and other Turkish attire upon his body, he had not thereupon been *lost*” (C3, 12). However, Gouge encouraged the Christian audience to bear the burden of the physical torture by the Turks rather than convert to the “infidel” religion. He reminded the audience as well as the British captive, Vincent Jukes, of the tortures and persecution that the “old Christians” had faced for their faith in Christ and that they could overcome their pains and fear in favor of eternal salvation from Christ: “many of

them endured, though to flesh and blood it seemed intolerable, yet with much patience, excellent cheerfulness, and divine courage they endured it” (F2, 34). Therefore, Gouge warned Christians not to lose their faith in Christ even when tortured by the Turks, because they should imitate the old Christian “Martyrs” who endured pain for the sake of their religion. Also, Gouge, commenting on those who exchanged their faith in Christ in favor of wealth and luxury of “turbant,” maintained that God might not accept even their repentance: “what is then in this wide world that can countervail such loss? Or what can stand him [renegade] in any stead that is *lost*? Can wealth? Can honour? Can liberty? Can life itself?” (E, 25). Gouge was aware of the Turkish materialistic temptation to which his poor Christians might surrender, as if he was afraid that the case of the British captive, Vincent Jukes, might happen again and again with members of his audience. In this context, Gouge warned against the spell of the “allure” of Islam, which he called a “sin.” He addressed the British repentant renegade to “be more watchful in avoiding all temptations that might allure [emphasis added] to that sin again” (M3, 86).

Gouge declared the act of “circumcision” as anti-Christian and pagan. He considered the Christian who underwent the circumcision as an apostate and infidel, “Renegadoes that yield to be circumcised go as far, (yea and further too) in denying Christ” (C3, 14). Gouge endeavored to adapt the biblical verses to his prohibition of the act of “circumcision” in order to acquire biblical leverage for his argument and to warn the Christians that circumcision was enough to exclude them from Christ’s salvation and to remain with them as a sign of infidelity since Christianity did not allow it as he claimed. He explained how “circumcision” was “by Christ . . . demolished” when the “Apostle” declared that “*If yee be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing*” and when

“circumcision” became a distinguishing feature between the faithful Christian and the infidel “Jews” and “Turks”:

Now because the Christians, on these and other weighty grounds, utterly reject Circumcision, Jews, Turks, and other adversaries of the Christian faith, are not only circumcised themselves, but do what lie in them to draw such Christians as they can get into their clutches, to be circumcised. For any Christian to yield to them herein . . . is to deny the Christian faith, and to renounce Christ himself: which who so ever doth, is *lost*. (C3, 13)

Gouge prayed to God not to punish the British penitent for his circumcision, which was a sign of apostasy to Christ: “upbraid not his circumcision, upbraid not his subjecting himself to Mahometisme” (M2, 82). Furthermore, Gouge prayed for the release of the thousands of Christian captives and penitence of the renegades: “have pity on those that are in bondage under the adversaries, and persecutors of the said faith; on such in particular as are, as this Penitent not long since was taken captive by the Turks” (I3, 62).

Christophorus Angelus, a Grecian monk, served as the model of the faithful Christian captive who endured the torture of the Turks and never denied Christ. His pamphlet appeared in 1617 and 1618 when he lectured at Cambridge and Oxford after his release from the Turkish captivity. The pamphlet was published as Christopher Angell, a Grecian, who Tasted of many Stripes and Torments Inflicted by the Turkes for the Faith which he had in Christ Jesus, at Oxford: Printed by John Lichfield, and James Short, Printers to the Famous University, 1617, in which Angelus narrated his story of captivity by the Turks and his patience to endure both the Turkish tortures and the alluring temptations to convert to Islam. The Turks, suspecting him to be a “traitorous Spaniard,”

started to torment him severely. Angelus, however, claimed that the Turks gave him a chance of release only if he “turned Turk” and high positions and “honours” if he accepted: “if thou wilt deny thy Christ, we promise thee . . . that if thou wilt become a Turk, thou shall greatly honour our feast day, and for this we will make thee a Centurion, besides other great honours which wait upon thee” (A3). Angelus was different from Vincent Jukes, who surrendered to the torture of the Turks and turned Turk, because Angelus seemed more resilient to endure the physical pain in favor of Christ’s salvation, when even the Christian “slaves” did not expect such patience and forbearance when Angelus declared that he “will first die an hundred times in one day before I deny my Saviour Christ” (A3).

Angelus, like Gouge, discussed the religious legitimacy of forced conversion into Islam. He concluded that a Christian captive should imitate the model of “Christ,” Who endured the most pain, and the experience of the Christian “Martyrs,” who scarified their bodies in return for eternal life and “who were fleshly men, and sinners, yet by the grace of God were strengthened to die[;] therefore by the same grace shall I be sustained” (A3). Angelus sketched a picture of a man being tortured by the Turks in order to dramatize his miserable and painful situation and to elucidate his faithful model of refusing to be a renegade and denying Christ. He explained the way in which he was tormented:

Two men dipping their rods in salt water began to scourge me, and when the one was lifting up his head, the other was ready to strike, so that I could take no rest, and my pain was grievous, and so they continued beating me, saying, turn Turke, and we will free thee: but I answered them, in no case, until they made me half dead: then they rested a while, saying he is surely very constant, and will not deny

his religion. (B)

Angelus seemed proud of his model of endurance and his near legendary status in his country, “where this laying wait was made known to all the Christians, both men and women in Athens” (B). However, it was God’s providence which liberated him from the Turkish captivity and humiliation. Angelus seemed also interested to spread his model of the faithful Christian in England when he was advised by the “merchants” to go there where he “inquired diligently from them [merchants] where I might find wise men, with whom I might keep my religion, and not lose my learning: they told me, in England you may have both” (B). Therefore, he resided in “Cambridge” then moved to “Oxford University,” where he could continue his study. Once again, Angelus, like Gouge, insisted on the predilection of the Christian captive over the renegade since the former maintained communion with Christ and the possibility of future release, whereas the latter was condemned as a denier of Christ, who sold his life to the devil.

The phenomenon of the renegade caused a political and religious threat to the West in terms of their military participation in wars against Christendom. Sultan Ahmad (1603-1617), in one of his translated letters into English, referred to the advantageous function of the renegade in attacking Christendom from within when the Turks utilized the renegades as a tool of imperial conquest and religious triumph over Christendom. The letter of the Sultan came under the title, “Letters from the Great Turke lately Sent unto the Holy Father the Pope and to Rodulphus Naming himself King of Hungarie, and to all the Kings and Princes of Christendom Translated out of the Hebrue Tongue into Italian, and out of the Italian into French and now into English out of the French Coppie. Imprinted at London: By John Windet, and are to be Sold [by C. Burby] at the White

Swan in Pauls-Church Yard, 1606.” In this letter, he declared himself as “Lord of the country of Judea, even unto the earthly paradise; Conqueror of Constantinople, and of Greece, Governour of the high and lower Seas, Commander of the Hungarie and the future Conqueror of Christendom.” The Sultan reminded the Pope of the religious liberty given by the Turks to all its Christian citizens since the Islamic law encouraged such freedom; thus, many Christians started to give up their faith in the Pope’s law in favor of the Turks’: “it has pleased us . . . to use your own faith and law, and your accustomed ceremonies, even as you have done herefore, which liberality and permission we have extended and given likewise to all Christians, and also to all others what religion or law so ever they held living and inhabiting under our universal Monarchie” (A4).

Such liberty, according to the Sultan, was the cause for the conversion of many Christians into Islam and the ultimate weakness of popery: “by the same means we hope to be the only Monarch of the whole earth before the expiration of two years, like as your own Christians denying your law and embracing a much better, have divined and prophesied to be at Rome in the Chappel of Saint Basille” (A4). The Sultan warned the princes of Christendom and the Pope that he would invade them with a strong army consisting not only of the Turks but also of Christian renegades, who seemed more Muslim Turks than the Turks themselves: “as many other Christians which attend our artillery ordinance, and others which are the founders of our artillery, and other instruments of war, which are of so great number as the rest, all *Renegados* to fight in defense of our law, and with us to conquer your country” (B2). In this sense, the Turkish Sultan’s letter indicated the possibility that renegades might be weaponry tools against the heart of Christendom.

The stories of release from the Turkish captivity were celebrated by Renaissance writers and the British audience because they emphasized the heroic ideals of the courage of British merchants, sailors and soldiers, their faith, and God's assistance to them against the "infidels." John Taylor (1580-1653) commemorated the heroic story of the release of the English ship "Elizabeth" from the capture of the Turkish pirates in 1640 due to the bravery of its crew and God's Providence in guiding their safety, as the title of Taylor's story indicated: "A Brave and Valiant Sea-Fight, upon the Coast of Cornewall, the 17. of June Last Past Betwixt Three Turkish Pyrats, Men of Warre, and only One English Merchants Ship of Plimouth, (Called the Elizabeth) being not above 200. Tun. Wherein they all Behaved themselves so Valiantly, that (after a Long and Bloudy Fight) they Quit their Ship out of Hands of the Cruel Turke, with the Loss only of Three men, but Slew many of the Turks, to their Everlasting Honour. Written from Plimouth by a Good Hand, and Exemplified for the Delight of the Reader. London: Printed [by Elizabeth Purslowe, Bernard Alsop, and Thomas Fawcet] for Nathanael Butter, July 14. 1640. With Privilege, [1640]." The story appealed to the "delight of the reader" because it confirmed the British readers' self-confidence of their religious correctness and assurance of one day defeating the Turks. The British ship, Elizabeth, while returning from "Virginia" into England, was attacked by "three" ships of Turkish pirates. However, the British ship, consisting of a mere "30 men," achieved victory over the Turks and returned home safe where its crew were celebrated as heroes at the moment of their arrival. The writer derived significant lessons from the story:

Thus (by the merciful assistance of God) this one poor Ship, so weakly man'd, and so meanly furnished with Artillery or Ordinance, against so many, and so great a

multitude, (as were 3 ships, 500 men, and 56 Pieces, maintain a fight almost 8 hours, and (with the loss of 3 Men) not only kill and spoil a great number of their enemies, but also to escape them and come off with reputation, as it were with Conquest, Triumph, and Victory. It is almost to be thought miraculous and beyond belief. (B2)

The writer allegorized the story of the British ship, “Elizabeth,” to the biblical story of Noah’s ship—the “Arke”—which was attacked by the three pirates, “world, flesh, and the Devil” (C). Just as God’s grace saved Noah’s “Arke” from drowning, so too God saved the British ship from the Turkish pirates, who were compared to the “Devil” (C). Furthermore, the writer illustrated the religious and political significance of the “ships,” which referred to “Noah,” who was “Admiral, Master, and Pilot” and whose ship, the “Arke,” was an inspiration from God to save the world from drowning (C). Also, “Christ” and the “Apostles” utilized the “ships” in order to spread their divine doctrine across the world. The political function of the “ships” lay in the fact that they provided military “defense” against “foreign invasions” because the “ships” were the “impregnable Wooden walls of Great Britain and Ireland” (C2).

### **John Mason’s The Turke (1607)**

John Mason’s play, The Turke, centers on the ferocity of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus and the enslavement of its leaders and citizens. Like the Venetian Conte Nestore Martinengo, John Mason dedicated his writings to warn against the danger of the Turks and called for a serious reaction by Christendom to root out the Turks. The only character, who refers to the Turkish invasion to Cyprus, is Eunuchus, a eunuch and servant to Borgias, the conspiring governor of Florence with the Turk, Mulleasses.

Eunuchus explains the tribulation and misery of his life as a result of the Turks' invasion to Cyprus:

How so' ere my fortunes make me now a slave  
I was a free borne Christians sonne in Cyprus,  
When Famagusta by the Turk was sackt:  
In the division of which City spoyles,  
My fortunes fell to Mulleasses lot:  
Nor was it Tyranny inough that I was Captive,  
My parents robd of me, and I of them,  
.....  
These sixteene yeares unto the vilde commaund,  
Of an imperious Turke, I now given  
To serve the hidden secrets of his lust. (I. ii. 443-55)

Even though Eunuchus' description of the Turk, Mulleasses, is stereotypical of the lusty Turk portrayal, he refers to the historical fact of the Turkish capture, invasion of Cyprus, and the loss of the last fort, Famagusta. Resisting the Turks' strong army led by Lala Mustafa, Famagusta's governor, Bragadino, was severely tormented as noted earlier. John Mason, who seemed aware of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus and of Venetians' reports, like Conte Nestore Martinengo's, creates the character of Eunuchus to remind the British Renaissance audience of the threat of Islam and of the Turks in enslaving and capturing Christian slaves.

Mason's play, The Turke, also depicts the disunity of Christendom, represented by the warring disputes between the Duke of Ferrara and Duke of Venice for the love of

Julia, Duchess of Florence, who, in one reading, represents Christendom since every Christian Prince and King competed to lead Christendom including the King of Spain, Phillip II. Mason's play parodies the politics of the European Princes and Kings, who were fighting each other while the enemy grew stronger. The Turk, Mulleasses, seems the God-head in the play because he controls and manipulates the conspiracies against Christendom and enthrones and dethrones Christian princes as he likes. Mulleasses is a man of shadows as he appears late in the play; however, his absence and secrecy, instead of being arbitrary, are tactical maneuvers to weave his plots in capturing the love of Julia, symbolic of his capturing Christendom. Mulleasses resembles the fierce "lyon," as Richard Knolles described the Turks, which watches its prey carefully and devours it when the time suits. Mulleasses even calls himself a "lyon" in the play: "Now me thinks I stand / Like a proud Lyon [emphasis added] with a richer prize" (V. iii. 2292-93). Therefore, Borgias, aware of the power of the Turkish "lyon," allies with Mulleasses to enthrone him as the "king of Italy." Borgias explains the nature of alliance with the Turk, Mulleasses:

I can commaund their lives: and then maintaine  
My actions with the sword: for which the Turke  
By Mulleasses made unto my purpose,  
Offers me forty thousand Janissaries  
To be my guard, against foreign outrages:  
And more: hee'le make me king of Italy. (I. iii. 657-62)

However, Borgias' ambition of alliance with the Turks does not succeed because Mulleasses conspires against him when he persuades Borgias' wife, Timoclea, to kill him.

Mason's play, in my opinion, subtly criticizes the foreign policy of Queen Elizabeth I of making an alliance with the Turks, especially at the time of Sultan Murad III, and praises the policy of King James I in demolishing such alliance as observed earlier.

Mason's play, as the editor Joseph Q. Adams explains, was first "acted between 1607 and 1609" and had "entry in the Stationer's Registers" on "March 10, 1609," (XII) which was the Jacobean period of James I. Mason utilizes the Renaissance theater in order to warn the audience as well as the King of the futility of making any alliance with the Turks: just as Mulleassa betrays the Italian governor, Borgias, the Turks might betray the King and the British people. Mason creates the character of the Italian eunuch in order to remind the British that the Turks aspired to emasculate all Christians and enslave them as servants in the Turkish Empire (as they do Eunuchus in the play), thereby in actuality humiliating the Famagusta's governor, Bragadino. Even though Mason does not mention Bragadino in the play, he mentions "Famagusta," whose story was most likely known by the Renaissance audience. Eunuchus refers to the relationship between emasculation and manhood, the loss of the former representing a kind of perdition: "But they wronged nature in me, made me an Eunuch, / Disabled of those masculine functions, / Due from our sex: and thus subjected" (I. ii. 450-53). In other words, the eunuch character functions also as a reminder of the Christian captives, residing in the Turkish Empire; emasculated of their manhood, they were sold at the slave markets, served the Turkish master, and were "disabled of those masculine functions."

The imperial love of Mulleassa to Julia, the symbol of Christendom, represents, moreover, the Western anxieties of the Turks' ambition to conquer Christendom. Julia refuses the Turkish affiliations of Mulleassa due to the difference of their religions: "If you beest gentle leave me Mahomet / Our loves like our religions are at warres / And I disclaime all peace" (V. iii. 2264-66). Julia dramatizes the Renaissance antagonism to Islam—what she calls stereotypically "Mahomet[ism]"—because she suspects the imperial ambitions of the Turks to dominate her wealth and people's conscience. Mulleassa also deals with the love of Julia since he symbolically relates her to the wealth of "Florence," which is a materialistic and imperial love. Mulleassa shows his imperial love to Julia: "The wreath of Florence: Love and ambition, / Kindled my cold braine from their mutual heate / Sprung my aspiring aime: nor shall it sincke" (V. iii. 2300-33). In my reading, Mulleassa resembles the historical figure of Lala Mustafa, whom the Venetian Conte Nestore Martinengo described as the main initiator for the large number of the Turkish soldiers, in his attacking Cyprus and "Famagosta," especially when "Mustafa had distributed a rumour, through the Turks Dominion, that Famagosta was much more wealthy and rich" (True Report F.iii, 15). Moreover, just as Lala Mustapha broke his promise to grant safety to Famagosta's governor and noblemen, Mulleassa breaks his word to aid Borgias. Mulleassa, the "monster" (V. iii. 2310)—as called by Duke of Venice—dramatizes the Turks' power, which was a constant source of anxiety, fear, and intimidation in the Renaissance.

## William Shakespeare's Othello and the Dream of Deconstructing the "Allure" of the Islamic State

Shakespeare's Othello (1604) remains one of the most important plays about the Moors in the Renaissance because it has attracted new critical interpretations in terms of the origin, religion and function of the protagonist Othello. Jack D'Amico, in his book The Moor in the English Renaissance (1991), considers the black color of Othello as the main focus of the play because Othello, the black Moor, is seen as a "deviation" from Christianity. He points out, "in the Christian tradition, deviations from the European norm, whether in appearance, custom, or religion, signaled degeneration or sin. Hence, the descendants of Cham were black, ugly, devoid of true civilization, and the followers of Islam were children of the night and the devil" (179). In other words, Othello, in this line of thinking, is despised by the Renaissance audience for his black color which demonstrates his sinful origin as a "descendant of Cham." However, D'Amico does not answer the question whether all Muslims—Turks, Moors, or Persians—were perceived by Renaissance writers, travelers, merchants, and playwrights as black and descendants of Cham or not.<sup>22</sup> Also, D'Amico's reading of the play is reductive because it assumes that Islam and Muslims were perceived in the Renaissance as "devoid of true civilization," whereas Islam was always seen as threat, a cultural rival, and powerful "lion," which aimed to devour Christendom as noted earlier.

Nabil Matar, to cite another example, considers Othello as blackened by Shakespeare—in that the Moor was depicted stereotypically as black by many

---

<sup>22</sup> Nabil Matar, for example, in his book Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery, notes that most critics "failed" to distinguish between "North Africans" and "sub-Saharan" in Renaissance writings: whereas the sub-Saharan Africans were subject to "domination and slavery" for their black color, the "Muslims of North African and the Levant were of anxious equality and grudging emulation." pp.7-8.

Renaissance dramatists—because the Britons were “unable to defeat the Muslims, as they had the American Indians, and unable to situate them in a world view convenient to their colonial and millennial goals [;] as they had done with the American Indians, writers and illustrators applied constructions of differentiation from the American Indians to the Muslims.” Therefore, Matar defines this process as “Superimposition,” which was “conscious and deliberate” (Turks 15). In other words, Othello, in reality, is blackened by Shakespeare in order to defeat the strong North African. Matar, offering another historical reading to the play in his book Britain and Barbary (2005), alleges that Othello might represent the Moorish Ambassador, “al-Annuri,” who was sent by the Moorish ruler, Ahmad al-Mansur, to negotiate military alliance with England against Spain. Queen Elizabeth, “having seen that the Ambassador was a Morisco, as his painting confirms, she decided to co-opt him into her service” without the knowledge of the Moorish ruler, because “the Moriscos of Morocco were the elite fighting force and were known to be restive” (26). For Matar, the defeat of the Moor, Othello, in the play represents the antagonistic feelings and antipathy of the British against all military alliance with the Moors. Moreover, Matar, suggesting a third reading of Shakespeare Othello in his book Islam in Britain 1558-1685 (1998), explains that Shakespeare’s play revolves about the notion of “hypocrisy and fraud” of Muslim converts to Christianity, since the “Moriscos of Spain who, until their final expulsion in 1609, were always suspected by their compatriots of an expedient and superficial conversion to Christianity. Othello’s conversion in Shakespeare’s 1604 play thus also may have been viewed with suspicion by the Jacobean audience” (129). Matar asserts that Othello “may have also been inspired by the figure of Hassan al-Wazzan/Leo Africanus (1494-1552), the Muslim traveler who

had converted to Christianity in Rome but who had later reconverted to Islam” (130). In other words, for Matar, Othello, who converts to Christianity and reconverts to Islam, is depicted as hypocritical as the historical figure “Hassan al-Wazaan” since both of them desert Christianity. However, Matar in theory does not answer the pertinent question as to why Othello is depicted as noble and virtuous if Shakespeare, the Renaissance audience, and even the Jacobean England of James I had been antagonistic to the Moors.

In his book Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630 (2003), Daniel J. Vitkus dedicates a whole chapter to Shakespeare’s Othello, “Othello Turns Turk,” in which he observes that Othello, a Muslim convert to Christianity, turns Turk at the end of the play and deserves the “double” condemnation by the audience: one for his black color and the other for his reconversion to Islam:

A baptized Moor turned Turk, Othello is ‘double-damned’ . . . for backsliding. Sent out to lead a crusade against Islamic imperialism, he turns Turk and becomes the enemy within. He has ‘traded’ the state of Venice and converted to a black, Muslim identity, an embodiment of the Europeans’ phobic fantasy. Othello has become the ugly stereotype. (106)

Vitkus explains that the “noble” character of Othello “dissolves as he reverts to the identity of the black devil and exhibits . . . jealousy, frustrated lust, violence, mercilessness, faithlessness, lawlessness, despair. . . . Othello enacts his own punishment and damns himself by killing the Turk he has become” (106). Again, even though I agree with Vitkus that the play is about conversion, Vitkus does not answer the question, why does Shakespeare make Othello the noble and supreme leader par excellence in the play?

Shakespeare's Othello, I suggest, is a dramatic attempt to deconstruct the assumption of the "allure" of Islamic state and to propose, instead, the allure of Christendom, as though Shakespeare wants to assure his Renaissance audience that Christendom, as powerful as Islamic state, can draw many Muslim converts into its realm and service, as demonstrated by Othello's conversion. Many references in the play speak to the conversion of Othello into Christianity. For example, Iago refers to the "baptism" of Othello: "to win the Moor, were't to renounce his baptism" (2. 3. 317). Also, Othello shouts at Cassio and Montano to stop fighting: "Are we turned Turks, and to ourselves do that / Which heaven hath forbid the Ottomites? / For Christian shame, put by this barbarous brawl" (2. 3. 153-55). Furthermore, Othello reminds Desdemona to repent her sins—a Christian practice—to God before dying: "If you bethink yourself of any crime / Unreconciled as yet to heaven and grace, / Solicit for it straight" (5. 2. 28-30). Othello's Christian affiliations and tendencies, in fact, defend Christendom more loyally than the Christians themselves in the play.

Shakespeare created the noble model of Othello in response to stories of captivity and against the many renegades, who immigrated to the Turkish land to seek wealth and residence. This was a time when many Christian captives were sold in slave markets and served their Turkish and Moorish masters and when many impoverished Christians were forced to immigrate to the Islamic world in search of job opportunities as contextualized by Matar and Vitkus. In this play, Shakespeare wants to assure his audience that Christendom can convert many Muslims into its "allure" and even provide them with job opportunities, just as it has with Othello. In the play, Shakespeare in no way opposes the progress of the "valiant" (1. 3. 48) Othello in Christendom; rather, he seems to encourage

the immigration of the Muslim Moors and Turks into the world of Christendom as long as they convert to Christianity. The model of Othello needed governmental and public sanction to establish economic reform and religious tolerance, which were to be addressed to the Christians from different sects and countries as long as they shared the ideals of Christianity. Shakespeare seems to applaud the Venetian governmental policy of providing job opportunities and religious tolerance towards all Christians whatever their race or country. The Christian Moor, Othello—the proven example of Venetian success—deconstructs the “allure” of the Islamic state by showing Muslim men, even elite ones, happily converted and in service of the Christian countries. The noble leader, Othello, is fulfilled at his conversion to Christianity and edified by his service to Venice because he earns high positions in the state and even obtains the love of Desdemona: “Othello: Let him [Brabantio] do his spite. / My [Othello’s] services which I have done the signory / Shall out-tongue his complaints” (1. 2. 17-19). Even Iago is so jealous of Othello’s privileged estimation to the state of Venice that he cannot dismiss Othello:

Cannot with safety cast him, for he’s embarked  
With such loud reason to the Cyprus wars,  
Which even now stands in act, that, for their souls,  
Another of his fathom they have none  
To lead their business, in which regard—  
Though I do hate him as I do hell pains—  
Yet for necessity of present life  
I must show out a flag and sign of love. (1. 1. 150-57)

Othello's marriage to Desdemona is even blessed by the government of Christian Venice. Shakespeare does not disallow the marital relationships with foreign Christians in Venice.

Thus, I disagree with Jack D'Amico's assumption that Venice in Shakespeare's Othello is "a state closed to the foreigner on the level of politics (a strict oligarchy) and the family, while open for the purposes of war or business" (164). On the contrary, Othello's marriage is blessed by the Duke of Venice and the Venetian senators whose main concern is to determine whether enforcement or "fair question" has shaped the marriage: "A Senator: Did you [Othello] by indirect and forced courses / Subdue and poison this young maid's affections, / Or came it by request and such fair question [?]" (1. 3. 111-13). In other words, the Duke and the senators do not question the race of Othello as the main warrant of marriage, because Othello, as a Christian citizen, has the very obvious and societally-sanctioned right to establish a family as long as the spouses love each other. To the Duke of Venice, Brabantio's objections to the marriage seem "a bootless grief" (1. 3. 208), because they violate the Venetian policy of extending equal privileges to all its Christian citizens. Even though many antagonists to the marriage endeavor to dismiss its legitimacy—like Brabantio, who claims it as "against all rules of nature" (1. 3. 101)—Shakespeare shows them as irrational and stupidly biased in contrast to the rational Duke and senators. Therefore, I also disagree with Matar that there are "superimposition" and "suspicion" of Othello's conversion in Shakespeare's Othello because I believe that Shakespeare does not wish the destruction of the model of Othello either on stage or in reality as long as Othello, a convert to Christianity, can participate in the discreditability and the demolition of the Turks.

The Duke attributes the crusading mission to Othello, just as Christendom appointed Don John of Austria to lead the Holy League in the Lepanto battle in 1571 against the Turks, who are described by the Duke as the “general enemy Ottoman” (1. 3. 49). Similarly, just as Don John of Austria was celebrated in Europe for his bravery and victory over the Turks, Othello is celebrated by the Venetians for what they perceive as Othello’s victory. Cassio also associates Cyprus’ victory with Othello: “Thanks, you the valiant of this warlike isle / That so approve the Moor! O, let the heavens / Give him defense against the elements” (2. 1. 44-46). Also, the Herald announces, under “Othello’s pleasure—our noble and valiant general” (2. 2. 1-2), an official ceremony for the victory and “perdition of the Turkish fleet” (2. 2. 3). The Herald, like Cassio, prays for Othello: “Heaven bless the isle of / Cyprus and our noble general, Othello!” (2. 2. 9-10). Othello, who is described by Iago as an “imperious lion” (2. 2. 257), reverses Richard Knolles’s notion of the Turkish “greedie lyon,” who intends to “devour” Christendom to defeat the Turks. Also, just as Sultan Ahmad (1603-1617) in his letter to the Pope threatened to attack Christendom with an army of “*Renegados*” (B2), Othello, a convert to Christianity, attacks the Turkish fleet.

However, Cyprus’ victory, as Vitkus observes, does not possess an accurate objective correlative—that is, “Shakespeare’s play does not provide a historically accurate representation of the real invasion of Cyprus by the Turks in 1571 or of any other Ottoman attempt to conquer the island” (Turning 94). In other words, Cyprus was still in the hands of the Turks during the performance of the play, which Vitkus considers an “ironic ring for an English audience that knew of the Turks’ victory over the Venetians and the long-standing Ottoman possession of Cyprus” (95). Similarly, Leeds

Barroll, in his article “Mythologizing the Ottoman: The Jew of Malta and The Battle of Alcazar,” raises the question of Shakespeare’s deviation from history when he represents the ahistorical Cyprus victory over the Turks: “Would Shakespeare—or the courtly audience for his play—be unaware that although Othello is sent by the Venetian Senate to protect Cyprus from the Turks, the Ottomans had owned the island since 1570?” (126). Barroll, however, theorizes that Shakespeare’s deviation was designed only to appeal to the Renaissance audience’s expectation: “the issue then is not so much what Marlowe, Shakespeare, and other playwrights of the period might or might not have known about the sixteenth-century Ottoman history, as it is what the playgoing public would want to believe about the Ottoman Empire” (127).

I do not think that Shakespeare was either “ironic” or only appealing to the audience as much as he desired to propagate the Othello-model, which deconstructs the “allure” of Islamic state and might in time lead to the anticipated liberation of Cyprus which could become a reality if Muslims, like Othello, converted to Christianity and enjoyed all the rights of the white Christians, just as Christians, converting to Islam, participated in the full rights of the Turkish Muslims in the Turkish land. The Turks in Shakespeare’s Othello are facile, delusive, crafty, and talented politicians and warriors. The Duke of Venice and the Venetian Senators, who represent the rational voice in the play, succinctly synopsis the adroitness of the Turks: “First Senator: We must not think the Turk is so unskillful” (1. 3. 28).

The death of Othello foreshadows the victory of the “allure” of Islamic state over Christian countries. The opponents of the Othello-model, like Iago, Roderigo, and Brabantio, overcome the rationality of the Venetian state and militate against the doctrine

of tolerance towards foreign Christians of different color and origin. Those opponents represent the conservative parties and voices which advocate a provincial isolationism and reject interference with the Islamic world or learning lessons from the “skilled” Turks; rather, they lived a fantasy that the Christian white race is innately superior to the Turks and Moors, whose power and allure, ironically, were known to the Renaissance audience. The coward Iago, always hiding his antagonism to Othello from the Venetian State and from the “valiant” Othello, turns himself into an asperser to Othello’s magnificence only in soliloquies and asides. Most of the stereotypical disparagements spread against Othello are uttered in secret and in a daydream. To Iago, Othello publicly remains his “noble lord” (3. 3. 372) as long as they are in proximity, yet Othello “will as tenderly be led by th’ nose / As asses are” (1. 3. 383-84) in soliloquy. Such fear of proximity and face-to-face contact represent, in an allegorical reading, the arrogance of Iago-like Christians to face the reality of the power of the Islamic state, represented by the Turkish Empire.

Even though I agree with Vikus that Othello “turns Turk” at the end of the play, I disagree with the notion that Othello “enacts his own punishment and damns himself by killing the Turk he has become” (Turning 106). Othello kills himself, rather, when he discovers that the “allure” of Christendom is an illusion and that his services and conversion do not guarantee his fusion and acceptance by it. Othello discovers too late that only the Oriental Islamic state can offer tolerance, financial self-improvement, fair identification, and reinforcement to all its Muslim citizens whatever their race or country. Othello, however, cannot return to the Crescent because he has once rejected Islam, the Turkish Empire, and the Barbary corsairs. He perceives his status as a traitor in the eyes

of Muslims and a racialized Other in Christendom. Othello's dream to liberate Christians from captivity and slavery to the Turks comes to an end when he perceives the impossibility of his status—a half-Christian—to participate fully in Christendom. When Othello kills himself, he punishes Christendom and leaves the Cyprus “victory” only on the stage as a mere illusion. Therefore, he reminds the audience to judge his case fairly:

I have done the state some service, and they know't.

No more of that. I pray you, in your letters,

When you shall these unlucky deeds relate,

Speak of me as I am. Nothing extenuate. (5. 2. 348-51)

Othello reminds the audience to “speak” of his experience and his model, which aspires once to save Christendom from its degeneration and humiliation to the Turks and Moors. This model is obliterated due to the irrational and arrogant voices, which Shakespeare and Othello consistently condemn in the play. In one reading, the loss of Othello means a loss of the “allure” of the politics of Christendom and the triumph of the “allure” of Islamic politics.<sup>23</sup>

### **Othello's Effect on Robert Daborne's A Christian Turned Turk (1612)**

Daborne's A Christian Turned Turk (1612) tells the story of the success of a renegade from England in the Islamic state. The British renegade, Ward, seeks self-reliance, self-establishment, high positions, and religious tolerance as a Muslim citizen in the Islamic state, represented by “Tunis,” in contrast to Othello, a renegade from Morocco, who is hindered by his irrational opponents to maintain his successful Christian status in Venice. Just as Shakespeare's Othello examines the possibility of a renegade

---

<sup>23</sup> My argument about Christendom and Islam is restricted only to the politics, rather than to the religious value of each religion. The triumph of Islam in the play means the professionalism of the politics of the Islamic state to draw citizens to its realms.

from the Muslim world to succeed in Venice, Daborne's A Christian Turned Turk juxtaposes the model of Othello with a renegade from England in the Muslim world. Whereas Othello is hindered by the racist and irrational Iago, Roderigo, and Brabantio to find equality in Venice as a Christian, Ward is celebrated by the Turkish governor for his conversion to Islam and is awarded by high positions in the Islamic state as long as he is a Muslim. The Turkish governor in Daborne's play is similar to the Duke of Venice in Shakespeare's Othello since both of them welcome and celebrate foreign converts. The Turkish governor illustrates to Ward that only conversion to Islam enhances his chances of success in the Muslim world because conversion means "assurance of your [Ward's] trust" (Scene 7, 55). Even Voada, sister of Crosman, the Captain of the Janissaries in Tunis, reminds Ward of the importance of his conversion to Islam in order to validate their marriage: "Too weak a bond to tie a Christian in" (Scene 7, 115).

Ward, as a historical character, achieved success and comfort in Tunis, which was part of the Turkish Empire.<sup>24</sup> Captain John Ward, who served in the "Royal Navy" and "in the wars with Spain," immigrated to Tunis to seek wealth and comfort after he "found himself in bad circumstances, out of employment, and in desperation" in England (Chew 347). According to Chew, Ward introduced new naval techniques to the Moors and Turks, who appreciated his talent and naval professionalism: "he taught them the use of swift sailing vessels instead of the galleys which were dependent for rowers upon a supply of slaves" (350). Also, he introduced "new methods of ship-construction, navigation, and naval warfare" (350). Ward's talents, however, were not recognized by

---

<sup>24</sup> Both of Chew and Vitkus observe that Daborne's play dramatizes the historical story of Captain John Ward. Vitkus contextualizes the play: "In Tunis, and elsewhere under Islamic rule in the Mediterranean, Christian renegades were able to gain considerable freedom, wealth, and authority—to a degree which would have been near impossible for English seamen serving on English merchant vessels" (Turning 153).

King James I, who later declined Ward's appeal for a pardon to come back to England. James I, under the influence of Venice, refused to grant Ward the pardon: "Venice continued to withhold her approval save on the conditions already set forth; and James sent a word that though Ward was offering large sums as ransoms or bribes he would issue no pardon without Venetian consent" (Chew 352). Consequently, Ward, being disappointed by the British government's decision, decided to resume his successful life among the Turks. Sir Anthony Sherley described Ward's reluctance to rejoin Christendom after he was expelled from it: "[Ward] made answer that he would give no credit to any fayre promises, or hazard his life on the hope of words, but would rather venture himselfe amongs the Turks, then into the handes of Christians" (qtd. in Chew 352). Stories of Ward's success over the Oriental land were brought to England by many travelers. For example, William Lithgow in 1615 described Ward's progress and achievements in the Islamic state:

Here in Tunneis I met with our English Captayne, generall Waird, once a great Pyrat, and Commaunder at Sea; who in despight of his denied acceptance in England, had turned Turke, and built there a faire Palace, beautified with rich Marble and Alabaster stones. With whom I found Domesticke, some fifteene circumcised English Runagates, whose lives and Countenances were both alike. (qtd. in Chew 361)

In the play, Ward describes his conversion from Christendom to the Islamic state: a "lamb is turned a lion" (Scene 13, 163)—that is, Ward associates Muslim Turks with the "lion," which allegorizes the power and richness of the Turkish Empire, since the notion of the Turkish "lion" circulated in the religious, political and dramatic discourses of the

Renaissance as noted earlier. For example, Ferdinand refers to the fiasco of resisting the Turkish “lion” while they are held captives by the Turks:

We must obey necessity, since 'tis our fates

To be surprised thus by this monster beast.

We must, as did that captain, so much famed,

Lick the fierce lion's [emphasis added] feet till happier times

Do give us freedom in his punished crimes. (Scene 1, 105-09)

Daborne's A Christian Turned Turk and Shakespeare's Othello raise the question why a Christian convert to Islam, like Ward, prospers in the Islamic state, whereas a Muslim elite convert to Christianity, like Othello, ultimately collapses in Christendom. Ward, who seems reluctant to convert to Islam in order not to resign the “belief of my [Ward's] ancestors” (Scene 7, 75), perceives the misfortunes and constraints he finds in his country, England, “compared” to his prosperity in the Islamic world: “My name is scandalled? What is one island / Compared to the Eastern monarchy? This large, / Unbounded station shall speak my future fame” (Scene 7, 181-83). Ward justifies his conversion to Islam because England does not offer him the same chances he finds among Muslims: “Beauty, command, and riches—these are the three / That world pursues, and these follow me” (Scene 7, 202-03). He refers to his materialistic success in the Islamic world: “I [Ward] have more than I can spend” (Scene 7, 189).

Moreover, in the play, Ward does not face Iago-like characters, who intend to renounce his conversion to Islam, as Iago plans to undermine the “baptism” of Othello. On the contrary, Muslim characters praise and reward Ward's conversion because Islam, for them, has universal appeal for all people whatever color or ethnicity, whereas in

Shakespeare's Venice, the irrational and racist voices of Othello's opponents, even when they constitute a distinct minority, call for the exclusion of the non-white races from Christendom. Despite the rational policy of the Venetian state, represented by the Duke and the senate, racist voices of Venice, represented by Iago, Brabantio, and Roderigo triumph over the rationality of the Duke. In Daborne's play, Islamic state, never discriminating between Muslims whatever their color or race, insures that each Muslim citizen is equally served by the government and promoted to high positions with respect to the qualification of each one. In this context, Daborne dramatizes the Turkish concern to convince Ward to convert to Islam so that they can benefit from his military skills. Crosman, the Captain of the Janissaries in Tunis, pines to appoint Ward the "captainship of our strong castle" (Scene 7, 253).

The Death of Ward, just as of Othello, jeopardizes the triumph of the "allure" of Islamic state over Christendom. Daniel J. Vitkus, the editor of the play, comments on the death of Ward in his "Introduction" to the play: "Ward's suicide . . . is less heroic and more damnable. Like Othello at the end of Shakespeare's play, Ward kills the woman he loves and then turns his sword on himself, assuring and confirming his damnation. He dies cursing, offering himself as an example to all future pirates and renegades" (39). Matar also argues that Daborne dramatizes a terrifying death scene of Ward to punish "evil": "Daborne draped Ward in evil because he wanted to show the consequences of apostasy. There was no redeeming quality in Ward, and much like Faustus in Marlowe's play, the renegade pirate met with a violent and fully deserved death—torn to pieces and thrown into the sea" (Islam 57). My interpretation of the suicide scene of Ward and Othello differs from Vitkus' and Matar's because, in my reading, Ward is not seeking

“heroic” action by his death nor expecting a “violent” punishment for his crime as much as he wants to critique the political system of Christendom, which fails to provide its impoverished Christians with economic success and promotion the Turks give to their citizens and to face the fact of the “allure” of the Islamic state. This “allure” is what William Gouge (1578-1653) warned against in 1638 when he prayed for Christians to “be more watchful in avoiding all temptations that might allure [emphasis added] to that sin again” (“Recovery” M3, 86). Samuel Chew, for example, finds the death scene of Ward in Daborne’s play as ironic: “all that need to be said here is that its ending with the sentencing of Ward to be torn to pieces and thrown into the sea is a wild departure from the truth, for the pirate [Ward] continued to live prosperously among the Moors” (360).

Ward, like Othello, criticizes the arrogance of Christians in not learning from the Turkish experience in granting tolerance, self-assurance, and economic promotion to its Muslim citizens whatever their race or religion. Ward kills himself, I maintain, because he despairs of his experience with Christendom, which continues to assert that Islam is still a “sin,” while ironically Islamic state offers favors and blessings to its Muslim subjects. Ward, like Othello, addresses the audience to judge his case whether his conversion is a “sin” or not: “To die I dare not: the jaws of hell do yawn / To swallow me. Live, I cannot: famine threats, / And that the worst of poverty—contempt and scorn” (Scene 13, 112-14). Ward, even at the moment of death, criticizes the failure of the political Christendom, instead of repenting his “sin.” In his mind, political Christendom is represented by “contempt,” “scorn” and “famine.” Like Othello, Ward calls for political reform within Christendom in order to be able to face the Turkish “lion.” For Ward, that reform, however, is merely illusory as it is for Othello: like Shakespeare’s

tragic protagonist, he commits suicide. In other words, Ward and Othello lament the presence of Iago-like miscreants, who corrupt the political system of Christian countries, rather than Christianity as religion.

It seems, in one interpretation, that Daborne's play and Shakespeare's Othello's shift their scenes in order to convey a panoramic analysis of the experience of a renegade in the Islamic state, represented by Tunis, and another in Christendom: whereas the former (Ward) is celebrated and contained heartily as an equal Muslim citizen regardless of race or origin, the latter (Othello) is ultimately excluded and rejected by the dominating irrational voices of Iago, Roderigo, and Brabantio on the basis of ethnicity and cannot, seemingly, enjoy the same rights of a white Christian. Whereas the Islamic state awards qualifications and services, political Christendom, when represented by those who distort its worldview, punishes its subjects on the basis of color and ethnicity. However, Othello is also directly responsible for his political disintegration in Venice since he accepts the perverted and corrupted advice of Iago, who represents an irrational and distorted minority of Christendom and who maliciously inverts the teachings of Christianity, which are based on love and epitomized so profoundly in Desdemona. Othello, who is supported heartily by the Duke of Venice, Venetian senators and Desdemona, deserts their spirited and loving guidance and blindly surrenders himself to Iago's wicked intrigues. Othello, while seen as a nobleman in Venice, collapses at Cyprus, which is the place of war and chaos. The Turkish navy, which is heading to invade Cyprus, also contributes to the chaotic atmosphere, by which Othello loses contact with the rationality of the Duke of Venice and the senators and is victimized by Iago, who exploits his temporary separation from the Duke and the senators and, owing to this

isolation, plans his conspiracy and intrigues against Othello more efficaciously. In other words, Othello's decline is amalgamation of Othello's blindness to follow Iago's corrupted guidance, conspiracies and intrigues of Iago, and the Turkish invasion of Cyprus. In this sense, both plays call attention to the malicious radicalization of Christianity and for the rejection of arrogant and irrational voices which object to the participation of all Christians whatever their ethnicity or color in Christendom. Also, both Shakespeare and Daborne dramatize the Turkish experience as politically astute, valuable and humane since it insures the security and welfare of its Muslim citizens and is, thus, attractive to many Christians because of its political appeal and its economic reparation over its lands. Both plays, in this reading, critique the political system which deconstructs Christianity as a religion since those countries, where such destruction occurs, do not offer the same opportunities available in the Islamic state. Also, both Othello and Ward are dramatic representations of the Renaissance concept of the religious renegade, who prefers one culture and religion over the other.

## CHAPTER TWO

### THE CONCEPT OF THE “CULTURAL RENEGADE” IN RESTORATION

#### DRAMA

This chapter, while discussing the political, economic and religious discourse of tolerance in Restoration England towards the Muslim Orient, explores the Restoration drama as deconstructive to the Renaissance anxiety to Islam and the religious renegade. The English Restoration dramatists harmonized the English theater with the new policies of England of “Respect and Friendship,” enriching “free and open Trade” (Present Gg, 217) as recommended by Paul Rycaut (1629-1700) with the Turks and Moors, reevaluation of Islam as a monotheist religion, and the European invitation to the Turkish Empire as a pivotal part of Europe rather than the terrorist opponent. The characters of the “cultural renegade”—Alphonso, Solyman, Ianthe, and Roxolana in William Davenant’s The Siege of Rhodes (Parts 1/2) (1656-1663), Almanzor and Almahide in John Dryden’s The Conquest of Granada (Parts 1/2) (1672), Wildblood and Donna Jacinta in Dryden’s An Evening’s Love (1668), Dorax in Dryden’s Don Sebastian (1689), Towerson and Ysabinda in Dryden’s Amboyna (1673), and Thomazo in Henry Neville Payne’s The Siege of Constantinople (1675)—represent the dramatic transformation of the negative and racial renegade in Renaissance—as discussed in chapter one—into the phenomenon of the “cultural renegade”—or what I call the “Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist—who is a cross-cultural, revolutionary and political activist, transcending the limitations of place, religion, and nation and interfaces other cultures without losing his/her religion or culture. The “cultural renegade” questions neither the

rightness of Islam/Christianity nor the predilection of Western culture over the Islamic one, since he/she believes in the interconnectedness and reciprocation of both cultures.

The political discourse towards the Muslim Orient tended towards moderation and leniency in Restoration England in the late seventeenth century because of the Turkish military decrepitude. In his book The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe (2002), Daniel Goffman explains that the West changed its political perception of the Turks in the late seventeenth century when the Ottoman Empire was no longer a threat to the West: “by the last decades of the seventeenth century, the Ottoman Empire was as integrated into Europe as it would ever be. Earlier, it had been perceived as too much the belligerent outsider for Christendom to integrate the empire into its political, economic, and social body” (224-25). The weakness of the Turkish army, in contrast to the development of European armies in the late seventeenth century, articulated a sense of comfort among the western countries to redefine their relationship with the Muslim Orient, based on friendship and alliance. Goffman sheds light on the new political relationship between the West and the Oriental Turk: “the Europe of Louis XIV and Charles II, however, considered the Ottomans—as friend or foe—along with other states of Europe in their diplomatic, commercial, and military policies. This was an Ottoman Europe almost as much as it was a Venetian or Hapsburg one” (225). Even though the Turkish power was still causing a threat to neighboring Christian countries like the Island of Crete, which was surrendered to the Turks in 1669 after a long siege, the Turkish naval power was no longer qualified for an imperial conquest to the heart of Christendom as was the case in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. In his book The Ottoman Centuries: The Rise and Fall of the Turkish Empire (1977), Lord Kinross elucidates the

retreating of the Turkish military power in Crete: “the continuing Ottoman campaign against Crete made it clearer than ever that the Turks no longer had command of the sea. . . . The Turks could no longer defend their own sea routes or even their own coasts” (331). Therefore, the Turks, recognizing their military degeneration, were forced to sign peace treaties and desisted from pursuing imperial ambitions of conquest. Kinross shows how in 1681 the Turks had to accept “a treaty of peace [which] was signed with the Russians, by which the Turks renounced all claim to the Ukraine and withdrew their troops from the area . . .” (342).

The defeat of the Turks in Vienna in 1683 concluded the Turkish gradual military deterioration. The Turkish Grand Vezir, Kara Mustafa, led the Turkish army to besiege Vienna and to resuscitate the imperial aspirations of the Turks. However, he did not recognize the incompatibility of the Turkish army to achieve what Suleiman the Magnificent could not achieve in his first siege to Vienna in 1529. The military interference of King John Sobieski of Poland accelerated the Turkish defeat of the battle when Kara Mustafa fled the fierce battlefield, leaving behind many Turkish soldiers dead or captivated.<sup>25</sup> Even though the Turks besieged Vienna for a long time, the European countries were not fervent to constitute a holy league against the Turks since each European country had different political agenda of correspondence and interest with the Turks, mostly based on trade. Furthermore, the West was aware of the Turkish military puniness to expand or to dominate Europe. Kinross describes the Western military supremacy over the Turks: “definitely there would be no return to the great days of the conquerors. By the European statesmen the inferiority of the Ottoman Empire to Europe

---

<sup>25</sup> For more information about the second Siege of Vienna by the Turks, see Lonnie Johnson’s Central Europe: Enemies, Neighbors, Friends (New York: Oxford UP, 1996) 95-102. See Lord Kinross’ The Ottoman Centuries: The Rise and Fall of the Turkish Empire, 341-57.

and increasing dependence upon it was henceforward accepted as a political fact” (357). However, the Turkish successive defeats in the late seventeenth did not impress all European countries, especially those which had commercial relations with the Turks like England and France. Therefore, as Bernard Lewis, in his book Islam and the West, observes:

After the withdrawal from Vienna and the military and political defeats that followed it, the new relationship became clear to both sides. Europe still had a Turkish problem, because Turkey remained an important factor in the European balance of power, but it was now the problem of Turkish weakness, not of Turkish strength. And Islam, which had long ceased to be regarded by the Christian churches as a serious religious adversary, now ceased to be even a serious military threat. (19)

The England of Charles II, while enjoying commerce relationships with the Turks and Moors, entered two devastating wars with the Dutch. The English wars after the Restoration no longer had religious or crusading motivations; rather, they were based on materialistic concerns. For the English court of the Restoration, the Turks and Moors did not form rivalry competition over trade as was the case with the Dutch; rather, the Turks and Moors were important importers of the English goods. In his article “Trade, Politics and Strategy: The Anglo-Dutch Wars in the Levant (1645-1675),” Jonathan I. Israel explains how the English and Dutch were competing to expand their exports to the Turkish Empire and to dominate the trade routes in the Mediterranean: “the first Anglo-Dutch War confirmed the indispensable role of naval power in the Mediterranean and also the value of the system of bi-annual armed convoys of ‘great ships’ . . . designed to

enhance business confidence and provide a psychological climate of security and stability in a highly insecure environment also in peace time” (21). Therefore, not only the naval power of the Dutch caused anxiety to the England of Charles II but also to the France of Louis XIV. Jonathan I. Israel, in his article “The Emerging Empire: The Continental Perspective, 1650-1713,” describes the objective of the Anglo-French alliance (1672-74) against the Dutch: “France and England were not intending to dismember the Dutch Republic entirely, but it was certainly their aim to destroy the Republic’s military and naval power, annex some Dutch territory, strip the Republic of its most valuable commerce, and deprive it of most of its colonies in Asia, Africa, and the Americas” (434). Moreover, religion was not the real motivation behind the Anglo-French alliance since both the England of Charles II and the Dutch were Protestants, while the France of Louis XIV was Catholic. In other words, Europe in the late seventeenth century ceased to acknowledge wars as holy religious wars, but as national and materialistic wars.

Trade with the Oriental Muslim flourished after the Restoration and facilitated cultural rapprochement between the English merchants and Muslims. In his book A History of the Levant Company, Alfred C. Wood explains how King Charles II confirmed the renewal of the Levant charter in 1661 when “it renewed the rights granted by King James I in 1605 and added several new clauses” (95). Moreover, the new charter granted the Levant Company a political autonomy in choosing its officials: “the right to vote at the election of the Company’s officers was henceforth limited to those members who in the previous twelve months had traded and paid impositions to the value of at least 40 shillings to the Company” (Wood 95). Because of the threat to their prosperity and profits, the Levant’s officials were worried about the danger of wars on their

merchandise. For example, the reign of William III, unlike Charles II's and James II's, witnessed Anglo-Dutch alliance against the French in 1690s and caused great losses to the Levant Company. In 1691, Nathaniel Harley lamented the Company's loss as a result of wars with the French:

This last misfortune of our ships is truly a great loss to the nation, but to the traders hither the greatest they or any other society of merchants ever felt at one blow. I cannot compute this factory's (Aleppo) loss to be less than 250 or 300,000 crowns, which is no small matter among five or six and twenty persons. You cannot think me exempt from so general a calamity in which I have but too great a share, but possibly less than others who have lost not only the labour of ten or twelve years but are deprived also of all future hopes. (qtd. in Wood 111)

The English merchants, in this sense, aspired to have peace not only with the Turks and Moors, but also with the Europeans so that they could pursue their trade without any "calamity," in Harley's word, or interference.

The Turks provided all facilities to the English merchants to secure their safe trade and their free religious worship over the Oriental land. Goffman expounds the Turkish procedures to ensure the security of the Levant's merchants: "Thus, the *harbi*, foreign, non-Muslim 'enemy,' upon taking up residency in Ottoman domains, received an *aman* [security], or safe conduct" (196). Moreover, the Turks perceived the Levant's merchants as Turkish citizens: "the Islamic worldview envisioned Dutch, English, and French traders, no less than Genoese and Venetians ones, as *taifes* [groups], and thus potential Ottoman subjects" (196). The Levant's European merchants established their trade in three major Ottoman cities: "Istanbul, Izmir, and Aleppo" and enjoyed a kind of

“communal self-rule” and “commercial predominance” (Goffman 201). In addition, the Turks did not force the merchants to convert to Islam; rather, their freedom of worship was guaranteed by the Turkish law to attend churches and to preach freely: “it was fine for the missionary to proselytize among fellow Christians and even Jews” (210).

Restoration England encouraged the trade of the English East India Company. King Charles II not only renewed the Levant Company’s charter but also the East India Company’s. The Stuarts’ desire to expand the English trade overseas reflected the political transformation of the English consciousness of the importance of trade to the formation and prosperity of the British nation. In his article, “Pressure from Leadenhall: The East India Company Lobby, 1660-1678,” Arnold Sherman explores the effects of the East India Company’s “lobby” in determining the King’s and parliament’s political decisions and in drawing the foreign policy of England in terms of “war and peace” with countries: “the charter of 1661 gave the Company the power to deal with Englishmen who lived or traded in Asia, or who tried to import Asian goods into England without Company permission. The charter . . . granted the Company the right to wage war against non-Christians” (347). Such authority revealed the effect of the Company’s “lobby” on the Stuart Kings through granting them “gifts” and “loans”: “Charles II seemed to be perpetually short of money. So beginning in 1660, the Company used its funds to win concessions from the King” (336). Obviously, the Company’s members varied from a King, like James II who was a “Company stockholder,” to a parliament member (337). Each successive King and official sought to serve the interests of the Company and to enhance its autonomy. Furthermore, the Company, while its members succeeded in convincing Charles II and the parliament to wage war against its rival, the Dutch, was

able to associate trade with the value of the nation: “the lobbyists created a pattern of behavior such that the Navigations Acts, and even the Dutch Wars, were not unlike other concessions that the government made to them” (346). Donald F. Lach and Edwin J. Van Kley, in their book Asia in the Making of Europe, describe the English East India Company as “a state within a state” (87) since it became clear in the Restoration that trade was a priority of supremacy, competition, survival, and international and cultural contact. Trade created a cultural and political revolution when non-Christian countries, perceived in an earlier period as enemies of Christendom, were considered friends and commercial allies. Trade transformed the Protestant Dutch as enemy to the Protestant England of Charles II, whereas the Muslim Turk and Moor were discerned as business confederates.

### **Unitarianism as a Real Representation of the Restoration “Cultural Renegade”**

The appearance of Unitarians in Restoration England paved the way for the appearance of the phenomenon of the “cultural renegade”. The perception of Islam as heretic and pagan, prevailing in the middle ages up to the Renaissance, was deconstructed by Unitarians’ appreciation to Islam as monotheistic religion. In his book The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and Its Enemies, 1660-1730, Justin Champion investigates the religious narrative of the seventeenth century as deconstructive to the Middle Ages’ theological icon about Islam: “the seventeenth century saw a renaissance of scholarly research into the realities of Moslem religion, society and history, concerned more with establishing facts than scoring theological victories” (102). Unitarians adopted rational thinking in analyzing Islam and established monotheism as common ground between the two religions. Moreover, Prophet Mohammad was praised in Unitarian

writings since his teachings shared the roots of old Christianity. In 1690, Arthur Bury, a Unitarian, described Prophet Mohammad: “not an apostate, but a reformer” (qtd. in Champion 108). Stephen Nye (1648-1719) viewed Prophet Mohammed, proposing to “restore the belief of the unity of God,” as a follower of “Messias or Christ” (qtd. in Champion 110). Even though Unitarians did not displace Christianity with Islam, they appreciated Islam as a continuation of the old Christianity and deconstructed many stereotypes about its teachings and Prophet. However, the followers of the Anglican Church of England accused Unitarians of exaggerating the praise of Islam and preaching for Islam in disguise. For example, Charles Leslie, an Anglican priest, charged Unitarians as “scouts among us for Mahomet” since they treated “Mahometans as the true Christians, and our Christianity as mere paganism and Heathenism” (qtd. in Champion 113). Unitarians, in this sense, functioned as real representation of “cultural renegades” because they praised Islam and its Prophet without losing their Christian faith

The writings of Henry Stubbe (1632-76) represented the most radical and revolutionary model of the Unitarian “cultural renegade.” In his book An Account of the Rise and Progress of Mahometanism with the Life of Mahomet: And a Vindication of him and his Religion from the Calumnies of the Christians (1671-1676)<sup>26</sup>, Stubbe refused to treat Islam as it was in the Middle Ages. Instead, he adopted rational tendencies in analyzing the history of Islam without prejudice. Hafiz Shairani, the Muslim editor of Stubbe’s text, comments on Stubbe’s text: “he was the first Englishman to cast from himself the trammels which, with the rest of his countrymen, he had inherited from the Middle Ages. There is no trace in him of that concession to preconceived ideas and

---

<sup>26</sup> The date of Stubbe’s text is unknown; however, the editor, Hafiz Shairani, observes that Stubbe might write the text during his arrest for attacking the “marriage of the Duke of York and the Princess of Modena ... [when] ‘threatened with hanging, and was put to a great deal of charge’” in 1673 (Introduction xx).

malignant notions . . .” (Introduction xvi). Stubbe explained that he would not consult biased and intolerant Christian narratives, which were inherited from the Middle Ages and Renaissance, in his rational critique of Islam: “the calumnies charged upon him [Prophet Mohammad] by the Christians, will . . . consider the foregoing account of his Life and Actions, which I have extracted out of the best Authors, Arabians, and others, but have justly rejected a great deal of fabulous, ridiculous trash, with which most of the Christian Narratives of him are stuffed” (142). Moreover, Stubbe illustrated that prejudiced Christian authors to Islam were responsible for feud and hostility between Christendom and Islamic world: “can we blame the Mahometans who despise the foolish Relations our Authors give of their Prophet and Religion?” (155). Stubbe addressed the new authors and thinkers of Restoration to deconstruct the unfair and one-sided narratives about Islam and to commence new phase of Islamic reevaluation and appreciation: “let us now lay aside our prejudices and see . . . the Mahometan Religion” (168).

Stubbe rejected many stereotypes about Islam and its Prophet. Firstly, he attacked the notion that Prophet Mohammad was “Antechrist” and considered it “ridiculous” (143) since those Christian authors’ accusations were mere mystification. Secondly, he discarded the medieval misconception that Prophet Mohammad was taught religion by Christian and Jewish “monks” like “Sergius,” who was a “Nestorian”: “if there were such a Sergius, a Nestorian, why did not Mohamet adhere to Nestorianism” (144). Thirdly, Stubbe described the medieval and Renaissance myth of the “pigeon,” which was thought “to eat peas out of his [Prophet Mohammad] ear, and therefore as a representation of the Holy Ghost would resort to his shoulder, and seem to converse with or inspire him,” as “fable” since “neither Mahomet nor his followers speak of any such apparition of a

Pigeon, nor doth any Christian of the Arabians mention it” (149-50). Therefore, Stubbe believed that the myth of the “Pigeon” was invented by an “ignorant person” and not to be trusted by thinkers and religious persons of the new age because such a fable was mere “rubbish” (150-51). Fourthly, Stubbe repudiated the erring thoughts that Prophet Mohammad’s “Tomb” was hanging in the “Air,” and the notion that Muslims were worshipping the “morning Starr” or “Venus” were just fabrications: “as the Mahometans laugh at, and deride the Christians for relating them” (152-53). Fifthly, Stubbe defended “Alcoran,” the miracle of Prophet Mohammad, as of “rational belief” (158) and not a work of imposture as was believed in the Middle Ages and Renaissance. Stubbe explained how the English-translated copy of the Alcoran was not accurate in showing the linguistic elegance of its original language, Arabic, since it included many erroneous fabrications: “our English translation follows the French, and the French is very corrupt, altering and omitting many passages. . . . It is impossible to explicate it without the help of the Arabic, Persian, and Turkish Comentaries which our translators not knowing” (159). Sixthly, Stubbe objected to the stereotypical accusation of the “sensual” description of “Paradise” in the Alcoran because he thought that Muslims’ description of Paradise was no different from the “Jews[?] and Christians[?]” (167). Therefore, Stubbe wondered, “I know not why he [Prophet Mohammad] should be so blamed for representing those Joys by sensual Delights” (168). Finally, Stubbe refuted the stereotypical misconception that Islam was spread by the “sword” and considered it “vulgar Opinion” (180). Therefore, he distinguished between the political and religious aspects of Islam: whereas the “sword,” symbolizing the use of military power, was utilized by politicians to expand their state, Islam, as a religion on the other hand, was

faithful and won the hearts of people: “it is manifest that the Mahometans did propagate their Empire, but not their Religion, by force of Arms” (182). On the other hand, Stubbe accused the West of using the “sword” to colonize and enslave the “West Indies”:

In the West Indies we keep infinite Numbers of poor Creatures in a most cruel Slavery and debar them and their posterity from the benefits of the Gospel to secure to ourselves the benefit of their Labour, and thus shutting them out from that which we think the only dore of Salvation, we do (as much as in us lyes) put their Souls in as bad a Condition as their bodies, which is a Cruelty that Turks and Pagans would be ashamed of. (187-88)

In his book Henry Stubbe, Radical Protestantism and the Early Enlightenment (1983), James Jacob observes that Stubbe’s An Account of the Rise and Progress of Mahometanism called for religious toleration in the England of Charles II for all Christian sects, especially for the nonconformists: “Stubbe wrote his Account in the very period, perhaps the same year, that Charles II asserted what he claimed to be the royal prerogative in ecclesiastical affairs and issued his Declaration of Indulgence (1672)” (76). In other words, Stubbe hoped that religious tolerance in England should be extended to tolerate and reevaluate Islam since Islamic world became an essential partner to England. For example, Jacob assumes that Viscount Conway, who “commissioned his brother-in-law, Sir John Finch, Ambassador to Constantinople, to write a series of reports concerning Muslim customs and culture with a view to suggesting the ways in which they might be applied in England to the reform of political and religious institutions,” was the same person who asked Stubbe to write his book on Islam, since Conway, “a Privy Councilor for Ireland at that time,” was also the “patron of Henry Stubbe” (76-77). In this

context, Conway and Stubbe represented the new spirit of the Restoration, which was a period of religious toleration to Islam. Similarly, in his book A Seventeenth-Century Defender of Islam: Henry Stubbe (1632-76) and His Book (1972), P. M. Holt remarks that Stubbe, calling for religious proximity, formed a new trend of Western speculation of showing respect and tolerance to Islam in the seventeenth century: “the writer defends, not a weak sect which, however radical and unconventional, was Christian in its origins and inspiration, but the powerful Muslim community and its Prophet, whom for a millennium Christians had viewed as precursor of Antichrist” (28).

### **English Historiography and Lenience to the Muslim Orient**

The English historiography in the Restoration period showed a political awareness of consolidating intimacy and cultural rapprochement with the Muslim Orient. In his book The Present State of the Ottoman Empire (1668), Paul Rycaut (1629-1700), a British diplomat at Constantinople, referred to the end of the Western-Turkish religious wars and called for “reconciliation” with the Muslim Orient: “the best use the Emperor could make of his good success, was moderation in Victory, and reconciliation with his powerful Enemy” (“Dedicatory” A2). The notion of “moderation” was a political tactic which Rycaut desired the English governance to meet when further wars with the Muslim Orient had no longer political or moral obligations. Rycaut addressed Henry Lord Arlington, His Majesty’s Principal Secretary of State, that the Muslim Orient, misrepresented by previous writers, was no different from the English people: “so that your Lordship will conclude, that a People, as the Turks are men of the same composition with us, cannot be so savage and rude as they are generally described” (“Dedicatory” A2). Rycaut, attacking travelers whose writings about the Muslim Orient were subject to

“many errors and mistakes” and showed “superficial knowledge” (“Epistle to the Reader” 1), distinguished between travelers’ and diplomats’ writings about the Muslim Orient: whereas the former showed inexperience, the latter revealed maturity and seriousness. Rycout, who held the position of “Secretary to the Earl of Winchilsea Lord Ambassador” at Constantinople, described the political privileges which enabled him to interact with the reality of the Ottoman politics, which travelers did not have: “I had opportunity by the constant access and practice with the Chief Ministers of State, and variety of Negotiations which passed through my hands in the Turkish Court, to penetrate farther into the Mysteries of this polity . . . than hasty Travelers could do” (“Epistle to the Reader” 1). Rycout explained that the Turks enjoyed high reverence and esteem to the English Royal court of Charles II and the commercial diplomacy, represented by the Levant: “of all the Princes so far remote as England, none amongst this people stands in better account than His Majesty of Great Britain, not only for the convenience of the Trade, which provides this Empire with many necessary commodities; but for the same of his Shipping, and power at Sea” (N2, 91).

Rycout reminded the English royal court of the fading of the Turkish military power and of the increasing dominance of the English navy. Even though the Turkish army achieved military success “by land,” they could not meet the western naval mastery “by sea”: “the Turks now despairing of being equal to the Christian Forces by Sea” (Ff2, 215). In this context, Rycout, assuring the British politicians that England was geographically invulnerable from invasions and militarily superior to the Turks, called the British government to strengthen commercial ties with the Turks:

Barrocado’d and fortified by the Seas from the violence of our Enemies, to bless

God we born in so happy and so secure a Country, subject to no dangers but from ourselves, nor other miseries but what arise from our own freedom and too much felicity; we ought to consider it as a Blessing . . . and yet have tasted of the good and benefit which hath proceeded from a free and open Trade, and an amicable Correspondence and Friendship with this People . . . and daily improved both in Business and Reputation by the excellent Conduct and Direction of that Right Worshipful Company of the Levant Merchants, hath brought a most considerable benefit to this Kingdom, and gives employment and livelihood to many thousands of people in England; by which also His Majesty without any expense, gains a very considerable increase of his Customs. (Gg, 217)

Rycaut, who was anxious that his praise of the Muslim Turks would be misunderstood by his English “Countrymen” as exaggerated, was aware of the Royal protection to his radical argument: “Knowing (My Lord) that this work . . . is liable to common censure, I have chosen to shrowd my name under the patronage of your Lordship, to protect me from ill-understanding and misconceptions of our Countrymen . . . against which I doubt not but to be sufficiently armed” (A2). Of course, Rycaut, a diplomat at Constantinople, was assured of Charles II’s protection since his writings corresponded with the Royal politics of “Respect and Friendship” with the Turks and Moors. Rycaut’s expression of “censure” indicated that Restoration discourse of Orientalism supervised and excluded antagonistic statements to the Turks and Moors. Rycaut, in short, was a real representation of the “cultural renegade” since he praised both Islam and Christianity without losing his Christian affiliation.

Roger Palmer, Earl of Castlemaine (1634-1705), in his An Account of the Present War between the Venetians and Turk (1666), referred to the military decline of the Ottoman Empire when Christendom no longer needed to unite its power to face the formerly powerful Turk. He discussed the Turkish-Venetian wars from a political point of view and assured the English King that the Venetians were able alone to defend themselves against the helpless Turk: “yet though these Christian Heroes be as brave as the Swords they wear, the Venetian Fleet are no ways fond of the help; and this, I suppose proceeds from their being Match enough for the aw’d Enemy themselves” (C4, 28). Palmer, as a politician, explained the change of power relations between Christendom and the crescent world since the Turks, who were ambitious to colonize the West and to expand their limitless empire, were now unable “to defend his subjects” (D, 33). Such power transformation was evident since the Turks were incapable even to subjugate the modest power of the Venetians, in contrast to the vigorously mighty power of England: “the Turks are here now thus weak, that a sudden Recruit of 1000 Men would utterly beat them out of the Island” (E3, 53). Palmer, on the other hand, blamed the Venetians’ political deterioration to the political corruption of the Venetian government and politicians, since the “Robberies of Ministers” and corruption of the judicial system were responsible for the inferiority and vulnerability of Venetians. In this context, Palmer criticized the Venetian policies, which failed to take serious responsibilities for reforming the judicial and political system and indulged itself with wars with the Turks. Palmer did not arouse English sympathetic feelings to the Venetian wars because Venetians were to be blamed for their political decay rather than the Turks, whose power was no longer a

threat to anyone: “and though the Turks be Conquerors, the World may nevertheless see, that they are no longer Invincible” (G, 82).

English priests after the Restoration showed some acquaintance with Islamic verses from the Koran and Hadith (sayings of Prophet Mohammad), which call for tolerance and peace, and they accused the Turkish and Moorish pirates of violating the toleration of Islam as described by Prophet Muhammad. In his pamphlet To the Great Turk and His King at Algiers (1680), George Fox (1624-1691) accused the Oriental pirates of violating Islamic teachings which prohibit the works of captivity and piracy. Fox, unlike medieval and Renaissance priests, did not resort to the traditional stereotypes, depicting Islam of imposture and heresy. Fox, choosing Islamic holy verses of tolerance, debunked those traditional stereotypes which accused Islam of terrorism and heresy: “did ever Mahomet give you Authority to rob, spoil, and take the Goods of them that do you no harm, and keep Captives the bodies of them, and sell them, or to beat upon the feet, belly, or back” (A2, 2). Fox used many verses from the holy Koran that condemn captivity and murder: “and further you say, *He that slayeth an Innocent person, shall be punished as if he had slain the whole World; and he that shall give his Life shall be recompensed as if he had given Life to the whole World.* Now hath not your practice herein been contrary to your Alcoran” (A2, 5).

Also, Fox referred to the notion that Islam calls for justice and asked the Oriental pirates to comply with the tolerant teachings of the Koran: “and you say in your Alcoran. . . . *God loveth the Just*” (A2, 4). Fox considered captivity as works of wickedness, which Islam condemns: “Mahomet saith, that *God guideth not the Wicked.* . . . And again, he saith, *Alms is appointed for the Poor, for them that recommend themselves to God, to*

*redeem Slaves, and such as are in Debt. . . .* I say then, according to your *Alcoran*, God hath not been your Guide, to be so wicked against the Slaves you take” (B, 6). Fox reminded the Oriental pirates of the story of the English Quakers, who were captured by Turkish pirates and lastly were able to release themselves from the bondage of the Turkish piracy. The English Quakers, however, did not only release themselves but also captured the Turkish pirates who later were set free since Christianity forbids captivity. Fox explained that King Charles II came himself to welcome and to hear the heroic story of the Quakers: “the King came to the Vessels side, and enquired an Account, the which the Master gave him” (C2, 19). In this context, Fox did not accuse the Koran and Hadith of encouraging terrorism and captivity; rather, he distinguished between Islam, which calls for tolerance and charity, and the “wicked” works of pirates who did not represent the moderate teachings of Islam. Fox debunked the medieval and Renaissance discourses, which demonized Islam and Prophet Muhammad and took false generalization as an intrinsic part of Islam.

The Oriental Muslims were invited by English religious priests to join European culture and religion and to maintain brotherhood and intimacy. In his pamphlet A Visitation of Love, and Gentle Greeting of the Turk (1658), John Perrot induced the Muslim Turks to share Christian Europeans the seeds of brotherhood and consortium since all humans share the love of God:

I say unto thee O Turk, the Great One, I am not come into thy coasts to hide knowledge from thine eyes, or understanding from thine heart, but in love to visit thee with the Message of a goodly Treasure, which never failed to strengthen my Fathers in a strange Land, or to nourish their feed in a Wilderness, or to give

courage to them in weakness to vanquish the mighty force of their Enemies, that thou mayest come to the same, to drink of the same, and eat of the same, to be nourished with the same, unto the same life and dignity which the Lord giveth. (C2, 18)

Perrot's provocation of "everlasting peace" (A2, 3) with the Oriental Muslims represented a tolerant Christian voice, which put an end to the religious rivalry between Islam and Christianity as was the case in the medieval and Renaissance periods. Perrot employed lenient and humanitarian religious discourse to address both Europeans and Muslims to abandon hostility and to retain peace and alliance.

William Penn's An Essay towards the Present and Future Peace of Europe by the Establishment of an European Dyet, Parliament, or Estates (1693) invited Europe and the Turks into a union, which set aside hostilities, on the one side, among Europeans and on the other between Europeans and the Turks. Penn advocated that "peace" as the only solution for prosperity and settlement: "what can we desire better than Peace, but the Grace to use it? Peace, preserves our possessions: we are in no danger of invasions: Our trade is free and safe, and we rise and lie down without anxiety" (A3, 3). Penn warned that the "Imperial States" would not have the fruits of peace as long as they continued to wage wars and to expand their colonial empires. The "Imperial States" were destined to decay because they could not maintain the same power and protection: "but all the world knows the date of the least of such Empires, and that they expire with the Power of the Possessor to defend them" (B2, 16). In this sense, Penn welcomed the Turks to join the European Union since peace should unite all people whatever their religion: "and if the Turks and Muscovites are taken in, as seems but fit and Just, they will make 10 a piece

more. A great presence when they represent the 4<sup>th</sup> and now the Best and wealthiest part of the known world, where Religion and Learning, Civility and Arts have their Seat and Empire” (B5, 29). William Penn did not privilege the white European race over the oriental Turk; rather, he advocated for equality and unanimity between all people.

In his book Historical and Political Observations upon the Present State of Turkey Describing the Policy, Religion, Manners, and Military-Discipline of The Turks, with an Account of All the Battels, Sieges, and Other Remarkable Transactions and Revolutions, which have Happened from The Beginning of the Ottoman Empire to This Present Grand Seignor: to which is Added his Life, Containing all the Material Occurrences that Have Happened During his Reign: together with The Present State of Hungary and History of the Wars there to This Day (1683), R. D. asserted the importance of reevaluating the Turkish politics and culture by elaborating on the positive side of the oriental Turk: “if this Landship of the State of Turkey be but considered with unprejudiced Eyes, it will undoubtedly appear in other Colours that we commonly bestow upon that Nation” (B2, 3). For example, R. D. praised the Turkish governmental policy of offering equal opportunities to all Turks, whatever their class or race, on the basis of merit and qualification: “for all are here equal and nothing but merit does advance people to the Ministry and places of State” (B3, 5). R. D even preferred the Turkish motivations to their citizens over the westerns’ feudal system, which was exploited by the “nobility.”

While the Turks achieved the “destruction of all Nobility,” the West maintained unequal distribution of wealth: “people [Turks] are studious to qualify themselves for Offices, which Personal Merits render them Candidates for” (B3, 6). In other words, a Turk, not a member of the nobility, could procure high positions and economic success,

since the Turkish system was not “Hereditary” (B3, 5). Therefore, R. D. explained that the European “Renegades” benefited from the Turkish laws to establish personal business and to achieve self-reliance “in hopes perhaps of bettering their Fortune thereby” (D5, 72). In R. D’s description, the concept of the renegade was transformed from the religious to the materialistic perspective since the renegade was to seek only economic rather than religious advantages over the Oriental land. Even Christian captives, in R.D’s view, were not mistreated by the Turks as was the case in the Renaissance narratives: “slaves in Turkey are not so ill treated as People do imagine, nay they are happy if they happen into some great City where they have . . . some peculiar Talent, then they are cherished by their Master, who does not hinder them from going to Church and performing their Devotions there when they please” (E, 73). R. D. did not lament the life of the renegades as traitors to their nation; rather, he justified their demeanor as any unemployed English person seeking for job opportunity.

R. D. glorified the Turkish “toleration” towards other religions. He exposed that the Turks endowed Christians and Jews freedom of worship since Islam accepts Christianity as a Judaic religion and forbids Muslims to deny Christianity:

Toleration of other Religions, especially cajoling the Christians and their Terents, owing Christ to be a Prophet, and a greater too than Moses; that Mary conceived by the smell of a Rose; that the blessed Virgin was free from Original Sin, and the Temptations of the Devil; that Christ was the Word of God and is so still in the *Alchoran*, and cured Diseases, raised the dead and workt many miracles, and that his Disciples did the like by his power, hardly any of them ever speaking of our Saviour but with Veneration and Reverence. ( B5, 14)

## The “Cultural Renegade” in Restoration Drama

The English Restoration dramatists responded positively to the East-West politics of openness and toleration and deconstructed the Medieval and Renaissance representation of Islam and the Muslim Orient. The iconoclastic Restoration dramatists harmonized the theater with the new politics of the age and turned their drama to political discussion. In her article “Restoration Drama and Politics: An Overview,” Susan J. Owen observes that Restoration Drama was political: “politics had a profound effect on both the form and the content of Restoration drama” (126). Restoration dramatists revised and reevaluated the perception of the Muslim Orient, just as was the case in the historiographical and religious narratives, and introduced the concept of the “iconoclastic cultural renegade”—that is, the “Restoration cultural revolutionary protagonist,” who advocates multiethnicity and multiculturalism and ushers in East-West rapprochement. The dramatic “cultural renegade” breaks off the theatrical demonization of the archetypal treacherous renegade in Renaissance and celebrates both Christian and Islamic cultures. The word “renegade” does not entail religious conversion in the literal sense because he/she interfaces and honors simultaneously both Christian and Islamic cultures while maintaining his/her religion and culture. The “cultural renegade” deconstructs Renaissance religious fanaticism and partisanship and advocates harmonious East-west relationship, which meets the spirit of the age of restoring reconciliation and toleration. The characters of the “cultural renegade”—Alphonso, Solyman, Ianthe, and Roxolana in William Davenant’s The Siege of Rhodes (Parts 1/2) (1656-1663), Almanzor and Almahide in John Dryden’s The Conquest of Granada (Parts 1/2) (1672), Wildblood and Donna Jacinta in Dryden’s An Evening’s Love (1668), Dorax in Dryden’s Don Sebastian

(1689), Towerson and Ysabinda in Dryden's Amboyna (1673), and Thomazo in Henry Neville Payne's The Siege of Constantinople (1675)—fostering East-West reconciliation through intermarriage and mutual obeisance, reverse the Renaissance archetype of the negative renegade as discussed in chapter one.

William Davenant's The Siege of Rhodes (Parts 1/2) (1656-1663) presages the spirit of the Restoration dramatization of the “cultural renegade”—that is, the “Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist”—archetype. Even though Davenant's play was written during the Interregnum (1649-1660), it was revised by the author in 1663 and was first performed in the Restoration period in 1661. Ann-Mari Hedback, the editor of the cited play, explains that “the first part of The Siege of Rhodes was entered in the Stationer's Register on August 27, 1656. . . . [But] we do not know the date of the first performance” (Introduction xiv). Similarly, the second part of the play, which “was entered in the Stationer's Register on May 30, 1659,” does not have known date of performance; however, Hedback notes that “the first performances of which we have a definite record are those noted by Samuel Pepys in his diary for July 2, 1661” (xxi). Furthermore, Davenant revised the play in 1663, and a “re-issue” of the play included modifications, noted by Hedback: “the new title announces a first and second part of the play as presented in a new theatre. It also states that the first part of the play has been enlarged. The name of the author is given for the first time” (xvi). The significance of the play lies in the fact that it was the first heroic play which John Dryden cited as a dramatic model of the Heroic drama. In his essay “Of Heroic Playes,” John Dryden explains the literary significance of Davenant's play:

For Heroick Plays, (in which onely I have us'd it without the mixture of Prose) the

first light we had of them on the English Theatre was from the late Sir *William D'Avenant*: It being forbidden him in the Rebellious times to act Tragedies and Comedies, because they contain'd some matter of Scandal to those good people, who could more easily dispossess their lawful Sovereign than endure a wanton jeast; he was forc'd to turn his thoughts another way: and to introduce the examples of moral vertue, writ in verse, and perform'd in Recitative Musique. (9)

In her book English Dramatic Form, 1660-1760: An Essay in Generic History (1981), Laura Brown examines the literary development of the “heroic action” in Restoration England and relates the heroic genre to Davenant’s play: “the most important early example of the heroic action is William Davenant’s Siege of Rhodes. . . . Davenant is a significant figure for historians of the theater because of his association with the dramatic efforts of Henrietta Maria’s court, his interregnum compositions, his own attempt at a heroic poem, and his later role as patentee of the Duke’s company” (4). In addition, Davenant was one of the first founders of the English Restoration theater since King Charles II authorized him and Killigrew to stimulate the theatrical life in England after the years of theater closure in the Interregnum. In his article “The Theatre,” Edward A. Langhans observes the essential and authoritative role of Davenant in developing the theatrical activity during Restoration: “by 1663 they [Davenant and Killigrew] had been granted definitive patents not only empowering them to run the only official theatres in London but giving that authority to their heirs or assigns” (1). Obviously, Davenant’s power derived from Charles II’s royal decree in 1660:

Our will and pleasure is that you prepare a Bill for our signature to passe our Greate Seale of England, containing a Grant unto our trusty and well beloved Thomas

Killegrew Esquire, one of the Groomes of our Bed-chamber and Sir William Davenant Knight, to give them full power and authoritie to erect Two Companys of Players consisting respectively of such persons as they shall chuse and apoint; and to purchase or build and erect at their charge as they shall thinke fitt Two Houses or Theatres. (qtd. in Langhans 1)

William Davenant's The Siege of Rhodes paved the way for the dramatic development of the "cultural renegade"—that is, the "Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist"—in Restoration drama. Solyman the Magnificent, a "cultural renegade," while besieging the Island of Rhodes, shows empathy to the besieged Rhodians and expresses reverence for their valor. His great military power does not restrain him from interfacing the Christian culture of Rhodes or from offering assistance to the Christian Ianthe, who is captured by the Turks and released by Solyman for her virtue: "Solyman: O wond'rous vertue of a Christian Wife!" (1 SOR II.ii.76). Solyman admires the story of Ianthe, who risks her life to rescue Alphonso, her husband, and to sacrifice her "Dow'r and Jewels" (1 SOR II.ii.75) for his release. Ianthe, who is another "cultural renegade," praises the generosity of the Muslim Solyman for his bounteous initiative:

And when in peace his vertue thrives,  
Let all the race of Loyal Wives  
Sing this his bounty to his Glory  
And teach their Princes by his story:  
Of which, if any Victors be,  
Let them, because he conquer'd me,

Strip cheerfully each others Brow,

And at his feet their Laurel throw. (1 SOR II.ii.125-32)

Alphonso, another “cultural renegade,” adores Solyman’s benevolence and liberality which is no different from Christian valor: “This Christian Turk amazes me, my Dear!” (1 SOR III.ii.112). Alphonso’s description of Solyman represents the essence of the “cultural renegade”—that is, the “Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist,” who is a cross-cultural iconoclastic. Solyman, described as a “Christian Turk,” transcends the limitation of religious bias and switches his religious affiliation without losing his Islamic culture. In other words, Solyman is a Christian and Muslim simultaneously. I do not agree with Matthew Birchwood’s account of the play, in his book Staging Islam in England: Drama and Culture, 1640-1685 (2007), that the play revolves about the theme of anxiety of “turning to the Turk” or what is called the religious renegade: “throughout the period under consideration, then, the possibility that Englishmen might literally be turning Turk was an ever-present concern” (98). Birchwood notes that Solyman transforms from barbaric to “reformed and transformed Turk” at the end of the play: “the Turkish ruler becomes the apogee of a notionally Christian ideal of kingship, the confluence of reason and compassion, honour and love” (128). In my reading, Davenant’s play does not address the anxiety of conversion to Islam; rather, it deconstructs the Renaissance concept of religious renegade. In the play, Christian characters do not evaluate Solyman on the basis of his religious background, rather on his personal conscious deeds. No one in the play converts to the other’s religion, whether Islam or Christianity, and remains faithful to their Islamic and Christian cultures till the end of the play. For example, Alphonso’s personal encounter with

Solyman enables him to rationalize an East-West relationship of friendship and cooperation without converting to Islam:

‘Tis strange! Dismiss so fair an Enemy?

She [Ianthe] was his own by right of War.

We are his Dogs, and such as she, his Angles are.

O wondrous Turkish chastity!

Her Gallies, freight, and those to send

Into a Town which he would take!

Are we besieg’d then by a friend? (1 SOR III.ii.124-30)

Solyman grants both of Ianthe and Alphonso Turkish citizenship. The Admiral tells Alphonso that Solyman “hath Passports sent for her and you” (2 SOR I.i.197). Solyman’s decision is warmly received by Christian Rhodians, to whom Solyman switches his cultural affiliation from Islam to Christianity and vice versa. Both Ianthe and Alphonso enjoy dual citizenship (Turkish and Rhodian) and never prefer one over the other since the “cultural renegade” transcends ethnic and religious prejudices. Alphonso reveals the Rhodian gist of admiration to Solyman: “That *Solyman* has civil been, / And did much Christian honour winn” (2 SOR I.i.193-94). Furthermore, Solyman’s sympathy extends to all besieged Rhodians and stipulates to supply them with security and peace: “Let us no more the *Rhodians* flight pursue; / Who since below our anger, need our care. / Compassion is to vanquisht Valour due” (2 SOR V.v.1-3). Alphonso foreshadows the new East-West relationship of dualism and open trade and promises Solyman that the western history will witness an end to religious and political hostilities to Islam:

To *Sicily* let chaste *Ianthe* steer;

And sing long Stories of your virtue there:

Whilst, by your mercy sent, to *Rhodes* I go,

To be in *Rhodes* your Suppliant, not your Foe. (2 SOR V.vi.192-95)

Solyman, in return, blesses the union of the lovers, Ianthe and Alphonso, and launches East-West reunion, which is based on “virtue” and “honour”: “Let Giant-Virtue be the watchfull Guard, / Honour, the cautious Guide, and sure reward: / Honour, adorn’d in such a Poets Song” (2 SOR V.vi.218-20). In her Introduction to the play, Hedback remarks that despite the fact that the main historical source of Davenant’s play is Richard Knolles’ Historie of the Turkes, Davenant did not comply to Knolles’ description of Solyman the Magnificent:

Davenant’s Solyman is a heroic figure, victorious and raised above every one else both in valor and honour. Ianthe speaks well of him and in the end also

Alphonso has to admit that Solyman is his superior not only in arms but also in courtesy. This is not the picture of the Turkish Emperor that we find in Knolles; the English historian is mostly concerned with Solyman’s violence in conquering one Christian nation after another. (I)

Davenant’s dramatic deviation from Renaissance historiography ushered the new liberal spirit of the Restoration in deconstructing the Renaissance archetype of the terrorist and bloodthirsty “greedie lyon” Muslim Orient as discussed in chapter one.

Roxalana, the Turkish wife of Solyman, behaves as a “cultural renegade.” The noble Roxalana objects to the Turkish wars with Christendom and calls for peace and tolerance: “if I am soft enough to grieve, / It is to see the *Sultan* leave / The Warring World, and end his Conquests here” (2 SOR III.iii.60-63). Roxalana, a revolutionist,

shows critical consciousness of rejecting the exploitation of religion to serve colonial ends and condemns the moral corruption of politicians when their personal concerns eclipse public interest: “Religion is but publique fashion here; / And justice is but private interest” (2 SOR V.vi.73-74). She also denounces the political and religious antagonism between the Islamic world and Christendom since the political circumstances have been changed from the medieval and Renaissance periods. She, instead, advocates that the Turkish Empire and Christendom perform “natural” rule, which is based on inoffensiveness and innocuousness: “Accursed Empire! got and bred by Art! / Let Nature govern, or at least / Divide our Mutual interest” (2 SOR IV.iii.345-47). Furthermore, Roxalana’s encounter with Ianthe represents the cultural rapprochement between East and West during the Restoration era and deconstructs the stereotypical dichotomy of the sensual and morally corrupted Oriental woman vs. the virtuous Christian woman. At the beginning, Roxalana feels jealous of Ianthe’s highly esteemed position at Solyman’s court, so she decides to meet Ianthe to detect the suspicions. However, Roxalana comes to the realization that Ianthe’s relationship with Solyman is based on mutual respect and virtue: “Roxalana: But know, I must / Your virtue trust; / Which, proving loyal, you are safe in mine” (2 SOR IV.iii.145-47).

In my view, the encounter between Roxalana and Ianthe symbolizes the fact that that the East-West relationship during the past used to depend on suspicion and mistrust due to the lack of real encounter between the two parties. Davenant suggests that East-West relationship remains antagonist and hostile as long as mere stereotypes and suspicion prevail over rational commitment to converse with the other and to resolve disputes. Just as the encounter between Roxalana and Ianthe proves successful, cultural

rapprochement between the East and West prospers as well. Therefore, I do not agree with the assumption of many critics that Davenant's play preserves the cultural difference between Oriental woman and virtuous Christian woman. In her book Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714 (2001), Bridget Orr notes that: "the contrast the text attempts to establish between the modest Christian Ianthe and the fiery Oriental Roxalana establishes a pattern of opposition which recurs in a whole series of heroic plays, and serves as a fundamental index of difference between the two cultures" (67). Even though Orr notes that Roxalana represents "a femininity perverted by corrupt institutions, false religion, despotism and power, won over only by a 'wondrous kind' Christian wife" (71), I think Davenant's Roxalana is a positive one, in contrast to the historical Roxalana, who instigated the murder of Mustafa, son of Solyman the Magnificent, in order to save the throne for her son, Selim II. In his book The Ottoman Centuries: The Rise and Fall of the Turkish Empire (1977), Lord Kinross observes that the murder of Mustafa by Solyman was a political mistake since Mustafa was more qualified for the Turkish throne than Roxalana's son, Selim II:

Selim the Drunk—from his chronic addiction to wine. Indolent and dissolute in character, he was a nonentity, absorbed in himself and his pleasures, who had inherited no trace of his father's abilities or of his mother's scheming but forceful nature, and who won little respect from either his ministers or his subjects at large.

He had no stomach either for the hazards of war or for the affairs of state . . . . (260)

According to Kinross, Roxalana's influence on Solyman's political decisions and on the assassination of Mustafa marked the beginning of the Ottoman decline: "Suleiman's passions, fanned by Roxelana, had overridden his judgment, his wisdom, his sense of

statesmanship, to destroy at his [Mustafa] death much that he had worked for in his life in the evolution of Ottoman greatness” (260). In this context, Davenant’s play does not mention the violent story of Mustafa’s murder and positively depicts Roxalana like a “cultural renegade” and a political reformist. Davenant creates different picture of Roxalana and presents her powerful, rational and critical.

John Dryden’s drama represents the later Restoration phase of the “cultural renegade”—that is, the “Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist”—evolution. In his article, “Of Heroique Playes,” John Dryden defines the nature of heroic drama: “an Heroick Play ought to be an imitation, in little of an Heroick Poem: and, consequently, that Love and Valour ought to be the Subject of it” (10). According to critics, heroic drama was first defined by John Dryden: “The Siege of Rhodes is generally described as the first heroic play, and Dryden, the primary theorist of heroic drama” (Brown 4). Heroic drama celebrates Oriental male/female Muslim protagonists alongside Christian characters and facilitates cultural contact between East and West. Heroic drama has been analyzed by critics in terms of creating the English national identity without focusing on the phenomenon of the “cultural renegade”—that is, the “Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist.” In his article “Dryden’s Ceremonial Hero,” Joel Blair explains the relationship between the English national identity and what he calls “ceremonial hero”: “Dryden’s poems transform public events into ritualistic celebrations of the union of the hero and the nation as they move toward spiritual and patriotic goals; thus, the principal figure in them can properly be termed ceremonial” (77). Moreover, the function of Dryden’s heroic drama was to present moral “models” for “imitation” to the King and royal courtiers. In his book Dryden the Public Writer: 1660-1685, George

McFadden shows that Dryden's concern was to instruct through the medium of his arts the royal court:

Dryden had accepted the prevailing rationale that included poetry, and especially the epic and the drama, among the civilizing arts in the service of the master art of politics. He was convinced that it was part of his function to develop models of human behavior, or 'characters,' which would be worthy of imitation by the leading men and women of the Court and nation. (88)

Similarly, Frances M. Kavenik, in his book British Drama, 1660-1779: A Critical History, illustrates that the perfection of the heroic hero constitutes a good "example" for imitation: "the heroic hero (male or female) is the best that nature produces—powerful, passionate, eloquent, and attractive; he or she stands above the play's other characters and, to some extent, even above the action to become an example and an inspiration" (32). However, none of these scholarly works address the issue of the dramatic intersection between the heroic hero and the "cultural renegade." Heroic drama not only offers chances of instructing the English identity, but also, in my estimation, helps to rethink the East-West mutual perception.

John Dryden's The Conquest of Granada (Parts 1/2) (1672) introduces three "cultural renegade" figures: Almanzor, Almahide, and Ozmyn. Almanzor, whose origin in the play fluctuates between Africa and Spain, transcends the religious prejudice against both Christianity and Islam and celebrates both cultures. Almanzor comes to aid the weak Boabdelin, King of Granada, against the Moorish revolting rabble. Prince Abdalla, brother of Boabdelin, assures the King of the power of Almanzor to restore stability to Granada: "And who, henceforth, to our defence will come, / If death must be the brave

*Almanzors doom? / From Africa I drew him to your ayd*” (1 COG I.i.241-43).

Almanzor’s presence threatens the rabble and ends the chaos: “Almanz. Lay down your Armes; ’tis I command you now. / Do it—or by our Prophets soul I vow, / My hands shall right your King on him I seize” (1 COG I.i.277-79). Almanzor’s efforts are appreciated by the Moorish leaders since his miraculous assistance and valor retain the Moorish prestige and peace. Prince Abdalla praises Almanzor’s heroism: “How much of vertue lies in one great Soul / Whose single force can multitude controll!” (1 COG I.i.287-88). Brought up in Africa as indicated by Prince Abdalla, Almanzor is supportive of the Moorish “cause” in Granada and loyal to its culture. He cures the political weakness of King Boabdalin’s court and confronts bravely the threatening of the Spanish Duke of Arcos, who later appears to be the real father of Almanzor: “Almanz. The *Moors* have Heav’n and me t’ assist their cause” (1 COG I.i.357). He attacks the imperial ambitions of Ferdinand, King of Spain, against the Moors and promises to put an end to Ferdinand’s colonial regime:

Let *Ferdinand Calabrian* Conquests make,  
And from the *French* contested *Millan* take,  
Let him new worlds discover to the old,  
And break up shining Mountains big with Gold,  
Yet he shall finde this small Domestique foe  
Still sharp, and pointed to his bosome grow. (1 COG II.i.37-42)

Even though Almanzor defends the Moorish culture, he rebukes the political corruption of King Boabdalin and Prince Abdalla. His royal loyalty is always connected to principles of virtue and righteousness. As a revolutionary activist, Almanzor refuses

political exploitation of his authority to the King's or princes' personal interests. He refuses Prince Abdalla's domination when contradicting heroic principle of virtue: "I'm not thy Subject, and my Soul's thy King" (1 COG III.i.520). However, he remains loyal to his King and Moorish culture in case of Spanish invasion: "We will not give one stone from out these Walls" (1 COG I.i.348).

Almanzor is, in short, Muslim-Christian simultaneously. The second allusion to the origin of Almanzor is indicated by his Mother's Ghost: "From antient Blood they Fathers Linage springs, / Thy Mothers thou deriv'st from stemms of Kings. / A Christian born, and born again, that day" (2 COG IV.iii.123-25). Almanzor, who has been brought up in the Moorish Islamic culture, undergoes constant multicultural transformation. The Ghost of his Mother informs him about his Christian parentage and birth, which is perceived as "Riddle" (2 COG IV.iii.143) by Almanzor. The mother and son have been separated from each other since her death in the shipwreck at the sea: "On Sea's I bore thee, and on Sea's I dy'd. / I dy'd; and for my Winding-sheet, a Wave / I had; and all the Ocean for my Grave" (2 COG IV.iii.98-100). The confused and puzzled Almanzor laments the cultural loss he may have in case his Mother Ghost's news demonstrates truth. He is afraid of losing his love to the virtuous Muslim woman, Almahide. Almanzor is not enthusiastic at the beginning of his Christian origin because he, as a "cultural renegade"—that is, "Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist"—does not guarantee cultural acceptance to his case from both sides (Muslim Moors and Christians). He is worried that others may misunderstand his principle: does Moorish society accept him as one of its members even though he is of Christian origin and a lover of a Muslim woman? Also, he

is anxious whether Almahide welcomes his cultural transfiguration from Muslim to Christian or not:

What if some Daemon should my death foreshow,  
Or bid me change, and to the Christians goe,  
Will you [Almahide] not think I merit some reward,  
When I my love above my life regard? (2 COG IV.iii.175-78)

Almanzor, as a “cultural renegade,” does not prefer one religion over the other; rather, his “love” to Almahide is more precious than religious prejudice. He questions whether his Christian origin is a “reward” or not. However, his worries have been resolved when Almahide, who acts as a “cultural renegade,” confirms her indifference to the religious affiliation of her lover: “In such a case your change must be allow’d” (2 COG IV.iii.179). Almahide asserts that “honour” and virtue rather than religious affiliation are the principles by which man is judged:

Yes; ’tis the Conscience of an Act well done:  
Which gives us pow’r our own desires to shun.  
The strong, and secret curb of headlong Will;  
The self reward of good; and shame of ill. (2 COG IV.iii.192-95)

Almanzor is a “half” Christian. He adapts himself to combine between both of Moorish Islamic culture and Christian culture. He declares himself: “Alas I am but half converted yet” (2 COG IV.iii.281). He decides not to become a fully converted Christian nor fully Muslim; rather, he resolves to enjoy both cultures. It is significant that the play never fully defines Almanzor’s origin. The evidences presented in play about his origin are communicated through supernatural elements: the Ghost of his Mother and the

“sacred voice.” The Duke of Arcos explains the miraculous intervention, which stops Almanzor from killing his father, Duke of Arcos. The “sacred voice” orders Almanzor not to kill Duke of Arcos because he is his biological father. This third allusion to Almanzor’s origin fosters the play’s ambiguity and prevents a definite determination of his exact ancestry. The play, not presenting empirical evidences of the birth and parentage of Almanzor, keeps it open-ended. The Duke of Arcos explains the supernatural voice, which reconciles the departed son and father:

When, from above, a shrill voice reach’d his ear;

Strike not thy father, it was heard to cry;

Amaz’d; and casting round his wond’ring eye,

He stop’d: then, thinking that his fears were vain,

He lifted up his thundering arm again:

Again the voice withheld him from my death;

Spare, spare his life, it cry’d, who gave thee breath. (2 COG V.iii.196-202)

Almanzor’s conversion to Christianity does not stem out of an innate error or corruption within the Islamic culture; rather, it represents a confirmation of spectacular celebration of the “cultural renegade”—that is, the “Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist.”

Almahide represents the “cultural renegade” model of the Oriental female. Her virtuous actions get the admiration of most characters and make her an exemplary perfection. Even though Almahide’s forced marriage to King Boabdellin hinders her love to Almanzor, she remains a faithful wife to Boabdellin. She assures her jealous husband, Boabdellin, that she respects their marital bond and has no space for another man’s love:

Either my Love or Vertue you suspect.  
But know, that when my person I resign'd,  
I was too noble not to give my mind:  
No more the shadow of *Almanzor* fear;

I have no room but for your Image, here. (2 COG I.ii.147-51)

She even asks Almanzor to provide protection to her husband against the rebels because she cannot sacrifice her virtue for the sake of personal ambitions: "I no return of Love can ever make; / But what I ask is for my Husband's sake" (2 COG II.iii.95-96). It is only after the death of her husband, Boabdalin, that Almahide reunites in marriage with Almanzor. In this sense, Dryden's Almahide deconstructs the stereotypical description of Oriental woman as shrewd and immoral. Dryden presents a new dramatization of Oriental Muslim woman no different from Shakespeare's virtuous Christian Desdemona. The Almahide model deconstructs the misconceptual dichotomy between virtuous Christian woman and lewd Oriental woman. Moreover, her conversion to Christianity renders her the status of "cultural renegade" since her conversion does not embody any moral or religious transformation; rather, it unites Islam and Christianity. The Muslim/Christian Almahide transcends the limitation of place and religion and interfaces with both cultures. Dryden gives room for multicultural interaction and advocates diversity without promoting any specific ethnic or religious group as pivotal. Almahide shifts her religious affiliation from Islam to Christianity without losing her principles of virtue and probity. Almahide remains simultaneously Muslim/Christian, thereby proving that religion does not supersede culture.

Ozmyn, another “cultural renegade” figure, activates cultural reconciliation on two levels: First, between the warring Moorish tribes (Abencerrages and Zegry) and, second, between East and West. Ozmyn, as Abencerrago, falls in love with Benzayda, who belongs to the Zegry. However, the frustrated lovers need to struggle against their parental objections due to the state of revenge history of both sides. Benzayda asks her father, Selin, to pardon Ozmyn, who is accused of killing her brother, Tarifa, and to release him from imprisonment. The enraged father commands her to kill Ozmyn herself: “Here, take the sword; and do a Sisters part; / Pierce his, fond Girl; Or I will pierce thy heart” (1 COG IV.ii.247-48). Benzayda, disobeying her father’s order, gives the sword to Ozmyn and releases him. Similarly, Abenamar, Ozmyn’s father, orders his son to quit Benzayda’s love: “Leave her, or cease henceforth to be my son: / This is my will: and this I will have done” (1 COG V.i.130-31). To Ozmyn, his father’s command is “a murdering will!” (1 COG V.i.132). However, the revolutionary love of Ozmyn and Benzayda reconciles the warring Moorish tribes when both of the lovers’ fathers bless their love and marriage. Abenamar declares that “the father is not wholly dead in me” (2 COG IV.i.52). Similarly, Selin announces repentance for his misbehavior against his daughter and celebrates the reunion of the lovers:

My heart’s not made of Marble, nor of Brass.

Did I for you a cruel death prepare,

And have you—have you, made my life your care?

There is a shame contracted by my faults,

Which hinders me to speak my secret thoughts.

And I will tell you (when that shame’s remov’d,)

You are not better by my Daughter lov'd. (2 COG II.i.83-89)

Ozmyn and Benzayda behave as “cultural renegades” in the play since they go beyond the limit of the tribe and promote no ethnic or religious preference of a certain race or tribe over the other. Their revolutionary love is perceived as an exemplary model to the fighting fathers and exceeds propitiation among the Moors.

Ozmyn, while a Muslim Moor, is received warmly among Spanish Christians. His story, in fact, is admired by the Spanish King and Queen. Queen Isabel provides protection to the lovers: “Henceforward, safe in my Protection live. / *Granada*, is, for Noble Lovers renown'd; / Her best defence is in her Lovers found” (2 COG I.i.142-44). Even though Ozmyn feels gratitude towards the Spanish Queen, he expresses feeling of homesickness to the Moorish culture and prefers to return home unless he is misinterpreted as defector to the Moorish land:

'Tis true that our protection here has been

Th' effect of Honour in a *Spanish* Queen.

But, while I as a friend continue here,

I, to my Country, must a Foe appear. (2 COG II.i.1-4)

Ozmyn, who does not convert to Christianity, is praised by both the Muslim Moors and Christians. He vacillates between Moorish and Christian cultures without losing his identity. The cultural vacillation of Ozmyn establishes cultural rapprochement between East and West and pacifies the historical hostility of the Reconquista. The play never promotes Christianity over Islam or vice versa; rather, it depicts religion as a personal interest, granted to everyone. Characters in the play are never evaluated according to their religious or ethnic backgrounds. For example, Ozmyn, being dramatized as a virtuous,

brave hero, remains a Muslim Moor all the play. Similarly, Almanzor is indebted to the Islamic Moorish culture and land where he is brought as a hero. Almanzor neither regrets the years he spends over the Moorish land, nor promotes his Christian origin over the Islamic culture since he adopts both. The characters' religious tendencies, in short, are always blurred in the play in favor of cultural diversity.

Dryden compares Almanzor to Prince James, Duke of York. In his dedication, John Dryden explains the relation between the two "Heroes":

If Almanzor has fail'd in any point of Honor, I must therein acknowledge that he deviates from your Royal Highness, who are the patern of it. But, if at any time he fulfils the parts of personal Vallour and of conduct, of a Souldier, and of a General; or, if I could yet give him a Character more advantageous than what he has; of the most unshaken friend, the greatest of Subjects, and the best of Masters, I shou'd then draw to all the world, a true resemblance of your worth and vertues . . . . (7)

Dryden's dramatic parallelism between Almanzor and the Duke of York illustrates the new discourse of Restoration "Respect and Friendship" with the Turks and Moors. The Oriental Muslim, who was demonized as a "greedie lyon" in the Renaissance drama as discussed in chapter one, is celebrated by Restoration dramatists and royal patrons.

Almanzor, whose name is of Moorish origin, causes no offense to the Duke of York or the audience if compared to the English monarchy.

In John Dryden's An Evening's Love (1668), both Wildblood and the Moorish Jacinta act as "cultural renegades"—that is, the "Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonists." The play dramatizes love story between the English Wildblood and the Moorish Jacinta, includes acclamation to Islam and its prophet, dramatizes a multicultural

love which breaks the spell of religious prejudice, and reconciles East and the West.

Jacinta, who is self-confident of her Moorish culture, refers to her Moorish ancestry:

Wild. Why Madam, Are you not of *Spain*?

Jac. No, Sir, of *Marocco*: I onely came hither to see some  
of my Relations who are settled here, and turn'd Christians,  
since the expulsion of my Countrymen the Moors.

Wild. Are you then a *Mahometan*?

Jac. A *Musullman* at your service. (III.i.417-22)

Exalting multicultural relationships, Wildblood, an English gentleman, compliments Jacinta's Islamic origin: "I honour your Prophet and his Law" (III.i.447). Further, Wildblood, intending to show religious tolerance, employs Islamic expressions while conversing with Jacinta: "I, by *Alha* do I, most extreemly: you have Wit in / abundance, you Dance to a Miracle, you Sing like an Angel, / and I believe you look like a Cherubim" (III.i.440-42). Jacinta perceives Wildblood's cultural transformation to Islam: "You Swear like a *Turk*, Sir" (III.i.445). Jacinta, who later reveals her Moorish name as "Fatyma" (III.i.456), endeavors to achieve cultural and religious reconciliation between East and West through her love to the "Turk" English Wildblood: "No, the love you made was certainly a design of charitie / you had to reconcile the two Religions" (III.i.588-89). Even though neither Jacinta nor Wildblood converts literally to the other's religion, they revolutionize the concept of love and intermarriage. Religious and ethnic backgrounds no longer restrict marital relationships since the new age of the Restoration foreshadows universal and multicultural interrelations. The play, dramatizing intermarriage between Jacinta and Wildblood, commemorates cultural communication

between Islam and Christianity and calls for the acceptance of the other. Bellamy, friend of Wildblood, describes the dramatic transformation in the personality of his friend: “in that case my friend is a *Turk* to me” (IV.i.424). The play deconstructs the anxiety of the character of the religious renegade, as dramatized in Renaissance drama, and esteems the liberal “cultural renegades” like Jacinta (Fatyma) and Wildblood.

In his play Amboyna, or The Cruelties of the Dutch to the English Merchants (1673), John Dryden depicts the cultural, political and economic concordance between the East, represented by Amboyna, and England, represented by Captain Gabriel Towerson. According to critics, the play revolves about the English-Dutch rivalry about monopolizing trade in the East when the Dutch captured and tortured English merchants in 1623. In his book The Far East and the English Imagination, 1660-1730 (2006), Robert Markley contextualizes the play’s historical significance:

In act five of Dryden’s tragedy Amboyna, first produced in 1672 on the eve of the Third Dutch War, cruel Dutch merchants torture their virtuous English counterparts, setting their fingers on fire and wrapping their necks in oiled cloths, then forcing them to drink until they swell to grotesque proportions. The dramatist is not reticent about depicting the horrors of torture that his countrymen endured in 1623 on this Southeast Asian island. (143)

The play perpetuates the distinction between the Dutch East India Company (VOC) and the English East India Company (EIC). According to Markley, Thomas Roe, English diplomat, distinguished between the strategies of both companies: “the limitations of the EIC dictate both short-term mercantile strategy and a moral sense of its mission that downplays the kind of aggressive, gun-barrel strategies practiced by the Dutch” (147).

Therefore, Dryden's dramatization of the English characters as virtuous and gentle, and the Dutch as hostile and cruel, is "a basis for his championing a political philosophy of national aggrandizement by 'quiet trade'" (Markley 151).

Bridget Orr suggests that Dryden's play represents the imperial and mercantile contest of Europe over the East. Therefore, Dryden advocates the importance of England's commerce to enrich the imperial role of England: "Dryden was an enthusiastic proponent of England's future as an imperial power, one which gained its stature from the nobility of its monarchs and aristocracy but was also enriched and supported by the successful activities of her merchants and seamen" (Empire 140). In the play, the Indian Princess, Yasbinda, is subject to an imperial love between the Dutch and the English, represented by Towerson. The play weaves symbolic relationship between Yasbinda and the European lovers:

While the Anglo-Dutch competition for the Indian Princess, a synecdoche for the possession of Amboyna, reflects the link of territorial and amatory conquest recurrent in the heroic plays, the mercantile Towerson and Harmon are capable only of ignoble inaction and brutal rape. In the absence of any military conflict, Dryden's representation of European-Amboynese relations is conducted almost entirely in terms of sexual competition and exploitation. Apart from Yasbinda, and a few dancers, the Amboyners themselves are almost entirely absent from the action: the island itself exists solely as an example of luxuriantly feminized natural bounty, in which 'Luxuries' and 'the Food of Heaven in Sacrifice' are produced without any apparent human labor. (Orr 158)

Apart from Markley's and Orr's reading of the play, I propose that the play does not promote western moral superiority over the East, nor advocates England's imperial prospect. On the contrary, Dryden dramatizes two "cultural renegades"—Yasbinda and Towerson—who are interrelated by marriage and mutual respect. Their intermarriage, being disinterestedly conceived without enforcement or rape, is based on free will and personal choice. Yasbinda expresses her love of Towerson: "for I have so much Love, and so much Joy: / That if you do not love as well as I, I shall appear distracted" (I.i.266-67). On the other hand, Towerson shares with his betrothed the same virtuous feeling of love: "for I am nothing / else, but Love and Joy" (I.i.268-69). Yasbinda yearns to be always united with her husband and not to be departed from him: "but my dear Englishman, I prithee let it be our / last of absence, I cannot bear another parting from thee, nor / promise thee to live three other years, if thou again goest hence" (I.i.278-80). Yasbinda, despite her "Baptism" (I.i.120) as alluded to by Collins and her conversion to Christianity, behaves as a "cultural renegade." The play rescinds religious proclivity in deciding marriage partner and accepts cultural openness between England and the East, as represented by Amboyna. Towerson, unlike the Dutch, does not show rapacity towards Yasbinda's wealth and beauty, but he emphasizes "Friendliness" with the East: "For this we only ask a fair Commerce and Friendli- / ness of Conversation here" (I.i.235-36). Again, Towerson's term of "Friendliness" reminds us with Charles II's and James II's discourse of "Respect and Friendship" with the Turks and Moors. Towerson in the play hints at his commitment to the English King's—namely, Charles II's—politics: "and what our several Treaties bind / us to, you shall, while *Towerson* lives, see so perform'd, as fits / a Subject to an *English King*" (I.i.236-38).

Dryden deprives the Dutch from the value of being “cultural renegades.” In the play, the Dutch feel jealous of Towerson’s cultural congruity with Yasbinda and threaten to depose that intimate relationship. Harman Junior, stimulated by materialistic drives, aspires to break the marital bond between Yasbinda and Towerson and to usurp Towerson’s position. Yasbinda, in return, rejects the Dutch’s superciliousness: “if this be earnest, you’ve done a most unmanly and un- / grateful part, to court the intended Wife of him, to whom you /are most oblig’d” (II.i.14-16). The Dutch, described as “barbarous *Hollanders*” (III.iii.109) and “Murderous *Dutch*” (III.i.121), rape Yasbinda when refusing to submit herself to the Dutch. The enraged Yasbinda moans the calamity of being raped by the Dutch:

Oh Mercy, Mercy, Oh pitty your Soul, and pitty  
mine: think how you’l wish undone this horrid act when your  
hot Lust is slak’d: think what will follow when my Husband  
knows it, if shame will let me live to tell it him; and tremble at  
a power above, who sees, and surely will revenge it. (IV.iii.59-63)

The rape scene indicates the European moral corruption as caused by the avaricious mercantile contest over the East’s wealth. In the play, Fiscal justifies that the rape is not considered a “sin” since it is conducted in the East: “if there be a Hell, ’tis but for those that sin in *Europe*, not for / us in *Asia*; Heathens have no Hell” (IV.iv.56-57). On the other hand, for the English Towerson, the East is pure of sin and moral corruption: “You still as fragrant as your Eastern Groves; and your / whole frame as innocent, and holy, as if your being were all soul / and spirit, without the gross allay of flesh and bloud” (IV.v.34-36). In this context, Dryden, as anti-imperialist to all models of empires,

juxtaposes the English model of moderation and tolerance towards the East with the violent and cruel model of the Dutch. The English model of the “cultural renegade” demolishes materialistic and moral justifications to colonize other people’s lands. The “cultural renegade” looks for equal relationship, which is based upon mutual respect and cultural acceptance between East and West. He/she revolts against the monstrous machine of war and against the dehumanization of other nations. The “cultural renegade,” like the English Towerson and Yasbinda, reconciles cultures and establishes common ground for East and West.

In his play Don Sebastian (1689), John Dryden turns Muslim Orient. The play came after the Glorious Revolution in 1688 when the Catholic James II was dethroned by his Dutch son-in-law, the Protestant William of Orange, who later became William III along with James II’s Protestant daughter, Mary, the wife of William III.<sup>27</sup> However, the Glorious Revolution remains controversial among English historicists and politicians since some argued that the Revolution was an invasion to England by outside political agenda, which employed religion as a pretext to invade the English land. In his book Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms, 1660-1685 (2005), Tim Harris addresses the controversial perception of the Revolution among different political parts:

Nevertheless, the Glorious Revolution has occupied a somewhat ambiguous place within the British historical imagination. It has proved difficult to know how to relate to it, as the tercentenary commemorations of 1988-9 testified. What exactly was there to commemorate? To those on the left it seemed nowhere near revolutionary enough; to most liberal-minded people it appeared to be an episode

---

<sup>27</sup> For more information about the Glorious Revolution of 1688 in England, see Maurice Ashley’s The Glorious Revolution of 1688 (New York: Scribner, 1966).

fuelled by anti-Catholic religious bigotry (hardly to be lauded in the multicultural Britain of the late twentieth century); while to ultra-conservatives clinging to a sentimental Jacobitism it had merely served to overthrow Britain's legitimate dynasty by an act of infamous treachery. . . . Furthermore, however it might have been seen in the past, modern-day scholars have had the discomfoting habit of reminding us that the so-called Revolution of 1688 was, in fact, essentially a successful invasion of England by a foreign power—by the Dutch, of all people, a nation with whom England had fought three exhausting wars in the 1650s, '60s and '70s. (9)

To some English observers, restoring Protestantism to England after the Catholic reign of James II was not a satisfactory justification for allying with England's previous enemy, the Dutch. Therefore, the Revolution's motifs were suspicious in terms of facilitating the "invasion" of England.

Dryden, converting to Catholicism at the time of the Catholic James II, lived like a renegade in the eyes of the Anglican England of William III. John Dryden, who was appointed as Poet Laureate and the poet of the royal court at the time of Charles II and later of James II, lost his prestigious positions at the time of the Protestant William III and deteriorated into impoverishment. James Anderson Winn, in his book John Dryden and His World (1987), expounds the negative consequences of the Revolution and the ascension of William III to the English throne on John Dryden's career: "on 9 March 1689, a warrant was issued for the appointment of his old antagonist Shadwell to the post of Poet Laureate" (435). Moreover, Dryden moved his house from "Longacre where he had lived for nineteen years to a new house in Gerrard Street" in order to escape the

“double taxes,” which were imposed on Catholics: “Dryden may have been motivated by the prospect that the taxes of Catholics would be doubled: under those circumstances, a smaller house with a lower assessment was a desirable economy” (Winn 436). The opponents of Dryden exploited his Catholic affiliation to undermine his career and literary legacy in a world which did not encourage religious tolerance. Dryden had to suffer public curse for his Catholicism, especially when he refused to reconvert to Protestantism. In his book Dryden in Revolutionary England (1991), David Bywaters describes Dryden’s public and political misfortune: “his recent conversion to Catholicism, which seemed to his enemies and many of his former allies an act of shameless self-interest and servility, lessened his authority as a public spokesman” (9). That “shameless” act of conversion degraded him to a position of a traitorous renegade, who deposed the religion of his nation for the sake of the enemies’ and replaced his loyalty from legitimate monarchy to foreign political agenda.

In Dryden’s Don Sebastian (1689), the “cultural renegade” Dorax represents the Catholic Dryden, the writer and the renegade in an Anglican society. In the play, Dorax resorts to the Moorish land after being rebuked and derogated by his Portuguese King, Sebastian. Dorax, who feels injured of dereliction to his merits, decides to revenge his king by turning to Islam:

Nay, I was fool enough to love him too.  
You know my story, how I was rewarded,  
For Fifteen hard Campaigns, still hoop’d in Iron,  
And why I turn’d Mahometan: I’m grateful,  
But whosoever dares to injure me,

Let that man know, I dare to be reveng'd. (I.i.89-94)

The story of Dorax's conversion comes as a result of King Sebastian's refusal to allow the marriage of Dorax and his beloved, "Violante," whom Sebastian orders to marry "Enriquez," Dorax's rival. Dorax reminds Sebastian of the services he makes for the greatness of his King and country: "As I serv'd thee fifteen hard Campaignes" (IV.iii.462), but these services are still unrewarded: "And pitch'd thy Standard in these Forreign Fields: / By me thy greatness grew; thy years grew with it, / But thy Ingratitude outgrew 'em both" (IV.iii.463-65). Consequently, Dorax turns into the Islamic culture to seek solicitation to his pique. Dorax does not reprimand himself for the conversion; rather, he feels "grateful" to his personal choice, which enables him to evaluate the two cultures. Dorax, as a "cultural renegade," vacillates between the Islamic and Christian cultures. He does not demonize either Islam or Christianity, but he critiques the political religions. For example, he attacks those who exploit religion to their personal pursuits such as the character of the Mufti (religious deacon), who manipulates religious laws to suit his materialistic ambition: "But your Original Ignorance remains: / Bloated with Pride, Ambition, Avarice, / You swell, to counsel Kings and govern Kingdoms" (II.i.196-98). According to David Bywaters, the character of the Mufti resembles the historical "Gilbert Burner," the councilor of William of Orange:

The Mufti later supplies his prince with a general doctrine that seems a Jacobite parody of the Williamite justification for the Revolution. . . . The Mufti is not, however, actually as compliant to Muley-Moloch as he seems; throughout the play he slanders the Emperor and plots against him, ostensibly to serve his religion, but actually to serve himself. The Mufti's champion of the Moorish cause is in many

ways similar to Burnert's. (Dryden 50)

Dorax, as a political and revolutionary activist, calls for a liberal and fair evaluation of human beings regardless of their religious and ethnic backgrounds. He is against the combination of religion with politics: whereas religion is an expression of personal freedom, politics integrates all political parties whose members belong to various sects and religious affiliations.

The “cultural renegade” Dorax does not have anxious connotations. David Bywaters, analyzing Dryden's play in the context of the Glorious Revolution, observes that the character of Dorax resembles those who betrayed King James II to the Dutch William of Orange: “many of Dryden's most important patrons—Dorset, Halifax, Rochester, Ormond—had deserted James, and perhaps to reflect their case Dryden has invented Dorax . . .” (Dryden 48). According to Bywaters, Dryden utilizes the audience's anxiety of the renegade to reflect upon treacherous historical figures, who facilitated and strengthened the legitimacy of foreign leader (William III). However, I think Dorax does not betray his country nor his King; rather, he is victimized by their political system, which punishes his merits and dismantles the dream of making a happy family. Dorax, moreover, does not show antagonism to Islam, nor does he seek victory over the Islamic culture and religion. On the contrary, he joins the Moors to perform a political reformation to the Moorish political system. Dorax, like Dryden, suffers political subjugation and injustice. Both of them have been gentle courtiers to their Kings, and both are dismissed to live in exile. Therefore, Dorax, like Dryden, feels pessimistic of all religions, which Kings and courtiers manipulate for their personal pursuits: “Not this or that, but all Religions false” (II.i.220). In this context, I do not agree with Nabil Matar's

analysis of Dryden's play, in his book Britain and Barbary 1589-1689 (2005), that Dryden tends to defeat Islam:

Dryden presented his play in December 1689 after the anti-Catholic Glorious Revolution had deprived him of his office and pension. In poverty, religious and political illegitimacy and 'bad circumstances,' as he wrote in the preface, he turned to do unto Islam what his countrymen were doing unto Catholicism. Himself defeated, he turned to defeat the Muslim Other, employing the same exaggeration and misrepresentation that his countrymen used against Catholics in their libels and satires. In the play, Dryden presented his audience with an Islamic setting where Moors swore by their 'Prophet' and their 'Law,' and invoked 'Alcoran,' 'Alcoran' and 'Holy Mahomet'—words that constituted about the only knowledge that he showed about Islam in the play. Such emphasis served to posit Islam as a foil to Christianity—the Catholic Christianity of his heroic but tragic fighters—and as an expression of an irrational and violent civilization. The one topic Dryden could ridicule and attack and on which the British public, both Protestant and Catholic would concur, was Islam. (168-69)

On the contrary, Dryden deconstructs the stereotypical depiction of the religious renegade when he allegorizes himself as Muslim Orient. Moreover, it is reductive to draw such conclusions about Dryden's drama, detached from the evolution of the "cultural renegade" in Restoration drama.

Dorax reconciles the Islamic and Christian cultures. The Moorish land gives Dorax an opportunity to contemplate other cultures and to perceive the commonalties people of different religious and ethnic backgrounds share. Over the Moorish land, Dorax

reconciles firstly with his Christian culture when he meets Don Sebastian, King of Portugal, and resolves the conflict. Don Sebastian assures Dorax that he does not undervalue Dorax's services to the King and Portugal, but he rewards Enriquez, Dorax's rival, for the valor he shows on the battlefield and the self-sacrifice he manifests to save the life of Don Sebastian. Dorax reunites with his Christian King and culture over the Moorish land: "What, in one moment, to be reconci'd / To Heaven, and to my King, and to my Love!" (IV.iii.648-49). Dorax, however, does not forget the value of the Moorish culture in widening his consciousness and awareness of the multi-ethnic and multicultural intermingling significance. Therefore, I posit that Dryden's dramatization of the "cultural renegade" Dorax represents the writer's worries at the time of the Glorious Revolution: whether England of the William III would continue the same Restoration England's principles of political and cultural satisfaction with the oriental Turk and Moor or not. The end of play is a political and cultural recommendation by Dryden to the new English monarch, William III, to keep the same approach of peace and friendship with the oriental Turks and Moors as recommended in the play by the "cultural renegade" Dorax, who expresses optimistic perception of continuing western friendship with the Muslim Orient as allegorized by his friendly relationship with the new Moorish Emperor, Muley-Zeydan: "I trusted *Muley-Zeydan*, as a friend" (V.i.648).

In his play The Siege of Constantinople (1675), Henry Neville Payne transcends the religious limitation for discussing East-West relationship and dramatizes the character of the "cultural renegade," Thomazo, to declare friendship with the Turks even though he remains Christian. Even though the story goes back to the time of the fall of Constantinople to the Turks in 1453 when it was part of Christendom—that is, the

Byzantine Empire—the play looks at the event as part of a remote time of animosity and calls for acknowledging Constantinople as part of the Turkish sway. It does not evoke crusading sentiment to restore Constantinople to the Christian legacy; rather, the play ends the Islamic-Christian antagonism over Constantinople and considers the Turks the legitimate inheritors of the city. Thomazo, brother of Constantinople's Christian Emperor, starts as antagonist to the Turkish siege and domination and ends as pro-Turkish culture. At the beginning of the Turkish siege of Constantinople, Thomazo shows enthusiasm for defending the land against the Turkish invasion and emboldens the Christian army and the Emperor to face the decisive encounter with the Turks:

Good Sir, be strong

To your Imperial Self, that's all I'll say;

If so, I make no doubt by th' help of Heav'n.

To drive this Sultan back with as much shame. (I.i.663-66)

Thomazo's bravery compensates for the weakness of his brother, the Emperor, who is unable to finance the war and seems vulnerable to the Parliament's power.

Thomazo, however, changes his antagonistic attitudes to the Turks when he receives support and protection from the Turkish Sultan. The direct encounter between Muslims and Christians contributes to the cultural dialogue and lessens conflict intensity. Synan, the Turkish Bashaw, notifies the crowd of the Sultan's sense of admiration to Thomazo's heroism in the battlefield and the decision of not harming him: "Not but by his; whom you yourself obey. / Our Mighty Sultan saw and pitt'y'd him" (V.i.256-57). Moreover, the Turkish Sultan enthrones Thomazo as a "King of Morea" (V.i.544),

punishes the traitors to Thomazo's legitimacy, and restores peace and friendship with Christendom:

Synan: My Lord, you freely shall command this place

Whilst I have any Breath to give that power,

And after that, you safely may rely----

Upon our Sultans friendship to the Prince,

Which I dare say is real: But I must (V.i.300-04)

Thomazo feels gratitude to the Turkish Sultan's generosity and willingness to broaden peace and cooperation with Christendom: "Your Prince's Soul's as large as is his Empire, / And I with grateful thanks receive the gift" (V.i.547-48). Thomazo, as a "cultural renegade," relinquishes his former religious hostility to the Islamic culture and welcomes the Sultan's terms of "friendship" as conveyed by Synan: "And it has strengthen'd much his Friendship to you" (V.i.553). Thomazo's tolerant description of the Turkish Sultan moves the play beyond the stereotypical demonization of the Oriental leaders and restores the humanitarian elements of virtue and goodness to the Muslim Turks: "He is a Prince of such a mighty Soul; / Vertues in him contend for Victory, / And each of them in turn do gain a Triumph" (V.i.568-70). Thomazo, who represents the policy of Stuarts, foreshadows English cultural and economic openness with the Muslim Orient and puts an end to the religious wars. Even though he remains Christian throughout the play, he appreciates the Islamic culture. Similarly, the Turkish characters—the Sultan and Synan—do not convert to Christianity; however, they endeavor to find Turkish-Christian commonalities through which East and West meet and share interests. The play ends with

a celebration of the East-West union and mutual cultural respect: “Thom: We must your Vertue, and the Sultans praise, / And Monuments of Thanks for ever raise” (V.i.596-97).

According to Matthew Birchwood, Payne’s play reflects the political turmoil between Charles II and the Parliament, which objected to the infiltration of James (Duke of York), the Catholic brother of Charles II, into the politics of England due to his Catholicism. In this regard, the Parliament declined the King’s Royal Declaration of Indulgence (1672), which was supposed to provide religious freedom to all Christian sects and was replaced by the Test Acts (1673), which required the Anglican oath before holding public positions, since the Parliament suspected that Prince James would benefit from the religious freedom act and might spread Catholicism in England.<sup>28</sup> Birchwood observes that the play warns against the political chaos as a result of the Parliament’s pressure on the authority of the King and praises the Turkish model of “absolutism” in restoring peace and order to the political system: : “Payne instead makes a virtue of one of the most characteristic aspects of ‘Turkishness’ ascribed by English writers: despotism” (Staging 167-68). Therefore, Payne, as a royalist, advocates to the Turkish model of “despotism” in order to maintain the authority of the English King and the stability of England:

Like Rycaut’s earlier representation of the Islamic superpower, The Siege of Constantinople is an endorsement of the military might, and the desirability of empire. Both the play and the treatise participate in the same discourse of absolutism in which imperial supremacy is adjudged to be an *a priori* justification for strong leadership, regardless of issues of religion or morality. (Birchwood 169)

---

<sup>28</sup> For more information about the Act of Indulgence (1672), see Ronald Hutton’s Charles II: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989) 284-98.

Payne's play, however, favors not only the Turkish "despotism," as noted by Birchwood, but also circulates a recurrent theme of the "cultural renegade" in Restoration drama. Thomazo's appreciation to the Turkish court is not to justify the use of power for England's stability; rather, it is to disrupt cultural isolation and resentment and to establish cultural assimilation between East and West. In this context, Thomazo—just like Alphonso, Almanzor, Wildblood, Dorax, and Towerson—fulfills the mission of the "cultural renegade"—that is, the "Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist"—and shows reverence to the Muslim Orient without converting to the religion of the Other.

## CHAPTER THREE

### THE GRECO-ROMAN PERCEPTION IN RENAISSANCE AND RESTORATION THOUGHT

Just as Restoration dramatists revised and modified the Renaissance discourse of the religious renegade by introducing a newly emergent discourse of the “cultural renegade,”—that is, the “Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist”—they, as represented by John Dryden’s drama, also deconstruct the Renaissance mystification of the Greco-Roman imperial past. This chapter, examining the legacy of the Roman Empire on Renaissance and Restoration thought, sets forth a different dramatic perception of the Greco-Roman heritage. Whereas the Renaissance idealized and mystified the cultural and imperial impact of the Roman Empire as a morally political institution, the Restoration—represented by the drama of John Dryden—demythified and demonized the Roman heritage as corrupted by colonization and antagonism to the East, of which the Turks and Moors were part. In his play All for Love (1678), which adapts William Shakespeare’s Antony and Cleopatra (1607), John Dryden attacks the Roman imperial role in the East (Egypt), omits Octavius Caesar from the play, and elevates the virtue of Cleopatra. In his play Tyrannick Love (1669), Dryden impugns the tyranny of the Roman Emperor, Maximin, to his family, to the Roman state, and to the conquered Alexandria. Moreover, Dryden, in revising the Greek tradition, rebuked the military and imperial part of the Greek culture and deconstructs the Renaissance discourse of anxiety of the notion of the “Trojan Turks”—or what Margaret Meserve in her historical book, Empires of Islam in Renaissance Historical Thought (2008), calls the “theory of the Turks’ Trojan ancestry”

(16)—as dramatized in his play Troilus and Cressida (1679), which adapts Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida (1602).

Renaissance humanists idealized Roman culture and saw in it a moral alternative to the corruption of the Middle Ages. In his book The Foundations of Western Civilization (2002), Thomas F. X. Noble observes that there was an interrelation between the spirit of Renaissance—as it started in Italy—and the Roman past: “Italians felt themselves more directly the heirs of the Romans than anyone else could or did. To live in Italy was to live with the ghosts of Rome; the ancient world was everywhere” (93-94). The Italian Renaissance thinkers felt pessimistic of the social and political disintegration of the Middle Ages, which led to famine, wars, spiritual disenfranchisement, and intellectual decline. Therefore, Renaissance thinkers detached themselves from the Middle Ages and resorted to the Greco-Roman lineage. In his book The Renaissance, the Reformation, and the Rise of Nations (2005), Andrew C. Fix explains that: “people in Italy . . . in the late 14<sup>th</sup>, early 15<sup>th</sup> century, came to see their society not as a continuation of the 14<sup>th</sup> century or a continuation of the Middle Ages, but as a rebirth of antiquity” (41). In this sense, Rome gave Renaissance politicians and philosophers an inspiration to build their empire upon the imitation of the Roman model of government and culture. The appearance of what was called the “civic humanism” was fostered by the Renaissance thinkers to imitate the style and educational system of the classics because they believed themselves the “heirs” of that past. Fix points out that people in Florence “stressed the similarity between Florence and ancient Rome” (56). That “similarity” not only required nostalgic attachment to the Roman past but also demanded assertive actions to ameliorate society and to adapt the Roman experience to achieve triumph and a thriving civilization once

again Fix recites the main widespread slogan in the streets of Renaissance Florence: “Rome was this great power based on these virtues and Florence, being very close to Rome, can recapture this glory and be like Rome was” (56).

Reviving the imperial role and triumphs of the Roman Empire was one of the main objectives of the Renaissance. There was a marriage between the Roman Church and the Roman Empire. In his book The Renaissance in Rome (1985), Charles L. Stinger speaks to the imperial ambitions of the Renaissance Popes, like Pope Julius II (1503-1513), to inherit the Roman “mission” to spread true civilization to the world:

[And] to fulfill what he saw as the Roman Church’s imperial mission. As heir to the civilizing achievements of the Roman Empire—and destined to surpass them in universality—renewed Rome and the restored Roman Church could find only in the classicism of imperial Rome the forms suitable to express these overarching ambitions. An ideology of heroic classicism, grand synthesis, and triumphal culmination thus underlay the art and architecture of Julius’s pontificate, and these same notions run through the writings of the humanists active then in Rome. (11-12)

Pope Julius II was, as a result, perceived as “the second Julius Caesar” (12) since both of them sought “universality” to their empires. Even though the Roman Church did not adopt the heathen religion of the Roman Empire, it inherited the Roman imperial mission. Therefore, Pope Julius II adapted the Roman Church with the warrior’s mission of imperial expansion and with the establishment of Rome as the center of the world.

Humanists of Pope Julius II were ambitious that the Roman Church would transcend the glory of the Roman Empire because they enjoyed what the Romans did not

have—namely, Christianity. Stinger explains that “the humanists of Julian Rome increasingly referred to the Roman Church as *imperium*, a universal government, over which the Pope exercises supreme power” (238). In other words, the Pope of the Roman Church became Emperor-like, since he expanded his authorities to practice politics hand in hand with religion. As David Chambers observes in his book Popes, Cardinals, and War: The Military Church in Renaissance and Early Modern Europe (2006), Julius II’s policy was Machiavellian since he compounded religion and imperial expansion: “Julius II (Pope from 1503-1513), . . . received the frank approval of Machiavelli as the Pope who best understood the use of force” (110). Similarly, Francesco Guicciardini (1483-1540), an Italian historian and statesman, threw light on Julius II’s amalgamation of religion and war: “Julius’s concern and intention was to exalt the temporal greatness of the Church with the arts of war” (qtd. in Chambers 110). This process of “assimilation” between the Roman Church and Roman Empire was fostered by Pope Julius II and humanists to revive not only the cultural aspect of the Roman Empire but also the glory of the imperial Rome: “but the Roman humanists, possessed of superior knowledge of ancient Roman history and determined to revive the splendor of ancient Rome, made more literal the assimilation of the *respublica Christiana* to the Roman Empire” (Stinger 243).

Roman mythology and “imperial art” were utilized by Roman humanists to allegorize the triumphs of Pope Julius II and his successor, Leo X (1513-1521). For example, when Pope Leo X succeeded Julius II, the papal transition was compared by Roman humanists as “the displacement of Mars [Roman God of War] by Pallas Athena, Mercury, and Apollo [God of poetry and music]” (Stinger 247). That description was

evoked by the Roman humanists' ambition that the new Pope, Leo X, would enrich the cultural and artistic scholarship in Rome as was the case with the Roman Emperor, Caesar Augustus. Therefore, Leo X was called the "new Augustus" (Stinger 12). Presumed by humanists to restore peace and political stability to Rome after the achieved triumphs of Julius II, Leo X was called the "Pope of peace" (Chambers 134) to evoke assimilation between him and the Roman Emperor, Caesar Augustus, who brought peace to Rome at the later stages of his life. In addition, celebrations of triumph were expressed through Roman means such as the throwing of coins to people crowded in streets and the use of the "chariots," which Stazio Gadio in 1512 described as "in imitation of ancient Roman triumphs and all constructed in praise of Pope Julius" (qtd. in Chambers 129). Moreover, Roman architecture was restored in designing the "domes, piers, and massive arches of the imperial baths" (Stinger 281).

For example, Filippo Brunelleschi (1377-1446), the famous Italian architect and designer of the cupola of the Dome of Florence, was considered one of the first Renaissance architects who introduced the Roman architecture to the Renaissance building and designing techniques. Brunelleschi's rediscovery of ancient architectural methods was influential to later Renaissance architects. In his article "Brunelleschi's Inventions and the 'Renewal of Roman Masonry Work'" (1950), Frank D. Prager explains the importance of Brunelleschi's architectural rediscoveries: "this renewal was praised for the 'savings' and 'symmetries' that it brought—both in Filippo's main work, the cupola of the Dome of Florence, and his other buildings" (458). Brunelleschi's main inventions, "the chain, the vaulting method, and the hoist," (458) had Roman architectural roots in their use and design. Antonio Manetti (1423-1497), the Italian

biographer of Filippo Brunelleschi, also refers to Brunelleschi's investigation of the Roman architecture: "He decided to rediscover the manner in which the Ancient had built large and wonderful structures, and their musical proportions, and advantages and savings in their execution. He equally decided to learn the methods . . . and the instruments that they had used" (qtd. in Prager 491).

Furthermore, Giorgio Vasari (1511-1574), another Italian Renaissance biographer of Brunelleschi, explains that Brunelleschi copied the Roman architectural methods in designing and building the cupola of the Dome of Florence: "He had noted and drawn all ancient vaults . . . , from which he copied the methods of binding and clamping with ties, and also of encircling vaults with them; and he noted the ways of making buildings secure by binding the stones together, by iron bars and by dovetailing" (qtd. in Prager 491-92). To cite another example, Donato Bramante (1444-1514), the Italian architect, was influenced by the Roman architecture to rebuild the "new St. Peter's" at the command of Julius II. Bramante borrowed the Roman architecture of the "dome" to the new design of "St. Peter's Basilica": "the greatest domed temple from Roman antiquity was the Pantheon, and Bramante designed the dome of the new St. Peter's to be comparable in its dimensions" (Stinger 281). In his book The Architecture of the Italian Renaissance (1963), Peter Murray shows the impact of the Roman architecture on Bramante: "we know from Vasari that he [Bramante] spent a great deal of time exploring the remains in Rome and in the surrounding countryside, and it is safe to say that the gauntness and sheer physical size of many of these ruins were what impressed him most" (115). However, the project was not completed till the coming of the genius architect, Michelangelo (1475-1564). Moreover, there was serious attentiveness by the Roman

Popes to establish huge libraries, like the “Vatican Library,” in order to imitate the glory of the Roman “Augustus’ Palatine Library” and to “make Rome a center of humanistic scholarship” (Stinger 282).

Humanism took its roots from the Greco-Roman classics. Petrarch, called by Nicholas Mann in his article “The Origins of Humanism” as the “father of humanism” (9), revised the Greco-Roman politics and literature, set the rules of composing lyrical poetry, and became a model for the later Renaissance generation in all Europe. According to Mann, Petrarch did not invent humanism; rather, his works were a continuation and adaptation of the Greco-Roman literature: “Petrarch was not entirely an innovator, but that he depended upon the efforts of earlier generations to prepare the ground for the kind of scholarship at which he excelled, and that he was therefore part of a continuing tradition” (14). Petrarch defines the relationship between humanism and Greco-Roman tradition as “of a son to a father: *similitudo non identitas*” (Mann 13). In other words, hearing the voice of the Greco-Roman predecessors in literary works indicated their literary excellence since “*similitudo* [resemblance]” to the classics foreshadowed the western Renaissance glory. Petrarch’s talent, however, did not find inspiration from the Middle Ages, since, for him, the Middle Ages constituted a disruption of the Western genius when the literature and philosophy of the classics were buried during that time. In his book The Age of Renaissance and Reformation (1981), Charles G. Nauert explicates Petrarch’s critique of the worthlessness of the Middle Ages:

Petrarch became convinced that the ancient Greek and Roman civilization had reached the highest level ever attained by any society. . . . Europe was flooded by Germanic barbarians whose dominance completed the almost total loss of ancient

art and literature. For a thousand years thereafter, European society lived through a ‘Dark Age’—a term by which Petrarch meant an age that had lost the light of ancient civilization and had achieved nothing of value on its own. (87-88)

England responded tardily to the European humanism. However, English literature in time did match the revolutionary revival of the classics and developed their own English literary canon. In the sixteenth century, the English humanist, Thomas More (1478-1535), represented the first generation of the English humanists. He translated Greco-Roman texts and wrote in Latin. Also, the tragedies of the Roman writer, Seneca, impacted Renaissance playwrights like Christopher Marlowe, Thomas Kyd, William Shakespeare and others. In her article “Humanism and English Literature in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries,” Clare Carroll elucidates the dramatic assimilation of the Renaissance tragedy to Seneca’s: “many features of Elizabethan drama—the five-act structure, stichomythia . . . and *sententiae* (or pithy maxims)—were taken over from Seneca, as were the predilection for haunting ghosts, dreams and ominous curses. Even the iambic pentameter of blank verse may have emerged in part from the sound of the Senecan iambic” (254). Similarly, English poets like Sir Thomas Wyatt (1503-1542) and Sir Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey (1517-1547) imitated the style of Petrarch, introduced the English sonnets and translated the sonnets of Petrarch. They represented the “phase of English humanism” since they translated the classics into the “vernacular” (Carroll 256).

In this context, English humanists called for the assimilation of the classics through translating ancient manuscripts and creating the English vernacular on the basis of imitating their style. English humanists looked at the Romans as a model since they enriched their Roman cultural heritage by translating their Greek predecessors; therefore,

to gain the same Roman cultural prestige, the English humanists endeavored to create an English canon on the basis of the classics. Sir Thomas Elyot (1490-1546), the English Renaissance scholar, evoked the English humanists to imitate the Roman model: “lyke as the Romanes translated the wisdom of Grecia in to their citie, we may, if we liste, bringe the lernynges and wisdomes of them both in to this realme of Englande, by the translation of their warkes; sens lyke enterprise hath ben taken by frenche men, Italions, and Germanes, to our no litle reproche for our negligence and slouth” (qtd. in Carroll 263). In this context, the English humanism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries showed more confidence in the vernacular as a medium of conveying the literature and wisdom of the classics. In his article “Humanism and Seventeenth-Century English Literature,” Joseph Loewenstein points out: “in the seventeenth century, Greek lyric and dramatic models became more accessible and the work of assimilating and, then, competing with them was lively and absorbing” (281). In other words, the English humanists moved from the process of “assimilating” the Greco-Roman literature to the establishing of English tradition, which was seen as similar to the mechanism by which the Romans assimilated the Greek culture and thereafter created their independent cultural trend. Consequently, the Roman cultural and political experience was highly idealized and celebrated by humanists, who considered their experience as an extension of the glory of the Roman past.

England, moreover, inherited the “civilizing mission” of the Roman Empire. The Britons, who were once conquered by the Romans in 43 AD, incorporated the imperial mission into their politics. As the Britons acquired civilization and Christianity from the Romans, the British ancestors believed that they could expand the same mission to other

nations. In his book Roman Officers and English Gentlemen: The Imperial Origins of Roman Archaeology (2000), Richard Hingley defines the process of identification, through which the British Empire took lessons from the Roman imperial mission:

The Roman occupation of southern Britain had introduced civilization—including roads, towns, laws, government, taxes, an organized army and Christianity—to England. The English had exported civilization to the Scots and also used their inheritance to great effect by making the British Empire the next great world power in succession to Rome. Britain was thus exporting this inherited civilization to vast new areas of the globe. The Christian inheritance, in some relevant accounts, appears to provide part of the context for inherent teleology. Rome enabled the British to achieve salvation; the British were seen to be exporting salvation to the non-Christian areas of their empire. According to some works, therefore, Britain and Rome had a strong religious purpose in their imperial activities that presumably formed part of the ‘divine plan.’ (158)

According to Hingley, the Roman conquest of Britain, which was based upon binary opposition between the “barbaric native Celts” and the “civilized Romans” (4), was performed under the pretext of bringing civilization to the British, who, in turn, imitated the same imperial “mission” of their Roman conquerors to conquer and civilize other nations.

The imperial transformation through which the British Other turned into Roman imperialist-like was called “Romanization.” Hingley refers to Romanization as: “the process by which the uncivilized Briton (or European) achieved civilization” (4). For the British imperialists, to Romanize meant to civilize the uncivilized Other. In this sense, the

process of “Romanization” had beneficial connotations of spreading civilization and enlightenment to the other nations. As the British benefited from the Roman conquest to Britain, other nations could also profit from the British conquest of their lands. In his book Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction (2001), Robert Young explains the spiritual and political affiliation between the English “upper class” and the Roman conquerors: “the English upper classes remained shamelessly in love with the culture of their own conquerors of over a thousand years earlier and imitated them in their own cultural productions and educational institutions. They were the first mimic men” (33). Nevertheless, that “shameless” identification with the Roman conquerors was justified by the British moral “mission” to spread civilization to the “barbaric” Other. Again, Young refers to the impact of the Roman model in the formulation of the British Empire: “the Roman empire gave the British . . . a model through which they could justify their own, and which, in the language of Tacitus, afforded a significant precedent for the triumph of civilized races over barbarism and savagery. It gave them a sense of historical as well as a moral duty to spread civilization” (33).

The Roman Imperial past enriched the British idea of empire. According to Edward Said in his book Culture and Imperialism (1993), imperialism denotes “the practice, the theory, and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan center ruling a distant territory” (9). In this context, the idea of the British identification with the Roman Empire’s triumphs and glory aggrandized the “theory” and knowledge of imperialism, since imperial thoughts justify colonization. Therefore, Said distinguishes between imperialism and colonization: whereas the former constitutes the theoretical part, the latter represents the actual military conquest. Said clarifies that “colonialism, which is almost always a

consequence of imperialism, is the implanting of settlements on distant territory” (9). The idea of the “Romanization” was part of the “theory” of the Empire through which the British—as inheritors of the Roman Empire—aspired to civilize the “pagan” and “barbaric” others. Therefore, Europe during the Renaissance revived not only the literature of the classics but also the political body of the Roman institution. One major motif behind the revival of the politics of the Roman Empire was the European countries’ eagerness to expand their territories and to reverse the economic depression which resulted from the Middle Ages. In his book The First Imperial Age: European Overseas Expansion C. 1400-1715 (1989), Geoffrey Vaughn Scammell sheds light on the economic ambitions of the Europe during Renaissance: “the driving force behind the beginnings of Europe’s expansion was a search for the gold and silver needed to redress the chronic bullion shortage that afflicted the continent in the late Middle Ages” (53).

Restoration England, unlike the Renaissance, discontinued fascination of the Greco-Roman imperial past. The most prominent Restoration politician and dramatist was John Dryden, whose plays—namely, All for Love (1678), Tyrannick Love (1669), Troilus and Cressida (1679)—reflect on Restoration England’s ambition to foster openness and moderation not only with the Turks and Moors but also at home. Dryden, who was aware of Charles II’s discourse of “Respect and Friendship” with the Turks and Moors, staged these plays to condemn rather than to fascinate the Greco-Roman colonization of the East (Egypt and Troy), of which the Turks and Moors were part, and to extend religious and political moderation in Restoration England. In his dedication of All for Love (1678), John Dryden celebrates the virtue of “moderation” in politics, foreign policy, and the Church of England. He describes to his dedicatee, Thomas Earl of Danby, who was “one

of His Majesties most Honourable Privy-Council” (3), the essential touchstones of a model king of the Restoration: “A King, who is just and moderate in his Nature, who Rules according to the Laws, whom God made happy by forming the Temper of his Soul to the Constitution of his Government, and who makes us happy, by assuming over us no other Sovereignty than that wherein our Welfare and Liberty consists” (5). For Dryden, “moderation” of kingship and dominion is a premier determinant of achieving prosperity, toleration, and stability: “Moderation is doubtless an Establishment of Greatness” (5). The model king of the Restoration detains from the “Arbitrary Power” and “Lawless Anarchy” (5). Even though the play revolves about the Roman past, Dryden never gives the Roman Emperor—namely, Octavius Caesar, the virtues of the model king of the Restoration. On the contrary, those virtues pertain to the “Englishman”: “These, My Lord, are the proper Virtues of a Noble Englishman, as indeed they are properly English Virtues” (5). Of course, Dryden, from my point of view, deprives the Roman Emperor of the “English Virtues” because Octavius Caesar, like Maximin in Tyrannick Love, colonizes the East, whereas the English King—that is, Charles II—advanced “Respect and Friendship” with it.

Dryden aspired to extend the theme of “moderation” not only to the Turks and Moors but also to Restoration England’s society. Dryden reminds the reader of the political chaos at the time of the English Commonwealth or what was called the English Council of State, when King Charles I (1600-1649) was beheaded and Oliver Cromwell (1599-1658) ascended the throne as Lord Protector in 1649. Dryden accuses that era of tyranny and oppression: “as I am an Englishman, and my Reason, as I am a Man, have bred in me a loathing to that specious Name of a Republick: that mock-appearance of a

Liberty, where all who have not part in the Government, are Slaves . . . to an absolute Dominion” (6). Dryden insisted that the England of Restoration should be a model for religious tolerance to all Christian sects since religious oppression led England to Civil Wars and political depression. Therefore, he encouraged the political discourse to grant freedom of worship to the “dissenters,” who supported the previous system of the Commonwealth: “the Moderation of our Church is such, that its practice extends not to the severity of Persecution, and its Discipline is withal so easie, that it allows more freedom to Dissenters than any of the Sects wou’d allow to it” (7). Again, Dryden does not refer to the Roman Empire as exemplary model of religious toleration even though the play is firmly centered on a Roman theme.

Charles II, who promised to establish religious toleration to Dissenters and Catholics at the time of the Restoration, failed to encounter the Parliament’s pressure to issue the Act of Indulgence in 1662 and 1673. In his book Restoration: Charles II and his Kindoms 1660-1685 (2005), Tim Harris describes King Charles II’s frustration against the Parliament’s coercion:

His attempts in December 1662 to issue a Declaration of Indulgence suspending the operation of the penal laws against non-conformists and Catholics provoked a storm of opposition when Parliament reassembled the following February, the Commons complaining that it was ‘a thing altogether without precedent’ and ‘inconsistent with the methods and procedures of the laws of England,’ and he was forced to back down. The same thing happened when he issued a second Declaration of Indulgence in March 1672. (63)

Charles II could not object to the Parliament's demands of terminating the Indulgence Act because he needed its approval to fund the bills for the English wars with the Dutch. In other words, it was a kind of quid pro quo through which the King gave up the Act in return of the Parliament's approval. The Parliament feared that the Act would enable Prince James, the Catholic brother of Charles II, to transform Protestant England to Catholicism. The Indulgence Act, as indicated by Harris, made the King suspicious in the eyes of the Parliament since he showed "sympathies for Roman Catholicism," made "alliance with the Catholic France," and constantly demanded to "relieve the plight of the Catholics through the use of the royal suspending power" (72). In this context, the King remained politically paralyzed to perform serious acts of religious toleration far beyond the authority of the Anglican Church of England and the Parliament. As described by Ronald Hutton, in his book Charles II: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland (1989): "the so-called (and miscalled) Declaration of Indulgence . . . did not declare anything except intent" (194). Instead of approving the Indulgence Act, the Parliament issued the Test Act in 1673, "which imposed upon all holders of public office a declaration which no Catholic could accept" (Hutton 301). The Test Act decreed that all Catholics and dissenters were to take oaths of loyalty to the Anglican Church of England in order to prove their loyalty to their country and monarch. Many Catholics and dissenters spurned the Test Act and resigned from their public offices. The highest official figure was the Catholic Prince James, who refused to take the oath and resigned from his position and "who thus revealed himself to the nation as a follower of Rome" (Hutton 301). Amid that religious struggle, John Dryden advocated King Charles II's efforts to restore religious freedom to England despite Parliament's compulsion. For Dryden, religious toleration

constitutes one major step for establishing a strong nation. Thus, he was supportive of Charles II's views of the significance of the British national unity, which was based on nationalism and loyalty to the country regardless of religious affiliation.

Dryden foreshadowed the political chaos that befell England when the Catholic King James II was dethroned by a foreign monarch, the Dutch William of Orange (1650-1702), because of religious justifications. King James II was not accepted by the Protestant England despite his British nationality and monarchical legitimacy. The Dutch William of Orange, later William III, ascended the English throne in what was called the Glorious Revolution in 1688. In his book Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy 1685-1720 (2006), Tim Harris describes the political and religious consensus in England during the reign of the Catholic King James II to rescind the Catholicization of England at the expense of the Anglican Church and to evade a possible massacre of English Protestants at the hands of the Catholics: "a Catholic monarch, the Whigs predicted, would persecute Protestants, overturn the rule of law, abandon parliament, rule through a standing army, and be a threat to the lives, liberties and estates of Protestants" (25). Consequently, the Dutch William of Orange received "invitation" letters from the earls of England to dethrone the English Catholic monarchy of James II. However, the justifications of the Revolution remained controversial to critics: whether it was a real revolution or an "invasion" of England. Harris elaborates on the controversy of the Revolution: "It was, after all, an event fuelled by anti-Catholic bigotry, one that was to lead to a bloody war in Ireland and the setting up of a severe penal code against the majority Catholic population . . . to the loss of political sovereignty for Scotland. To modern scholars it hardly looks like a proper revolution at all" (12). In this context,

Dryden—as a seventeenth century critic and thinker—foretells the controversy of the Revolution ideals and forewarns the exploitation of religion to serve political and materialistic ends. For him, religious freedom was the ultimate proof a modern and civilized nation which Restoration England should have been creating.

Dryden emphasized the importance of trade to England. Nevertheless, trade could not be consummated through arms and colonization; rather, its prosperity depends on “moderation,” in Dryden’s terminology, of foreign policy. According to Dryden, wars and enmity could not win the nation’s development since wars consume souls and budgets which people need most for their ease and affluence. Therefore, Dryden rejected the notion of the military Empire, which colonizes other nations and subdues their wealth by force: “the nature of our Government above all others, is exactly suited both to the Situation of our Country, and the Temper of the Natives: An Island [England] being more proper for commerce and for Defence, than for extending its Dominions on the Continent” (6). For Dryden, wars are economically destructive since people get impoverished when money is spent on the military arsenal: “Conquering abroad to be poor at home” (6). Dryden aspired that the English government took lessons from the past Empires and present countries, which presented an “Arbitrary Power” of using force to gain wealth and expansion. Such a form of despotic sway, in Dryden’s judgment, did not present successful “Examples,” in Dryden’s terminology, of government because imperial Empires face disintegration and collapse:

And the Examples of our Neighbours teach us, that they are not always the happiest Subjects whose Kings extend their Dominions farthest. Since therefore we cannot win by an Offensive War, at least a Land-War, the Model of our Government seems

naturally contriv'd for the Defensive part: and the consent of a People is easily obtain'd to contribute to that Power which must protect it. (6)

Dryden's dedication of the play came during the Restoration's politics of expanding trade with the Oriental Turks and Moors, as discussed in chapter two. Dryden encouraged Charles II's policy of "Respect and Friendship" with the strategic ally of the Turks and Moors and reminded the political leaders that the times of wars should be finished and the times of "commerce" began. For him, England had only to play the "defensive part" against foreign invasions, rather than expanding its territories by arms since economic growth could not be achieved through "offensive war."

To show the brutality and cruelty of the Roman imperial heritage, Dryden's All for Love demystifies the legend of the Roman Emperor Octavius Caesar, who was part of the western metaphysics of imperial expansion during the Renaissance, as noted earlier. The character of Octavius Caesar is omitted from the play because, in my view, Dryden repudiates the British heir-role of the Roman Empire. Even though the absent Octavius Caesar does not participate in Dryden's rewriting of William Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra, many characters echo Caesar's imperial ambitions to colonize Egypt. The state of terror and fear that the Egyptians and moderate Romans, like Antony, feel is due to Caesar's use of militarism to destabilize and conquer Egypt. Antony compares Octavius Caesar to the "Crocodile": "*Caesar* will weep, the Crocodile will weep" (I.i.225). The absent Caesar embodies cruelty and tyranny in the play since he intends to enforce his authority on other nations, a strategy Dryden attacks in his Dedication of the play. Antony is well aware of the slaughter and massacres, which Caesar plans to bring against the Egyptians: "His [Caesar's] malice is considerate in advantage; / O, he's the coolest

Murderer, so stanch, / He kills, and keeps his temper” (III.i.65-67). For Antony, Caesar’s imperial mission to expand Roman territories under the pretext of bringing civilization to the uncivilized is merely unhonorable usurpation:

Yet he [Caesar]  
Is full of deep dissembling; knows no Honour,  
Divided from his Int’rest. Fate mistook him;  
For Nature meant him for an Usurer  
He’s fit indeed to buy, not conquer Kingdoms (III.i.212-16)

Antony’s description of Caesar as “Usurer” acknowledges the greediness and rapacity of colonial masters. Therefore, Antony deprives Caesar the title of an honorable knight since he acts like a “usurer,” whose imperial and materialistic greediness unravels the heroic ideals of knighthood and valor.

Whereas Octavius Caesar, in William Shakespeare’s Antony and Cleopatra, describes his reign of “universal peace”—“The time of universal peace is near. / Prove this a prosp’rous day, the three-nooked world / Shall bear the olive freely” (IV.vi.4-6)—Dryden’s Caesar is only a “Crocodile.” While Octavius Caesar, in Shakespeare’s play, declares himself not a “merchant”—“Caesar’s no merchant, to make prize with you / Of things that merchants sold” (V.ii.179-80)—he is a “usurer” in Dryden’s play. Although Thidias, in Shakespeare’s Antony and Cleopatra, designates his leader Octavius Caesar as the “universal landlord” (III.xiii.72) and Caesar describes himself as “gentle”—“For Caesar cannot live / To be ungentle” (Antony V.i.58-59)—Octavius Caesar in Dryden’s revision is nevertheless described by Antony as a “Murderer.” Furthermore, Octavius, in Shakespeare’s play, brags that his imperial policy is “honourable”: “She [Cleopatra] soon

shall know of us, by some of ours, / How honourable and how kindly we/ Determine for her” (V.i.56-58), but the absent Caesar is described by Antony in Dryden’s play as a man of “no Honour.” However, this does not mean that Shakespeare advocates the character of Octavius Caesar since Shakespeare merely adapts the historical depiction as described in public documents available to Renaissance writers; moreover, he sympathizes with the tragedy of Antony and Cleopatra. Furthermore, Shakespeare’s tone to Caesar’s depiction is seemingly negative since Caesar’s project of bringing peace fails at the end of the play.

Walter Cohen, one editor of Shakespeare’s play, comments on the historical resources and context of Shakespeare’s play:

Much of the play’s fascination arises from the intertwining of empire and sexuality. The issue is already present in Thomas North’s translation of Plutarch’s Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes—Shakespeare’s favorite source, with the exception of Raphael Holinshed’s Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and one that he follows closely here. Plutarch and other writers of Greek and Latin antiquity were preoccupied with the opposition between the conquering West, often thought by them to stand for political and moral virtue, and the older civilization it subjugated in the East, frequently supposed to represent luxury and decadent, feminized sexuality. This particular understanding of empire reemerged in the Renaissance during a new era of Western expansion, as Europe entered the path to genuine global domination armed with an increasingly racialized and still sexualized view of the people’s it sought to subdue. (2619)

Shakespeare never identifies with any character nor clearly defines his attitude in the play. He leaves many unanswered questions in the play since he did not write a

dedication as was the case with Dryden, nor did he soliloquize his authorial intent through the characters. Cohen points out:

Antony and Cleopatra almost completely avoids soliloquy and thus inaugurates a final phase in Shakespeare's career, in which individual tragic intensity is sacrificed in favor of more broadly social representation. As a result, Antony's and Cleopatra's motives remain opaque to audiences and readers, to other characters in the play, to each other, and arguably, even to themselves. Though we are invited to guess, we never definitively learn why Cleopatra flees at Actium, why she negotiates with Caesar in the last two acts, or why Antony thinks marriage to Octavia will solve his political problems. Instead of self-revelation, the play offers contradictory framing commentary by minor figures. (2620)

John Dryden, on the other hand, deviates markedly from history and Shakespeare's play in rewriting the play. In his preface of the play, Dryden argues that he included some modifications to Shakespeare's play in favor of the changes in each period of time: "in my Stile I have profess'd to imitate the Divine *Shakespeare*; which that I might perform more freely, I have dis-incumber'd my self from Rhyme. Not that I condemn my former way, but that this more proper to my present purpose. . . . That I have not Copy'd my Author servilely: Words and Phrases must of necessity receive a change in succeeding Ages" (18). In addition, he argues that his dramatic treatment of the main plot of Antony's and Cleopatra's love is "steer'd the middle course" since he arouses the element of "pity" to the highest degree: "[I] have drawn the character of *Antony* as favourably as *Plutarch*, *Appian*, and *Dion Cassius* wou'd give me leave: the like I have observ'd in *Cleopatra*. That which is wanting to work up the pity to a greater height"

(10). Dryden's "middle course" matches the religious and political moderation, which Dryden recommends to the England of the Restoration, as noted earlier in his dedication of the play.

Dryden's All for Love deconstructs the stereotypical representation of the morally corrupted eastern woman vs. the chaste western femininity. In the play, Cleopatra, as a "cultural renegade," acts as a virtuous queen, who shares true love with Antony. Her love to Antony is not politically-oriented since it is a wholesome and spontaneous love. She reveals her passions of love when hearing that Antony will leave Egypt to rejoin Rome: "my Love's a noble madness" (II.i.18). Cleopatra does not stoop to using political or Machiavellian love, through which she could forge a political alliance with Antony against the invasion of Rome to Egypt; rather, she sincerely regrets the departure of a true lover:

But I have lov'd with such transcendent passion,  
I soard, at first, quite out of Reasons view,  
And now am lost above it—No, I'm proud  
'Tis thus: would *Antony* could see me now;  
Think you he would not sigh? Though he must leave me,  
Sure he would sigh; for he is noble-natur'd,  
And bears a tender heart: I know him well. (II.i.20-26)

Dryden, moreover, creates many justifications for Cleopatra's previous relationship with Julius Caesar, uncle of Octavius Caesar, and her escape from Actium. She refutes accusations addressed to her that she exploits her charms to draw the love of Roman Emperors and leaders for political ends. Justifying her relationship with the previous

Roman Emperor, Julius Caesar, Cleopatra describes Julius Caesar as a “Tyrant” (II.i.357), who “would take by force” (II.i.358). As a result, Julius Caesar enforces his love on Cleopatra even though his Roman military arsenal destroys and tyrannizes the freewill of nations. Again, that principle of enforcement and coercion is rejected by Dryden as discussed earlier in his dedication.

On the contrary, Cleopatra portrays her love to Antony as purely innocent and freely motivated:

I never had been his [Julius Caesar’s],  
And ne’r had been but yours [Antony’s]. But *Caesar* first,  
You say, possess’d my love. Not so, my Lord:  
He first possess’d my Person; you my Love:  
*Caesar* lov’d me; but I lov’d *Antony*. (II.i.351-55)

Cleopatra presents to Antony a “Writing,” made by Octavius Caesar, in which he offers Cleopatra the kingdoms of “*Egypt*” (II.i.397) and “*Syria*” (II.i.398) to ally with him in return against Antony, but she declines that offer for the sake of Antony’s love. This “Writing,” in my view, was invented by Dryden as dramatic empirical evidence of the innocence of Cleopatra which stood in sharp contradistinction to the stereotypical accusations of her as a morally corrupted eastern woman. Cleopatra declares that she does not use her love for Antony to bargain for political positions or to leverage wealth:

Indeed I do: I have refus’d a Kingdom,  
That’s a Trifle:  
For I could part with life; with any thing,  
But onely you. O let me dye but with you!

Is that a hard request? (II.i.403-07)

The empirical evidence of the written form of Octavius's letter is more convincing not only to Antony but also to the audience. Antony confirms the calligraphy of Octavius' letter: "By *Hercules*, the Writing of *Octavius*! / I know it well; 'tis that Proscribing hand" (II.i.393-94). Antony asks his friend, Ventidius— and, by extension, the audience—to examine carefully this empirical evidence for the trustworthiness of Cleopatra:

See, see, *Ventidius*! Here he offers *Egypt*,  
And joyns all *Syria* to it, as a present,  
So, in requital, she forsake my fortunes,  
And joyn her Arms with his (II.i.397-400)

The second component of Dryden's flattering depiction of Cleopatra centers on her escape from the Battle of Actium. She rationalizes her escape from the battle of the Actium due to her "fear" of confronting the ruthless huge navy of Octavius Caesar. She argues that her escape is not to be construed as treason to Antony's cause; rather, it is part of human nature to fear death: "I betray'd you not. / I fled; but not to th' Enemy. 'T was fear" (II.i.375-76). Cleopatra, unlike Antony, is not a militarily-trained warrior to fight against Octavius; therefore, her escape sounds reasonable in the play since she, in point of fact, does not join Caesar's army against Antony. However, Cleopatra, in the play, triumphs over Octavius Caesar since she chooses death, rather than surrender to the imperial ambition of Octavius to defame her in the "streets" of Rome: "Yield me to *Caesar*'s pride? / What, to be led in triumph through the Streets, / A spectacle to base *Plebeian* eyes" (V.i.424-26). She dies as a respectful queen elevated in death to supremacy and a victorious stature, which Caesar himself is incapable to possess: "You,

*Charmion*, bring my Crown and riches Jewels, / With 'em, the Wreath of Victory I made / (Vain Augury!) for him who now lies dead" (V.i.437-39). She challenges the unspeakably powerful military arsenal of Octavius, which is impotent to overcome her death or to separate the lovers: "And lay me on his breast.—*Caesar*, thy worst; / Now part us, if thou canst" (V.i.500-01). Both Dryden and Shakespeare perpetuate the victorious death of Cleopatra over the imperial ambitions of Octavius Caesar since in both plays the Romans come off poorly.

Dryden's All for Love deconstructs the racial binary opposition of the morally chaste western woman vs. the morally corrupted and sensual eastern woman. In the play, Octavia, wife of Antony and sister of Octavius Caesar, is portrayed as a sensual and callous woman, always identifying herself with the imperial power of her brother Octavius and xenophobically disdaining non-Roman races. Her martial bond with Antony is only politically oriented since nothing attaches her to Antony beyond "duty" and the "bed," which has sexual connotations: "But your *Octavia*, your much injur'd Wife, / Tho' banished from your Bed, driv'n from your House" (III.i.258-59). To Antony, she appears only as "*Caesar's* Sister" (III.i.254), who never shares his love as Cleopatra does. Octavia plays the part of a quasi-Roman leader of Octavius Caesar's army, rather than as a lover to Antony: "I come to claim you as my own; to show / My duty first, to ask, nay beg, your kindness: / Your hand, my Lord; 'tis mine, and I will have it" (III.i.264-66). For Antony, his marriage to Octavia is enslavement since he is dominated like a "slave" by Octavia and her brother:

And now I must become her branded Slave:

In every peevish mood she will upbraid

The life she gave: if I but look awry,

She cries, *I'll tell my Brother*. (III.i.285-88)

Antony rejects reconciliation with Octavia since such a reunion traps him again in the snare of Caesar's enslavement: "But I cannot yield to what you have propos'd: / For I can ne'er be conquer'd but by love; / And you do all for duty" (III.i.315-17). Octavia's pride is threatened by Antony's mutiny in refusing to return to her domination: "I have been inju'd, and my haughty Soul / Could brook but ill the Man who slights my Bed" (III.i.326-27).

Furthermore, Octavia's meeting with Cleopatra is characterized by haughtiness and racial discrimination against non-Roman races. Octavia reminds Cleopatra of the superiority of the Romans over other inferior races: "A *Roman*: / A name that makes, and can unmake a Queen" (III.i.418-19). She reprimands Cleopatra for defaming the Roman name of Antony by extracting him out of Rome, quintessential center of civilization and authority, to live in Egypt: "He was a *Roman*, till he lost that name / To be a Slave in *Egypt*; but I come / To free him thence" (III.i.421-23). For Octavia, interacting with non-Roman races stains the purity of Roman blood. Octavia's arrogance blinds her to see that her coldness and chauvinism account for her husband's distance not only from her but also from Rome. Therefore, Cleopatra believes that she deals with Antony out of love: "I love him better, and deserve him more" (III.i.450). Cleopatra's death avenges the arrogance of Octavia, who, like her brother Octavius, intends to humiliate the Egyptian queen and to restore Antony to Rome by force. Cleopatra's and Antony's deaths challenge the imperial rules of Rome and prevent surrender to the Roman enslavement:

Let dull *Octavia*

Survive, to mourn him dead: my Nobler Fate

Shall knit our Spousals with a tie too strong

For *Roman* Laws to break. (V.i.417-20)

Both Antony and Cleopatra function as “cultural renegades,” a concept discussed in chapter two; both of them, that is, are cross-cultural and revolutionary characters, who interface each culture without losing their cultural heritage. In the play, Antony criticizes his Roman culture, which is stained by the imperial ambitions of Octavius Caesar, who conquers and subdues other nations to his realm by force, a principle which Dryden attacks in his dedication of the play as noted earlier. Antony is not happy with his marriage to Caesar’s sister, who follows the same imperial strategy of her brother in dominating him as a slave. Antony finds himself the hero and lover in the East and breaks the Roman laws, which disdain intermixing with other non-Roman races. The play does not depict a psychological and moral struggle to choose between the moral west, represented by the Roman Empire, and the immoral East, represented by Egypt. Rather, the play deconstructs that reductively racial dichotomy and incites more cultural openness between East and West.

Dryden’s rereading of the play matched the policies of Restoration England of openness with the East as discussed in chapter two. Achieving that purpose, Dryden did not comply with western historical narratives, which sustained the racial dichotomy between East and West. For example, in his treatise The Life and Death of Julius Caesar, the First Founder of the Roman Empire as also, The Life and Death of Augustus Caesar, in whose Reign Our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ was Borne (1665), Samuel Clarke (1599-1682) maintained the racial and cultural dichotomy between East and West,

as represented by the Roman Empire. For him, Antony defamed the Roman morals and values when converting to the immorality of the East. Antony's disgrace occurred when he privileged Cleopatra over the chaste Octavia:

At this time *Mark Anthony*, who was in the East, though he had no great success in his *Parthian War*, yet was he still of great power, very Rich, and well obeyed in the Provinces of *Greece, Asia, and Egypt*, and in the rest of his Governments. But he was so besotted with the love, and company of *Cleopatra*, the Queen of *Egypt*, that he thought of nothing but how to satisfy her humour, in the meantime neglecting, and forgetting his Wife *Octavia*, the Sister of *Octavian*, who in beauty and Wisdom was nothing inferior to *Cleopatra*, and in virtue and goodness did far excel her. (K, 72)

For Clarke, Antony's ignominy resulted from his surrendering Roman power to the "wanton" Cleopatra: "accordingly, *Mark Anthony* went into Asia, where he gave himself up to sensuality and delights with the fair, but wanton Cleopatra, Queen of Egypt" (I, 63).

In this context, Dryden's All for Love deconstructs misrepresentations of Cleopatra and elevates her as the very embodiment of splendor and wisdom. Unlike Clarke, Dryden rewrote dramatically Antony's and Cleopatra's plot, in which he showed sympathy to the East and rejected at the same time the notion of "Romanization," through which the Renaissance West identified itself with and tried to emulate the imperial triumphs of the Roman Empire. For Dryden, the Roman model of Empire was a brutal and monstrous machine, from which Restoration England needed to abstain. Dryden's All for Love, conversely, commemorates the story of Antony and Cleopatra as a great model of glory and sacrifice:

Sleep, blest Pair,  
Secure from humane chance, long Ages out,  
While all the Storms of Fate fly o'er your Tomb;  
And Fame, to late Posterity, shall tell,  
No Lovers liv'd so great, or dy'd so well. (V.i.515-19)

John Dryden's Tyrannick Love (1669) depreciates the western fascination with the imperial grandeur of the Roman Empire. In the play, Maximin, the Roman Emperor, embodies cruelty and political inclemency not only to his Roman nation but also to other subdued nations. In the preface of the play, Dryden, apparently for moral reasons, justifies the dramatization of such a cruel person on the stage. According to Dryden, the principal rationalization of dramatizing Maximin is to warn against the tyrant model of Maximin:

If it be urged, that a person of such principles who scoffes at any Religion, ought not to be presented on the Stage; why then are the lives and sayings of so many wicked and prophane persons recorded in the Holy Scripture? I know it will be answered, That a due use may be made of them; that they are remembered with a Brand of Infamy fixt upon them; and set as Sea-marks for those who behold them to avoid. (110)

In the play, Maximin brags about the cruel Roman model of leadership: "By force submitted to the Roman sway / Fierce Nations, and unknowing to obey" (I.i.9-10). This model, which is based upon "force" and "obey," is practiced by Maximin on other nations. For Maximin, only "wars" decide prosperity and advancement. For example, Charinus, the Emperor's son, refers to the value of "wars" in the Roman Empire: "Wars

have, like Love, their favourable hours” (I.i.60). Maximin and his son believe that military power, rather than “Gods,” decide fate. Charinus refers to the effectiveness of wars over the gods’ will:

Visions and Oracles still doubtful are,

And ne’er expounded till th’ event of War.

The Gods fore-knowledge on our Swords will wait:

If we fight well, they must fore-show good Fate. (I.i.109-12)

Similarly, Maximin adopts imperial and colonial ambitions as a slogan of Roman reign: “War is my Province” (II.i.179).

Maximin identifies himself with the imperial triumphs of his Roman predecessor, Julius Caesar. After the death of his son, Charinus, in the battlefield, Maximin decides to appoint Porphyrius as successor to the Roman throne. Maximin plans to train Porphyrius to become Caesar-like: “To bind *Porphyrius* firmly to the State, / I will this day my *Caesar* him create” (I.i.328-29). Maximin consoles the death of his son with the continuity of conquests and with the exceeding expansion of the Roman Empire: “See to my Son perform’d each Funeral due: / Then to the toyls of War we will return; / And make our Enemies our losses mourn” (I.i.333-35). Maximin expects that Porphyrius will inherit the same imperial mode of Roman-style leaders: “*Porphyrius*, since the Gods have ravish’d one, / I come in you to seek another Son. / Succeed him then in my Imperial state” (II.i.97-99). However, Porphyrius, revoking the role of being a second Julius Caesar to the Roman Empire, identifies himself with Brutus, who kills his adopting father, Julius Caesar: “When *Brutus* did from *Caesar* Rome redeem, / The Act was good” (II.i.52-53). Porphyrius, spurning the imperial policy of Maximin, does not find himself a

suitable heir to the Roman Empire, which is governed by Caesar's and Maximin's imperial manner:

Por. My life and death are still within your pow'r:

But your succession I renounce this hour.

Upon a bloody Throne I will not sit;

Nor share the guilt of Crimes which you commit.

Max. If you are not my *Caesar*, you must dye.

Por. I take it as the nobler Destiny. (IV.i.641-46)

Porphyrius, who represents the revolutionary voice against the tyranny of the Roman model of Empire, pledges to annihilate the unjust absolutism and arbitrariness of the Roman Empire of Caesar and Maximin and to commence a new rule of tolerance and bloodlessness:

Let to the winds your golden Eagles flye,

Your Trumpets sound a bloodless Victory:

Our Arms no more let *Aquileia* fear,

But to her Gates our peaceful Ensigns bear. (V.i.671-74)

Maximin performs imperial coercion even on his wife and daughter. Berenice, the wife of Maximin, believes that the gods punish Maximin's crimes against her murdered brother and conquered nation. Berenice, captured by Maximin's army as a prisoner of war, is conscripted to become a wife for him as a ransom of her brother's release: "My Brother gave me to thee for a Wife, / And for my Dowry thou didst take his life" (I.i.283-84). For Berenice, the first divine punishment of Maximin is the death of his son, Charinus, who ends the imperial succession of Maximin's reign:

Yes; they have own'd it; witness this just day,

When they begin thy mischiefs to repay.

See the reward of all thy wicked care,

Before thee thy succession ended there.

Yet but in part my Brothers Ghost is pleas'd:

Restless till all the groaning world be eas'd.

For me, no other happiness I owne

Than to have born no Issue to thy Throne. (I.i.287-94)

Berenice here compares the illegitimacy of the imperial rule of Maximin to the illicit loot of "pirates." In other words, the Roman Empire, in conquering, subjugating, and humiliating other nations, is similar to the avarice and nefariousness of piracy. For Berenice, the fortune of both of Maximin's reign and the illegitimate pirates' is destined to collapse since both of their reigns are based on immorality, conscription, and booty:

The Pirate sinks with his-illgotten gains,

And nothing to anothers use remains:

So, by his loss, no gain to you can fall;

The Sea, and vast destruction swallows all. (II.i.34-37)

Porphyrius assures Berenice to defeat the reign of the pirate Maximin: "This Pirate of your heart I'll soon remove; / And, at one stroke, the world and you set free" (II.i.43-44).

However, Berenice feels restricted by the marital vow to her husband, Maximin. Even though she despises the tyranny and viciousness of Maximin, she does not repel the martial duty:

I hate this Tyrant, and his bed I loath;

But, once submitting, I am ty'd to both:

Ty'd to that Honour, which all Women owe,

Though not their Husbands person, yet their vow. (III.i.294-97)

Throughout the play, she nevertheless remains a strong voice of condemning, deconstructing and expunging the Roman imperial reign of Maximin.

Valeria, the daughter of Maximin, represents another strong female voice against the tyranny of her father. Maximin treats his daughter as a commodity, whom he awards to his political leaders. For example, Maximin decides to grant his daughter for Porphyrius in an attempt to forge a political marriage: “And, Daughter, I will give him you for Wife” (I.i.330). She criticizes the dehumanization of her father to the other nations and to his family, thereby predicting the inevitable demolition of her father’s reign since it is bloody and cruel:

Ah, Sir, to what strange courses do you fly,

To make your self abhorr'd for cruelty!

The Empire groans under your bloody Reign,

And its vast body bleeds in ev'ry vein.

Gasping and pale, and fearing more, it lyes;

And now you stab it in the very eyes;

Your *Caesar* and the Partner of your Bed. (V.i.506-12)

Valeria decides to punish her father by committing suicide. She wants to release herself of the curse of her father’s Roman race: “Thou, Tyrant, and thy Crimes have pull'd it on. / Thou who canst death with such a pleasure see, / Now take thy fill, and glut thy sight in me” (V.i.565-67). Valeria purifies her soul from her father’s crimes and sins against

humanity: “My Father’s Crimes hang heavy on my head, / And like a gloomy Cloud about me spread” (V.i.553-54). Her death moves her away from the center of the imperial Empire of Rome, which suffocates Valeria, her mother, Porphyrius and other colonized nations. Valeria’s death represents a kind of purification of the “Tyrant’s race” (V.i.556).

S. Catherine, the Princess of Alexandria of Egypt, is victimized by the imperial tyranny of the Roman Emperor, Maximin. The Egyptian princess, captured by the Roman army, suffers enslavement and humiliation at the hands of Maximin. The Roman Emperor shows no mercy to the Egyptian Princess and her nation since his colonial mind allows no place for pity: “From me they can expect no grace, whose minds / An execrable superstition blinds” (I.i.161-62). Maximin endeavors to force the Egyptian Princess to marry him, just as he does to his wife, Berenice. The Christian Princess, however, declines his coercion and threatening. For Maximin, the Egyptian Princess, who is a Christian, is only a fortune of war and a mere “slave”: “No, Slave; she only was a Captive then” (II.i.260). In the play, Dryden sympathizes with the Christian Egyptian Princess as he does with the non-Christian Cleopatra in All for Love since both of them defend their country, Egypt, against a foreign invasion of the Roman Empire, an imperial Empire which Dryden attacks, as noted earlier. Therefore, Maximin associates the Christian Egyptian Princess and Cleopatra: “How many *Cleopatra*’s live in her!” (II.i.258). Just as Cleopatra repudiates inferior subordination to Octavius Caesar in Dryden’s All for Love and in Shakespeare’s Antony and Cleopatra, the Egyptian Princess discards submission to Maximin’s authority: “Max. She courts not death, but shuns Captivity. / Great gifts, and greater promises I’le make” (II.i.288-89). Also, like Cleopatra, the Christian Princess of Alexandria refuses the appeals of the Roman

Emperor's messenger to surrender herself in favor of crowns. Placidius, a great officer of Maximin, plays fruitlessly the role of the messenger to mediate between the Roman Emperor and the Christian Princess of Egypt:

Placid. You have a Pilot who your Ship secures;

The Monarch both of Earth and Seas is yours,

He who so freely gives a Crown away,

Yet asks no tribute but what you may pay.

One smile on him a greater wealth bestows,

Than *Egypt* yields, when *Nilus* overflows.

S. Cath. I cannot wholly innocent appear,

Since I have liv'd such words as these to hear.

O Heav'n, which dost of chastity take care! (III.i.54-62)

Maximin is surprised that the Egyptian Princess declines to interact with the Roman race, represented by Maximin: "Can any brighter than the Roman be?" (III.i.82). Again, the Egyptian Princess, like Cleopatra, chooses death to triumph over the tyrant Roman Emperor. The Roman Emperor, Maximin, desiring to humiliate the Christian Princess of Egypt by ravaging her body, is similar to Octavius Caesar's attempts to degrade the glamour of Queen Cleopatra in the streets of Rome. However, their deaths defeat the Roman Emperors' imperial haughtiness. The Christian Princess of Alexandria expresses her contempt for the Roman Empire and its Emperor:

Yet, Tyrant, I to thee will never pray.

Though hers to save I my own life would give,

Yet by my sin, my Mother shall not live.

To thy foul lust I never can consent;  
Why dost thou then defer my punishment?  
I scorn those Gods thou vainly dost adore:  
Contemn thy Empire, but thy Bed abhor.  
If thou would'st yet a bloodier Tyrant be,  
I will instruct thy rage, begin with me. (V.i.281-89)

**John Dryden and the Deconstruction of the Renaissance Anxiety of the Notion of the  
“Trojan Turk”**

Just as John Dryden condemns the Roman colonization of the East, as represented in All for Love and Tyrannic Love, he, in his play Troilus and Cressida (1679), which adapts William Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida (1602), deglorifies the Greek invasion of the East, represented by Troy. Dryden deconstructs the Renaissance discourse of anxiety of the notion of the “Trojan Turk”—or what Margaret Meserve in her historical book, Empires of Islam in Renaissance Historical Thought (2008), calls the “theory of the Turks’ Trojan ancestry” (16). The Trojans, defending their city from the foreign invasion of the Greeks, show valor, commitment and intrepidity to counter the imperial progress of the Greeks. As noted earlier, Dryden affirms the right of England to defend itself from foreign invasion, but not to lead imperial conquest to other nations. In this context, Dryden sympathizes with the Trojans against the imperial Greeks, led by Agamemnon and Ulysses, since they are only defending their land, rather than conquering other nations. Dryden developed Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida's demystification theme of the ancients' war as bloody and unjustifiable. Moreover, the geographical location of the city of Troy, as part of the East and the Ottoman Empire in

particular, enabled Dryden to offer conspicuous praise and tolerance to the Eastern and oriental Trojans, arguably the forefathers of the Turks.

The notion of the “Trojan Turks” was broadly circulated among Renaissance historiography. In her book Empires of Islam in Renaissance Historical Thought (2008), Margaret Meserve explains that there was an anxiety among Renaissance authors about the idea of whether the Turks were descendants of the Trojans or not. Meserve points out that the notion of the “Trojan Turks” was nevertheless more popular in the Renaissance historiography than modern history: “the Renaissance belief that the Turks were descended from Trojans is far better known from the contemporary criticism it attracted than from any statement written in its support” (22). Meserve, however, points out that the Renaissance “humanists,” who refused the Turkish association with the Trojan ancestry, reduced the Turks to savages rather than Trojans: “such savagery also placed them [Turks] firmly outside the family of historically civilized nations” (65). For example, Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, the humanist scholar and later known as Pope Pius II, objected to the notion of the “Trojan Turks” in his treatise Europa (1458): “I see that in recent years numerous authors, not only writers and poets but even historians, are so mistaken that they call the Turks *Teuceri*—inspired, I believe, by the fact that the Turks now possess Troy, where the Teucrians once lived” (qtd. in Meserve 22). Even though Piccolomini did not prove scientifically the falsehood of the claim, his treatise showed the widespread circulation of the theory of the “Trojan Turks” in the Renaissance thought. Franciscan Bartolommeo da Giano also referred to the Turks as “Teuceri” when Byzantium was weak against the many Turkish attacks: “Alas, alas, it was only a few years ago that the *Teuceri* were unknown anywhere in the world, save for a few shepherds,

living on some hills or other on the outskirts of Damascus: rude, uneducated, wild, illiterate, without any learning—as they remain even to this day” (qtd. in Meserve 29).

In his article “Teucri and Turci,” Steven Runciman refers to some Renaissance authors, who acknowledged the Trojan origin of the Turks: “the chaplain who went with Sir Richard Guildford to the Holy Land in 1506 says that ‘all the country of Troya is the Turk’s own country by inheritance’” (346). A letter from a Muslim ruler, known as “Sultan Morbisanus,” addressed to the Pope, urged the Pope not to launch a crusade against Turkish Empire since the Turks and Italians shared Trojan roots:

I am compelled to wonder and grieve at the fact that the Italians rebel against me, since a secret love inspires me to cherish them, for they and their great works and their forefathers have sprung from the blood of Trojans. I know that their ancestors were Antenor and Aeneas, born of the blood of Priam; and in their place I shall carry my empire into Europe, fulfilling the promises which are known to have been made by my gods to my forefathers. And I intend to restore great Troy, and to avenge the blood of Hector and the ruin of Ilium by subjugating the empire of the Greeks to my rule, and to punish the heirs of the original culprits for the injuries done to my goddess Pallas. (qtd. in Meserve 35-36)

Modern historicists attributed this letter to the Turkish Sultan Mehmed II (1432-1481), who conquered Constantinople and brought an end to Byzantine Empire in 1453.

Meserve, for example, comments on the genuineness of the letter: “it is not surprising that the spurious letter of ‘Morbisanus’ was considered by some contemporaries to be a genuine text, written by Mehmed in reply to Pope Pius’s famous attempt at evangelization” (36). Other modern historicists like Steven Runciman argues that the

letter, which was supposed to be composed by Sultan Mehmed II to Pope Nicholas V to urge him not to launch a crusade against the Turks due to the Italian-Turkish shared ancestry, was composed by “some French enemy of the crusading movement” (345). For Runciman, the French preferred alliance, rather than war with the Turks: “the legend persisted, especially among the French, whose policy was veering towards a Turkish alliance” (346). However, the Sultan’s letter, which was highly circulated among Renaissance authors, was cited by many authors who supported the notion of the Trojan Turks.

The falls of both of Constantinople and Troy were often associated in the Renaissance thought. The idea of the Turkish revenge against the Greeks circulated among Renaissance historiography. For example, the Byzantine Greek Critoboulos described, in his book History of Mehmed the Conqueror (1467), that Sultan Mehmed II visited the tombs of Trojan heroes after the fall of Constantinople, thanked God for the Turkish victory over the Greek descendants, and expressed his joy of the Turks’ revenge of their Trojan ancestors:

He [Mehmed II] himself with his army crossed the Hellespont, marched through Phrygia Minor, and reached Ilium. He observed its ruin and the traces of the ancient city of Troy. . . . He also inquired about the tombs of the heroes—Achilles, Ajax and the rest. And he praised and congratulated them, their memory and their deeds, and on having a person like the poet Homer to extol them. He is reported to have said, shaking his head a little, ‘God has reserved for me, through so long a period of years, the right to avenge this city and its inhabitants. For I have subdued their enemies and have plundered their cities and made them the spoils of the Mysians. It

was the Greeks and Macedonians and Thessalians and Peloponnesians who ravaged this place in the past, and whose descendents have now through my efforts paid the just penalty, after a long period of years, for their injustice to us Asiatics at that time and so often in subsequent years.’ (qtd. in Meserve 43)

For Sultan Mehmed II, both of the Turks and the Trojans were “Asiatics,” who suffered severely from the Greeks and their descendants.

Renaissance authors, nevertheless, were reluctant to admit that the Turks were descendants of the Trojan race since such an admission acknowledged the Turkish imperial conquest of Europe generally and Constantinople particularly. Therefore, Pope Pius II, as noted earlier, objected to the notion of the “Trojan Turks” because it undermined the legitimacy of his crusading calls. Steven Runciman explains the dreadful effect of the notion of the “Trojan Turks” on Pius II’s crusading approach: “it was an error that was very harmful to his crusading policy” (344). Similarly, Meserve notes that the popular trend of the Renaissance authors was to refute, rather than to acknowledge the accuracy of the legend of the “Trojan Turks”:

In these texts, the idea is almost always presented as quite a ludicrous one, a notion that the credulous Turks may entertain about themselves but that no sensible European author or reader ought to accept. In these texts, the point is not that the Turks are actually Trojans but that they arrogantly claim to be Trojans. It is an accusation, not an explanation, used to underscore the outrageousness of Ottoman imperial pretensions, not to provide a plausible account of their motives or justification of their actions. (26)

Renaissance authors, who perceived the threat of the Ottoman Empire as a fierce “greedie lyon” as discussed in chapter one, could not tolerate the notion of the “Trojan Turks” since the Turkish conquests and threats to Europe would then be regarded as a legitimate and justified Turkish revenge of their Trojan ancestors.

In John Dryden’s Troilus and Cressida, Troy and Trojans are identified with Asia. In the play, there are references which indicate that Troy is part of the East. For example, Troilus, reminding his brother, Hector, of the valor and honor of Asia to win the war against the Greek invaders, objects to the exchange of both of Helen and Cressida since that means surrender to the imperial wishes of the Greeks:

Fy, fy, my noble Brother!  
Weigh you the worth and honour of a King,  
So great as *Asia*’s Monarch in scale  
Of common ounces thus?  
Are fears and reasons fit to be consider’d,  
When a Kings fame is question’d? (II.i.14-19)

The imperialist Ulysses, moreover, connects Troy with Asia. For him, the richness of the East deserves the Greeks’ invasion and conquest of Troy. Therefore, he blames the laziness and indifference of Achilles, who is described by Ulysses as a “fool” (II.iii.160) and “lazy” (I.i.64), since Achilles does not recognize the imperial value of colonizing the East: “Is this a Man, O *Nestor*, to be bought? / *Asia*’s not price enough! bid the world for him” (II.iii.144-45). In this context, Dryden’s text readdresses the notion of the “Trojan Turks” indirectly. Dryden, like Sultan Mehmed II, describes the Trojans as Asians, who are defending their city against the foreign invasion of the Greeks. As noted earlier,

Sultan Mehmed II described both of the Turks and Trojans as “Asiatics,” who suffered the “injustice” of the Greeks. As a result, Dryden’s play sympathizes with all Trojan characters, including Cressida who is depicted as virtuous. Moreover, Dryden’s play does not recirculate the same Renaissance notion of the “Trojan Turk” as an “accusation,” rather as an acceptance of it. As discussed in chapter two, the Turkish Empire was no longer a threat to the West after the Restoration period; rather, it was a commercial partner and friend of Europe and England in particular. Therefore, Dryden, who identified himself as a “cultural renegade” in the character of Dorax as discussed in chapter two, would not, in his celebration of the oriental Trojans, resist the notion of sympathizing with the “Trojan Turks,” or Cressida. The western anxiety of the power of the Turks during the Renaissance and the capture of Constantinople by the Turks were part of the remote past, in which Dryden and Restoration politicians showed no interest to keep circulating in their works.

The love of the “Trojan Turks” Cressida and Troilus, in Dryden’s version of the play, is portrayed as virtuous and noble. Cressida, objecting to the temptations of her uncle, Pandarus, to make a wanton love relationship with Troilus, insists on a virtuous and chaste love. She will not allow herself to be commodified and victimized by a patriarchal masters’ fickleness. A strong woman, she prescribes her conditions on the nature of the relationship with Troilus: “And will you promise that the holy Priest / Shall make us one for ever?” (III.ii.84-85). She desires for her love of Troilus to end in a virtuous marriage, rather than wanton lust as her uncle wishes. Troilus, who loves her truly, similarly promises that his love is faithful and virtuous: “Heavens prosper me as I devoutly swear, / Never to be but yours” (III.ii.95-96). Moreover, he rejects the principle

of Cressida's exchange, as demanded by Hector, with Antenor: "To give her self and all her Heaven in change, / I wou'd not part with *Cressida*: so return / This answer as my last" (III.ii.285-87). For Troilus, Cressida's love and honor deserve Trojan resistance and confrontation to the imperial progress of the Greeks: "O, she's my life, my being, and my Soul!" (III.ii.300). He also refutes the accusation that Cressida, whose father is "A Traytor to his country" (III.ii.357) as described by Hector, is unfaithful and immoral: "By Heav'n as chaste as thy [Hector's] *Andromache*" (III.ii.359). For Troilus, Cressida, not responsible for her father's crime, is not to be blamed for other's mistakes. Therefore, he maintains that Cressida is no different from the virtuous wife of Hector, Andromache: "For *Cressida* is first: as chaste as she, / But much more fair" (III.ii.362). Influenced by Troilus's sad departure from his love, Hector pities their love story: "I pity thee, indeed I pity thee" (III.ii.418). Troilus helps Hector to rethink and to reevaluate his perception of Cressida from an immoral to virtuous woman. Hector regrets his previous misrepresentation of Cressida: "I said it in my rage, I thought not so" (III.ii.427). He also promises to protect the love of Troilus and Cressida against the greedy ambitions of the Greeks: "I'le break this treaty off; or let me fight; / I'le be thy champion; and secure both her / And thee, and *Troy*" (III.ii.429-31).

In the play, the departure of Cressida to the Greeks' camp is beyond the power of Troilus since the gods, rather than Troilus, determine their departure:

*Cressid*, I love thee with so strange a purity  
 That the blest Gods, angry with my devotions  
 More bright in zeal, than that I pay their Altars,  
 Will take thee from my sight. (IV.i.35-38)

Troilus is helpless against the “envy” (IV.i.39) of the gods, who separate the lovers shortly from each other. For Troilus, the departure of Cressida is a “hateful truth” (IV.i.42). The “grief” of departure is obvious enough on Troilus: “If thou depart from me, I cannot live: / I have not soul enough to last for grief” (IV.i.103-04). Cressida, describing the Greeks as “Robbers,” promises to protect herself from the Greek molestation and abuse:

But as a careful traveller who fearing  
Assaults of Robbers, leaves his wealth behind,  
I trust my heart with thee; and to the *Greeks*  
Bear but an empty Casket. (IV.i.107-10)

Dryden describes the departure of the lovers in lyrical language, which highlights the glamour, purity and trustworthiness of Troilus’ and Cressida’s love. Troilus, at the moment of departure from Cressida, further defines his love: “Our love’s like Mountains high above the clouds, / Though winds and tempests beat their aged feet, / Their peaceful heads nor storm nor thunder know” (IV.i.115-17). In other words, their love remains solid and pure against the Greek “winds” and “storms,” which endeavor to destroy the lofty mountain-like love of Troilus and Cressida.

The imperial Ulysses plays the evil role of destroying the love of Troilus and Cressida. He deceives Troilus into thinking that Cressida, (falsely) having an immoral relationship with Diomedes, turns whore in the Greek camp,

At *Menelaus* Tent;  
There *Diomedes* does feast with him to Night:  
Who neither looks on Heaven or on Earth,

But gives all gaze and bent of amorous view,

On *Cressida* alone. (IV.ii.171-75)

Ulysses participates in the disreputation of Cressida and her love for Troilus. Diomedes, exploiting his political position among the Greeks, forces Cressida's father, Calchas, to convince his daughter of submitting her body to Diomedes's lechery. According to Calchas, Diomedes is another cunning Ulysses: "You must dissemble love to *Diomedes* still: / False *Diomedes*, bred in *Ulysses* School, / Can never be deceiv'd" (IV.ii.255-57). Even though Cressida does not surrender herself to Diomedes, she gives him the "Ring," which Troilus gives her before as a token. Cressida, conscripted to submit the ring, wants to save her father and herself from the atrocity of the Greeks. Ulysses, exploiting the ring's scene, deludes Troilus that Cressida cheats on him: "All's done my Lord" (IV.ii.315). Cressida defends her honor and love to Troilus:

If ever I had pow'r to bend your mind,  
Believe me still your faithful *Cressida*:  
And though my innocence appear like guilt,  
Because I make his forfeit life my suit,  
'Tis but for this, that my return to you  
Wou'd be cut off for ever by his death;  
My father, treated like a slave and scorn'd;  
My self in hated bonds a Captive held. (V.ii.212-19)

Cressida, in a helpless and slave-like condition, is conscripted to give the ring to Diomedes. She and her father, being enslaved by the imperial Greeks, are victimized by the "bonds" of the Greek imperial law. Diomedes, like Ulysses, feels "jealous" of the

virtuous love of Troilus and Cressida: “I was a jealous, hard, vexatious lover” (V.ii.232). However, he admits that he fails to break that virtuous love since Cressida remains faithful to her love and honor: “But she was honourable to her word” (V.ii.234). Cressida, like Cleopatra, entrapped and suffocated by imperial colonialists, chooses death to retain her virtue and honor from any predictable colonialists’ humiliation of her. She dies happily since her virtue and innocence are acknowledged by all: “And I dye happy that he thinks me true” (V.ii.280). For Troilus, Cressida remains “purest, whitest innocence” (V.ii.268). Troilus describes his despair, pity and lamentation of the death of Cressida: “Distraction pulls me several ways at once, / Here pity calls me to weep out my eyes; / Despair then turns me back upon my self” (V.ii.284-86). He further avenges her death by killing Diomedes till he is killed by Achilles.

Dryden’s All for Love, Tyrannick Love, Troilus and Cressida indicate that Restoration England’s discourse of Orientalism no longer accepts misrepresentation or anxiety to the East, of which the oriental Turks and Moors were part. In those plays, the East and Oriental heroines and heroes—represented by Cleopatra in All for Love, the Princess of Alexandria in Tyrannick Love, and Cressida in Troilus and Cressida—are highly celebrated by their virtue, valor and resistance to the Greco-Roman domination and colonization. The Greco-Roman governors—Octavius Caesar in All for Love, Maximin in Tyrannick Love, and Ulysses, Agamemnon, and Diomedes in Troilus and Cressida—are portrayed as imperialistic dictators and tyrannical colonizers. These plays, deconstructing identification with the imperial part of the Greco-Roman heritage, reject the role of heir to those predecessors. Dryden, who was aware of the importance of Restoration England’s discourse of “Respect and Friendship” with the Turks and Moors,

critiqued the western fascination with the Greco-Roman past and encouraged openness and moderation, rather than continued colonization of the East. As noted earlier, Dryden called for toleration not only to the East but also to other Christian sects like Catholics and dissenters. That mode of religious and political moderation, which rejected the oppression of the Greco-Roman leaders, anticipated King Charles II's warm friendship with the East. The Renaissance idealization of the Greco-Roman past was deconstructed by John Dryden's drama, which, conversely, objected to the notion of the grandeur of the imperial legacy of the ancients' past. Moreover, unlike Renaissance humanists, Dryden celebrates rather than denies the notion of the "Trojan Turks," as represented by his play Troilus and Cressida (1679), which adapts Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida (1602). For Dryden, the Renaissance anxiety of the notion of the "Trojan Turk" was no longer valid as a truth since what the Renaissance humanists perceived as the "Turkish 'problem,'" as observed by Meserve in Renaissance historiography, was not proper to Restoration England's discourse of the "cultural renegade"—or what I call, the "Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist."

## CHAPTER FOUR

### THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRANSFORMATION OF THE DISCOURSE OF ORIENTALISM IN RESTORATION POLITICS AND CULTURE

This chapter, examining the Foucauldian concept of discourse and discursive formation, analyzes the Restoration drama with regards to the formation of a new political and cultural discourse of the “cultural renegade”—that is, the “Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist.” The economic openness with the Oriental Turks and Moors facilitated the emergence of a new discourse, which was produced, supervised and surveilled by the politics of King Charles II and the Levant merchants in the mid-late seventeenth century. In his theoretical works—“What is an Author,” “The Order of Discourse,” The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language (1972), and Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison (1977)—Michel Foucault explains that discourses vary from one culture and time to another: “the modes of circulation, valorization, attribution, and appropriation of discourses vary with each culture and are modified within each” (“What” 117). Moreover, the mechanism of discourse always operates under the processes of “exclusion” and “prohibition” (“Order” 52), through which fictional and non-fictional narratives are filtered and modified to match the rules of discursivity. As a founder of the term “discourse,” Foucault is the seminal voice in the understanding of the archaeological transformation of the discourse of Orientalism in the Restoration era in accordance with political and economic factors—namely, political and military alliance, and economic openness with the Turks and Moors—which accelerated the process of transformation. Therefore, it is important to refer to the Foucauldian

analysis of discourse production since it explains how the discourse definition and discursive statements are influenced by the political and economic factors.

In this context, the Restoration theater, which responded to the newly emerging discourse of moderation and temperance to the oriental Turks and Moors, was prescribed and supervised by the politics of Charles II and major dramatists such as John Dryden and Sir William Davenant, who set the rules of dramatizing the oriental heroic characters. According to Foucault, there is a difference between writers, who just write their own works, and writers, who formulate the rules of writing: whereas the former are ordinary writers, the latter are called “founders of discursivity”: “they are unique in that they are not just the authors of their own works. They have produced something else: the possibilities and the rules for the formation of other texts” (“What” 114). In this context, John Dryden and Sir William Davenant performed the function of the “founders of discursivity” since their plays became a model of imitation for other dramatists. In his plays The Empress of Morocco (1673) and The Heir of Morocco (1673), Elkanah Settle (1648-1724) celebrates the grandeur and nobility of oriental Moorish heroes/heroines in a continuation of the Restoration England’s discourse of “Respect and Friendship” with the Turks and Moors. Settle’s fascination with the oriental dramatization, in no way arbitrary, reveals an authorial commitment to comply with the rules of the discursive formation of the emerging Restoration discourse of moderation to the oriental Moors and Turks.

In his article “The Order of Discourse,” Michel Foucault explains that the complex mechanisms of discourse production and circulation wholly depend on the application of rules, which sustain the domination of certain statements in any society: “in every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organized and redistributed by

a certain number of procedures whose role is to ward off its powers and dangers, to gain mastery over its chance events, to evade its ponderous, formidable materiality” (52). Those rules of discourse production—often called the “procedures of exclusion” (52), through which societies exclude statements and which go against the discursive formation— include the principles of “prohibition,” “opposition between reason and madness,” and the “opposition between true and false.” The “prohibition” principle is related to the question of whether we are allowed to speak about anything in a society or not, and what type of person is authorized to speak about, what Foucault calls, the “taboo”: “We know quite well that we do not have the right to say everything, that we cannot speak of just anything in any circumstances whatever, and that not everyone has the right to speak of anything whatever” (52). For Foucault, the most restricted areas of taboo discussion are “sexuality and politics” (52), since these subject matters are typically supervised and controlled by the procedures of “exclusion,” which maintain the circulation of authorized and acceptable statements about religion and politics.

The principle of the “opposition between reason and madness” is another exclusion practice, which maintains the distinction between the statements of the “madman” and the sane person. According to Foucault, the archaeological debarment of the “madman” originated in the Middle Ages: “since the depths of the Middle Ages, the madman has been the one whose discourse cannot have the same currency as others. His word may be considered null and void, having neither truth nor importance, worthless as evidence in law, inadmissible in the authentication of deeds or contracts” (53). The marginalization of the “madman’s” speech tends to include not only the statements of the madman, but also allegorically of any opposing and anti-discursive statements since they are accused of

lacking reason and truth. Furthermore, the principle of the “opposition between true and false” necessitates the persons of authority speaking what it is true and enforcing the circulation of true statements in a society. According to this concept, truth is not told and communicated by any person; rather, it is only accessible to the authorized persons of power. In addition, the principle of “true and false” depends on, what Foucault calls, “institutional support,” such as universities, schools, governments and publishing houses: “it is both reinforced and renewed by whole strata of practices, such as pedagogy, of course; and the system of books, publishing, libraries; learned societies in the past and laboratories now” (55). According to Foucault, those institutions, practicing a “sort of pressure and something like a power of constraint . . . on other discourses” (55), ensure the circulation of the true statements and exclude all irrelevant and false pronouncements.

Foucault refers to another division of procedures, the “internal procedures” (56), which control and organize the distribution of discourse. There are four “internal procedures”: “commentary,” “the author,” “disciplines,” and “the rarefaction of the speaking subject.” First, “commentary” refers to the statements, which are typically said of “religious,” “judicial,” “literary” or “scientific” texts (57). The “commentary” principle, which is similar to modern criticism, attempts to speak of primary texts in order to immortalize and perpetuate the circulation of certain literary or religious texts. In some cases, the secondary sources, which represent the “commentary” or criticism of primary texts, become more popular than the original primary sources: “Plenty of major texts become blurred and disappear, and sometimes commentaries move into the primary position” (57). Foucault mentions how the Odyssey, as a primary text, has been translated and rewritten by many commentators and how their rewritings have led to the appearance

of new discourses: “one and the same literary work can give rise simultaneously to very distinct types of discourses: the Odyssey as a primary text is repeated, in the same period, in the translation of Berard, and in the endless ‘explications de texte,’ and in Joyce’s Ulysses” (57). The function of these rewritings or commentaries is not just to imitate the primary text; rather, it is to preserve the validity of the primary texts: “it allows the (endless) construction of new discourses: the dominance of the primary text, its permanence, its status as a discourse which can always be re-actualized, the multiple or hidden meaning with which it is credited. . .” (57). In other words, the criticism or “commentaries” on the Odyssey gives it more dominance and prolongation in different epochs of time. Moreover, Foucault argues that the purpose of the “commentaries” is not to displace the original primary works, since a “return” to the original is always required:

Commentary exorcises the chance element of discourse by giving it its due; it allows us to say something other than the text itself, but on condition that it is this text itself which is said, and in a sense completed. The open multiplicity, the element of chance, are transferred, by the principle of commentary, from what might risk being said, on to the number, the form, the mask, and the circumstances of the repetition. The new thing here lies not in what is said but in the event of its return. (58)

The “return” to the original works renders essential credibility to “commentary,” whose meaning relates to the primary works: “it always displaces but never escapes” (58).

Second, the “author” is another principle of the “internal procedures.” For Foucault, the author, not simply the person who wrote his/her works, is defined as a “principle of grouping of discourses, conceived as the unity and origin of their meanings, as the focus

of their coherence” (58). The significance of the author has transformed through different ages. For example, during the Middle Ages, anonymous scientific writings were not accepted as trustworthy: “a text should be attributed to an author, since this was an index of truthfulness” (58). In the seventeenth century, works of “science” field started to be accepted and circulated even with anonymous authors. For example, “technical instructions,” “decrees,” and “contracts” circulate in a society without specific authors. However, anonymity was not approved for “literature” and “philosophy” fields since the author-function hereby is to bring “coherence” and “meaning” to all works, which are written by the same person. In other words, one author may have different books, which are interrelated to each other via, what Foucault calls, the “author-function”:

All those tales, poems, dramas or comedies which were allowed to circulate in the Middle Ages in at least a relative anonymity are now asked (and obliged to say) where they come from, who wrote them. The author is asked to account for the unity of the texts which are placed under his name. He is asked to reveal or at least carry authentication of the hidden meaning which traverses them. He is asked to connect them to his lived experience, to the real history which saw their birth. The author is what gives the disturbing language of fiction its unities, its nodes of coherence, its insertion in the real. (58)

The author-function includes not only what the author writes but also what he/she evades or omits: “what he writes and what he does not write, what he sketches out, even by way of provisional drafts, as an outline of the oeuvre, and what he lets fall by way of commonplace remarks—this whole play of differences is prescribed by the author-function, as he receives it from his epoch, or as he modifies it in his turn” (59). This

means that the writer omits or modifies his/her writing in accordance with the rules of discourse, which operates through the procedures of exclusion, as noted earlier.

Thirdly, “discipline,” another concept of the “internal procedures” of discourse mechanism is different, according to Foucault, from the previous internal procedures since it does not seek to identify the author nor to rediscover the meaning of the primary texts (commentary); rather, it is defined by: “a domain of objects, a set of methods, a corpus of propositions considered to be true, a play of rules and definitions, of techniques and instruments” (59). For example, medicine and botany are different disciplines since each one has certain rules and true statements, to which any new statement is judged as true or false. If a scientist makes a new proposal in the discipline of medicine, it will be either accepted or excluded by the rules and instruments of discipline: all this depends on whether the new proposal agrees or disagrees with the rules, facts, and definitions of the discipline of medicine. Foucault explains how Mendel’s new proposition of the genetics was excluded and rejected by the rules and true statements of biology at his time: “Mendel spoke the truth, but he was not ‘within the true’ of the biological discourse of his time. . . . It needed a complete change of scale, the deployment of a whole new range of objects in biology for Mendel to enter into the true and for his propositions to appear (in large measure) correct” (61). Mendel’s theories are now accepted today since the rules and statements of biology have been changed and modified.

Finally, “the rarefaction of the speaking subject” is the fourth principle of the “internal procedures” of discourse production. According to this principle, every discourse has certain rules, which only authoritative persons can speak of. Therefore,

some discourses are closed-systems, which are accessible to certain kind of people, while some other discourses are open to many people: “There is a rarefaction, this time, of the speaking subjects; none shall enter the order of discourse if he does not satisfy certain requirements or if he is not, from the outset, qualified to do so. . . . Not all the regions of discourse are equally open and penetrable” (62). In other words, qualification of the speaking persons is a prior condition to represent and speak of discourse. However, some parts of the discourse is accessible to most people: “some of them are largely forbidden (they are differentiated and differentiating), while others seem to be almost open to all winds and put at the disposal of every speaking subject, without prior restrictions” (62). For example, university professors are authorized to speak of the rules of discourse in their major areas of expertise since they are qualified to practice all regions of discourse. Students, on the other hand, being prescribed by their professors to participate in activities and presentations, are evaluated by their professors, who are authorized to evaluate, modify and speak of discourse. Similarly, physicians are authorized to treat patients and talk about the illnesses since they are qualified to practice the profession. Medicine, which is a discourse, is not open to all people because it requires specific knowledge and training. However, patients can describe their illness and expect a medication for their symptoms, but they cannot prescribe themselves medicines. As a result, pharmacists always ask the patients for authorized prescriptions, signed by physicians, to purchase medicine. The relationship between the authorized person and the ordinary subject is not interchangeable: “the roles of speaker and listener were not interchangeable” (63).

In his book The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language (1972), Michel Foucault further argues that discursive formations, sharing unity and “regularity” among their statements, are subjected to the restrictions of the “rules of formation”: “the rules of formation are conditions of existence (but also of coexistence, maintenance, modification, and disappearance) in a given discursive division” (38). In other words, discourses, being not static formations which do not accept modification, are subject to change in the course of time. For example, the “madman’s” perception and formation differ from time to time, since the discursive rules accept “maintenance,” transformation, and “modification.” Furthermore, discursive rules are subject to “disappearance” when new statements displace the old ones, which are no longer accepted as true and authentic. The process of the statements’ displacement is called a “field of memory,” which refers to “statements that are no longer accepted or discussed, and which consequently no longer define either a body of truth or a domain of validity, but in relation to which relations of filiation, genesis, transformation, continuity, and historical discontinuity can be established” (58). However, discursive modifications and transformation do not assume that the discursive rules disappear; rather, they undergo successive modification and development: “the unity of discourses on madness would be the interplay of the rules that define the transformations of these different objects, their non-identity through time, the break produced in them, the internal discontinuity that suspends their permanence” (33). According to Foucault, discourse is characterized by flexibility and “mobility,” which maintain discourse’s constant transformation:

A discursive formation, then, does not play the role of a figure that arrests time and freezes it for decades or centuries; it determines a regularity proper to temporal

processes; it presents the principle of articulation between a series of discursive events and other series of events, transformations, mutations, and processes. It is not an atemporal form, but a schema of correspondence between several temporal series. (74)

According to Foucault discourse creates, what he calls, “normativity,” which is a process of organizing, classifying, and excluding abnormal statements: “it constitutes a domain of *normativity* for itself (according to what criteria one may exclude certain statements as being irrelevant to the discourse, or as inessential and marginal, or as non-scientific)” (61). Moreover, discourse mechanism depends on two traits: “succession” and “coexistence.” In other words, discourse refers to successive objects, which are transformed and modified chronologically. Therefore, the discursive transformation does not incorporate contradiction; rather, discourse maintains “coexistence” among its discursive statements: “discourse endlessly pursues itself and endlessly begins again; it is because contradiction is always anterior to the discourse, and because it can never therefore entirely escape it, that discourse changes, undergoes transformation, and escapes of itself from its own continuity” (151). In this sense, the power of discourse, being able to adapt, transform, modify, exclude, and resolve contradictions, governs all individuals’ words and actions: “the rules of formation operate not only in the mind or consciousness of individuals, but in discourse itself; they operate therefore, according to a sort of uniform anonymity, on all individuals who undertake to speak in this discursive field” (63).

The mechanism of discourse is explained by what Foucault calls “archaeology.” It is an analytical approach for examining, classifying, defining and comparing various

discourses. The function of archaeology is to investigate the specificity of the discursive formation of each discourse: “archaeological analysis individualizes and describes discursive formations. That is, it must compare them, oppose them to one another in the simultaneity in which they are presented, distinguish them from those that do not belong to the same time-scale, relate them, on the basis of their specificity, to the non-discursive practices that surround them” (157). Moreover, archaeology analyzes the effect of the social, political and economic factors at a certain time on the production of discourse. Those factors, determining and motivating the creation of discourse, are called the “non-discursive domains,” which include “institutions, political events, economic practices and processes” (162). In this sense, archaeology examines the relation between “discursive formations” and “non-discursive domains.” Foucault explains that the development of the “clinical medicine” at the end of the eighteenth century came as a result of the political and economic factors (non-discursive domains) since the appearance of “industrial capitalism” shed light on the importance of man’s labor and health; therefore, scientists responded to invent medicine and vaccines for workers’ health:

Thus, at a period in which industrial capitalism was beginning to recalculate its manpower requirements, disease took on a social dimension: the maintenance of health, cure, public assistance for the poor and sick, the search for pathological causes and sites, became a collective responsibility that must be assumed by the state. Hence the value placed upon the body as a work tool, the care to rationalize medicine on the basis of the other sciences, the efforts to maintain the level of health of a population, the attention paid to therapy, after-care, and the recording of long-term phenomena. (163)

Archaeology also analyzes the circulation of discourse in societies. In his book Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison, Foucault analyzes the effect of “panopticism” on the circulation of discourse in societies. For example, in societies, where plague spread, surveillance system was essentially practiced to prevent the epidemic. The “syndic” used to perform a constant surveillance on the town’s inhabitants to prevent people’s interaction with each other during the epidemic. Meals were presented to people through “baskets” in order to restrain interaction with them. Moreover, the “syndic,” who used to register the inhabitants’ personal information such as “the name, age, sex of everyone, notwithstanding his condition,” sent copies of those documents to the “intendant” and the “office of the town hall” (196) for purposes of recording necessary information about the plague’s expansion. That state of emergency was met with organized procedures in order to stop the spread of the plague and the number of the deceased people. The control of the plague necessitated that “the gaze is alert everywhere” (195). Foucault describes the state of impeccability and superbness, which the state followed to prevent the danger of the plague: “the plague-stricken town, traversed through-out with hierarchy, surveillance, observation, writing; the town immobilized by the functioning of an extensive power that bears in a distinct way over all individual bodies—this is the utopia of the perfectly governed city” (198). Furthermore, the plague’s prevention depended mainly on the process of the “exclusion” between the “lepers” and the normal. The exclusion was justified since the aim was to protect the health and welfare of the public. However, the “lepers” exclusion was allegorically significant since it reveals a discursive practice of governing, organizing and evaluating individuals’ behavior:

The constant division between the normal and the abnormal, to which every individual is subjected, brings us back to our own time, by applying the binary branding and exile of the leper to quite different objects; the existence of a whole set of techniques and institutions for measuring, supervising and correcting the abnormal brings into play the disciplinary mechanisms to which the fear of the plague gave rise. All the mechanisms of power which, even today, are disposed around the abnormal individual, to brand him and to alter him, are composed of those two forms from which they distantly derive. (199-200)

In other words, all irrelevant statements, which dispute the validity and truthfulness of discourse, are metaphorically excluded as abnormal and aberrant “leper.” Just as the lepers were banned to interact and participate in their societies, abnormal behaviors in modern societies—whether political, religious or cultural—are supervised and modified in correspondence with the discursive formations and the discursive rules. In modern societies, the anti-discursive voices are metaphorically treated as the dangerous “leper”/untrustworthy insane. Thus, the state of excluding the “leper” is generally practiced upon individuals:

Generally speaking, all the authorities exercising individual control function according to a double mode; that of binary division and branding (mad/sane; dangerous/harmless; normal/abnormal); and that of coercive assignment, of differential distribution (who he is; where he must be; how he is to be characterized; how he is to be recognized; how a constant surveillance is to be exercised over him in an individual way, etc.). (199)

The “invisibility” of discipline and discourse is a new development of the classical disciplinary control of the “lepers.” The architectural design of the “panopticon” ensures the “invisibility” of discipline, discourse, and discursive rules since individuals’ behaviors are constantly observed and modified without seeing the observer or the discursive rules: “He is seen, but he does not see; he is the object of information, never a subject in communication. The arrangement of his room, opposite the central tower, imposes on him an axial visibility; but the divisions of the ring, those separated cells, imply a lateral invisibility. And this invisibility is a guarantee of order” (200). The “invisibility” of discourse and discipline enables the anonymity of the observer: “it does not matter who exercises power. Any individual, taken almost at random, can operate the machine: in the absence of the director, his family, his friends, his visitors, even his servants” (202). Moreover, the individual subjects play the role of observers upon themselves since they always expect a permanently invisible surveillance upon their actions and behaviors: “he makes them play spontaneously upon himself; he inscribes in himself the power relation in which he simultaneously plays both roles; he becomes the principle of his own subjection” (202-03). As a result, the “invisibility” of discourse and discipline creates a state of alertness and circumspection among all groups of society since “force” is no longer followed to maintain commitment and loyalty: “so it is not necessary to use force to constrain the convict to good behaviour, the madman to calm, the worker to work, the schoolboy to application, the patient to the observation of the regulations” (202).

According to Foucault, there are many educational, economic, and political advantages of the “Panopticon” society. The “Panopticon,” being contingent upon

analysis, observation, diagnosis, and evaluation, makes conclusions after deep examination of the results and classification of the objects of study. Therefore, Foucault describes the “Panopticon” system as a “naturalistic” science: “the Panopticon also does the work of a naturalist” (203). For example, the “Panopticon” is essentially helpful in the medical field since “it makes it possible to draw up differences: among patients, to observe the symptoms of each individual, without the proximity of beds, the circulation of miasmas, the effects of contagion confusing the clinical tables” (203). The “Panopticon” classifies different diseases with respect to their symptoms, causes, and treatment. Similarly, the “Panopticon” has educational advantage at schools since it investigates the individual differences between students, motivates the creation of new educational plans for improving the weak points of students, awards distinguished students, and so on: “among school-children, it makes it possible to observe performances (without there being any imitation or copying), to map aptitude, to assess characters, to draw up rigorous classifications . . . to distinguish ‘laziness and stubbornness’ from ‘incurable imbecility’” (203). Furthermore, the “Panopticon” enables employers to observe the quality of their workers’ achievements, to supervise their commitment to their duties and working hours, and to award the qualified workers: “among workers, it makes it possible to note the aptitudes of each worker, compare the time he takes to perform a task, and if they are paid by the day, to calculate their wages” (203).

The “Panopticon” has an economic value. For example, the “Panopticon” reduces the costs of supervising large numbers of employees, students, or workers since it enables one person to inspect many persons at the same time. Also, it reduces the amount of

losses and mistakes at works because “it is possible to intervene at any moment and because the constant pressure acts even before the offences, mistakes or crimes have been committed” (206). The machine of the “Panopticon” facilitates the process of administration since it does not need physical power to control individuals’ performance; rather, it emphasizes the mental aspect: “it [Panopticon] acts directly on individuals; it gives ‘power of mind over mind’” (206). Therefore, the practicality of the “Panopticon” achieves an economic boon because it also develops the skills of the workers, students, and individuals in general: “but the Panopticon was also a laboratory; it could be used as a machine to carry out experiments, to alter behaviour, to train or correct individuals” (203). As information about individuals is easily gathered, an immediate feedback is conducted to reform defects and unskilled persons. In this context, the “Panopticon” mechanism not only assists the society of prisoners, but also it extends to all groups of a society: “it is polyvalent in its applications; it serves to reform prisoners, but also to treat patients, to instruct schoolchildren, to confine the insane, to supervise workers, to put beggars and idlers to work” (205). The surveillance function of the “Panopticon” enables the participation of all society in administrating, supervising, controlling and developing the economy and the moral behavior of its members.

For Foucault, in short, the “Panopticon” is a comprehensive system of development: The “Panopticon,” on the other hand, has a role of amplification; although it arranges power, although it is intended to make it more economic and more effective, it does so not for power itself, nor for the immediate salvation of a threatened society: its aim is to strengthen the social forces—to increase production, to develop the economy, spread education, raise the level of public morality; to

increase and multiply. (207-08)

The “disciplinary institutions,” which are means of discourse circulation and order in societies, practice three processes. The first process is, what Foucault calls, “the functional inversion of the disciplines,” which describes the functional transformation of institutions from being instruments of eliminating dangers and “useless” members of a society, into apparatuses of a “positive role” of making a “possible unity of individuals” (210). For example, an institution such as the “army” applies a new “military discipline,” which is different from the old traditional military policy of forcing its members to comply with the rules and to punish the offenders. Rather, the new one ensures “unity” among members of the military, the development of the individuals’ “skills,” and “respect” for the military regulations. That anticipated “unity” reinforces the power of the army against possible invasions and creates more efficiently qualified soldiers: “discipline increases the skill of each individual, coordinates these skills, accelerates movements, increases fire power, broadens the fronts of attack without reducing their vigour, increases the capacity for resistance, etc.” (210). The newly disciplinary “inversion” emphasizes the “moral” aspect of commitment, rather than the use of force against individuals’ wills.

The “disciplinary institutions” are characterized by a second process, which is called “the swarming of disciplinary mechanisms.” According to this process, the “disciplinary institutions” expand their disciplinary function to other societal fields. For example, the “Christian School” in the seventeenth century surveilled not only the students but also their parents: “the Christian School must not simply train docile children; it must also make it possible to supervise the parents, to gain information as to

their way of life, their resources, their piety, [and] their morals” (211). In case of the students’ failure, the school’s supervisors follow up with the religious commitment and backgrounds of the students’ parents from the neighborhood. In this context, the “Christian School,” as a “disciplinary institution” in the seventeenth century, extended its disciplinary scope to supervise the students, their parents, and the neighborhood. Similarly, the “hospital,” another “disciplinary institution,” magnifies its function since it not only presents medical treatment to the patients but also it performs a “medical observation of the population outside” (212). Therefore, the architectural design of hospitals has been adapted to the process of the “swarming of disciplinary mechanisms” when the old “large buildings” were displaced by a “series of smaller hospitals.” These were scattered in many different areas to ensure the most surveillance on population as well as the “endemic or epidemic” diseases, which might threaten societies: “their [smaller hospitals’] function would be to take in the sick of the quarter, but also to gather information, to be alert to any endemic or epidemic phenomena, to open dispensaries, to give advice to the inhabitants and to keep the authorities informed of the sanitary state of the region” (212). Moreover, “charity organizations” played the role of a “disciplinary institution” by preaching religion and financially helping the poor families. The constant pursuit of the poor families’ financial status and their religious commitment enabled those organizations to gather a huge amount of personal information about the needy families, who were kept under permanent surveillance. In other words, the “charity organizations” had multifunctional roles of religious, economic and political surveillance: “their [charity organizations’] aims were religious (conversion and moralization),

economic (aid and encouragement to work) or political (the struggle against discontent or agitation)” (212).

“The state-control of the mechanisms of discipline” is the third process of the “disciplinary institutions.” According to this process, the “police” play the role of securing the “royal absolutism,” as was the case in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and the state in modern times. Achieving that purpose, the police follow a complex network of surveillance, control, and constant registration of all “visible” and “invisible” actions in a society: “ police power must bear ‘over everything’. . . ; it is the dust of events, actions, behaviour, opinions—‘everything that happens’; the police are concerned with ‘those things of every moment’, those ‘unimportant things’” (213). The invisibility of the police apparatus is intrinsically required to unravel what is hidden and to prevent what is threatening to the safety of the King/Emperor and the society in general. Therefore, the police “had to be like a faceless gaze that transformed the whole social body into a field of perception” (214). Even though the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries police’s surveillance and control of society were “in [the] hands of the King,” they worked through a complex network of organization with the king, the “machinery of justice,” and the “solicitations from below” the king (214). Furthermore, the police apparatus developed its surveillance function to penetrate into other “institutions of discipline” such as “workshops, armies, schools” in order to form an “intermediary network, acting where they [police] could not intervene, disciplining the non-disciplinary spaces; but it [police apparatus] filled in the gaps, linked them together, guaranteed with its armed force an interstitial discipline and a meta-discipline” (215). In other words, the police apparatus transformed the majority of the state’s institutions such as schools,

hospitals and many others into police-like centers, where the king and power held the control of all societal activities. As a result, the institutions of a society are transformed into police-like centers, which are interconnected through a complex network of surveillance and supervision of societal activities: “is it surprising that prisons resemble factories, schools, barracks, hospitals, which all resemble prisons?” (228).

In his article “What is an Author?,” Michel Foucault develops the concept of the author by clarifying the relationship between discourse and what he calls the “the author function.” According to him, the concept of the author does not simply refer to a “proper noun,” but to a state of discourse in a certain society: “the author’s name manifests the appearance of a certain discursive set and indicates the status of this discourse within a society and a culture” (107). Moreover, some authors are different from other ordinary writers, who just write their own works, since the former writers, who are called “founders of discursivity,” not only write their own works but also produce the “rules” of writings: “they have produced something else: the possibilities and the rules for the formation of other texts. In this sense, they are very different, for example, from a novelist, who is, in fact, nothing more than the author of his own text” (114). As a result, Freud and Marx represent the Foucauldian category of the “founders of discursivity” since both of them created not only their own texts but also the rules of other writings. In other words, those writers created different discourses of their fields of specialization—psychoanalysis for Freud and socialism for Marx. They have paved the way for other writers to develop other discourses since their works are the basis from which many writings have been created: “when I speak of Marx or Freud as founders of discursivity, I mean that they made possible not only a certain number of analogies, but also . . . a

possibility for something other than their discourse, yet something belonging to what they founded” (114). The permanent reexamination of the works of the “founders of discursivity” produces new scopes of knowledge and creativity without losing or destroying the value of the old cores. Foucault describes the process of the reexamination as the “return to the origin,” which includes rescrutiny, reexploration, and remodification of the works of the “founders of discursivity” and produces new discursive rules: “this return, which is part of the discursive field itself, never stops modifying it. The return is not a historical supplement which would be added to the discursivity, or merely an ornament; on the contrary, it constitutes an effective and necessary task of transforming the discursive practice itself” (116).

For Foucault, the author is defined as an “ideological product” (119). In other words, the person of the author no longer gives the texts their meanings; rather, the author, being an integral part of a certain society and culture, participates in the circulation of the discourse and discursive statements in his/her societies. Also, the author’s texts always indicate the discursive rules at a certain time, through which his/her works are monitored, modified and excluded. The author then is a product of culture and discourse:

We are accustomed . . . to saying that the author is the genial creator of a work in which he deposits, with infinite wealth and generosity, an inexhaustible world of significations. We are used to thinking that the author is so different from all other men, and so transcendent with regard to all languages that, as soon as he speaks, meaning begins to proliferate, to proliferate indefinitely. The truth is quite the contrary: the author is not an indefinite source of significations which fill a work;

the author does not precede the works; he is a certain functional principle by which, in our culture, one limits, excludes, and chooses; in short, by which one impedes the free circulation, the free manipulation, the free composition, decomposition, and recomposition of fiction. (118-19)

With this discussion of Foucauldian analysis of discourse in place, we can turn our attention to our main subject—namely, the emerging and oscillating view of the Orient during the Restoration era. The discursive rules of orientalism in Restoration culture had been transformed by the politics of the English Stuarts King Charles II and James II, who signed peace treaties of commerce and friendship with the oriental Moors and Turks. The circulation of the discursive statements in the Renaissance of the oriental Turks and Moors as terrorists and dangerous rivals, as discussed in chapter one, had been excluded and transformed by the new discursive rules of “prohibition” of the Restoration context when the oriental Turks and Moors became strategic friends of England. As noted earlier, discourse is characterized by “mobility,” which ensures the constant transfiguration of the discursive rules in accordance with time and place. Consequently, the archaeology of the western perception of the Oriental Turk and Moor is not static or monolithic since it is, on the one hand, subject to change, modification, and transformation, and on the other hand, discursive formations do not “arrest time and freeze it for decades or centuries” (Archaeology 74). In other words, the discursive statements of orientalism of the Restoration culture underwent a process of “normativity,” in Foucault’s terminology of discourse mechanism, through which the political and cultural narratives achieved organization and exclusion of irrelevant and antagonistic statements against the oriental Turk and Moor. Moreover, the discursive rules, subject to “disappearance” when they are

displaced by newly modified statements and rules, as noted above, show that the Renaissance discursive rules of Orientalism had disappeared in Restoration circulation of the Orient and went through the “field of memory,” in Foucauldian analysis of discourse, wherein the Renaissance statements about the Orient were no longer accepted as authentic facts. According to Foucault, the “return to the origin” always includes modification, reclassification, and exclusion to the discursive statements. In this sense, the Restoration politicians and writers revised the “origin” of the discourse of Orientalism and reestablished new discursive rules of moderation to the Oriental Turk and Moor.

Disciplinary discourse increases economic productivity and plays a “positive role,” as noted earlier. The “Panopticon” of the Restoration society enabled King Charles II and the English authorities to observe the circulation of the Orient’s moderate perception in the English culture. Many institutions such as the theater participated in reflecting the court’s aspirations to develop the economy of England by establishing foreign trade agreements and peace treaties with the Turks and Moors. According to Foucault, the process of “the state-control of the mechanisms of discipline” in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries explains the state’s interference in the work and formation of many societal institutions by connecting them with the monarch’s authority through a complex network of supervision, discipline, and “respect” to the state’s agendas. In other words, the Restoration theater played the “positive role” of introducing and propagating the courts’ openness with the Orient and contributed to the creation of a cultural convergence with other nations and cultures. In this context, the Restoration theater fulfilled “the swarming of disciplinary mechanisms,” which is, in Foucauldian analysis of discourse, the functional expansion of the “disciplinary institutions” since the theater played a

multiplicity of roles or functions of dramatizing the oriental Turk and Moor—namely, political function (propagating for Charles II’s foreign policies) and cultural role (appraising multiculturalism).

The peace treaty of Charles II with the Turks and Moors emphasized friendship and trade between the two parts. In the treaty Articles of Peace Between his Sacred Majesty, Charles II King of Great Brittain, France and Ireland, &c. And the City and Kingdom of Algiers; Concluded by Thomas Allen Esq. Admiral of His Said Majesty of Great Brittain’s Ships in the Mediterranean Seas, &c. London, Printed by Thomas Mabb, Dwelling on St. Paul’s Wharff, 1664, King Charles II and the Moors and Turks agreed on securing trade interests, ending the statement of animosity, and stimulating “friendship” and alliance between the two parts:

That from this day, and for ever forward, there be a Good and Firme Peace between his Sacred Majesty the King of Great *Brittain* and the *Bassa, Duan*, and Governours of *Algiers*, and the Dominions thereunto belonging; And the Ships, Subjects, and People on either Party, shall not do or offer any Offence or Injury to each other, but Treat one another with all possible Respect and Friendship; And any Ships belonging to the King of Great *Brittain* or any of his Majesties Subjects may freely come to the Port of *Algiers*, and Buy and Sell as in former Times; And also unto any other Port that belongs to the Government of *Algiers*, paying the Custome of 10 *per Cent* . . . ; And no Man within the Jurisdiction of *Algiers* shall give the Subjects of his said Majesty, a bad word, or a bad deed, or a bad action. (B2, 3-4)

The discursive statement of “all possible Respect and Friendship,” characterizing the spirit of the East-West relationship in the Restoration context, reflected the

transformation and modification of the Renaissance discursive rules of the Orient's stereotypical depiction. The newly modified rules of the East-West relationship did not favor "bad word, or a bad deed, or a bad action."

The treaty resolved the problem of the captivity of English merchants over the oriental land: "That all Subjects of the King of Great *Brittain* now Slaves in *Algiers*, or any of the Territories thereof, be set at Liberty, and delivered upon paying the Price they were first sold for in the Market; And for the time to come, no Subjects of his Majesties be bought or sold, or made Slaves of in *Algiers*, or its Territories" (B2, 4). Therefore, the agreement confirmed the preparation of the Moors and Turks to protect the English merchants against piracy and pillage: "That no Ship-wrack belonging to his said Majesty, or any of his Subjects on the Coast belonging to *Algiers*, shall become Prize, and that neither the Goods be forfeited, nor the Men made Slaves, but that the People of *Algiers* shall do their best Endeavours, to save them and their goods" (B3, 6). Besides the safety of the English merchants' souls, the treaty secured the freedom of worship for the English merchants, who were living over the oriental land: "That the *English Consul* that lives in *Algiers* be allowed a Place to Pray in, and no Man to do him, or any of his said Majesties Subjects any Wrong or Injury in word or deed whatsoever" (B3, 5). This principle of the religious freedom served to enhance the cultural and religious respect among Christian and Muslim societies since each individual had the right of religious freedom. Therefore, the English Christian merchants practiced their prayers freely over the oriental land without enforcement or offence.

In the Preface of the treaty, the writer celebrated the efforts of King Charles II to sign the peace treaty with the Turks and Moors since its advantages would be reflected

upon England and the English people: “It is not needful to say much concerning the late Agreement betwixt his Sacred Majesty Charles the Second . . . and the City and Kingdom of Algier. . . . For certainly that Man is very little read in the world, who sees not how much this Peace imports the Benefit and Security of the English Commerce, and no less the Honour of the English Nation” (Preface, A2). The writer praised the moderate and wise policy of Charles II since it achieved economic and national security to England and the English nation: “how great a Care His Majesty hath of the Reputation and Welfare of his People, and of the True Interest of the English Crown and Nation: And it is our further happiness that the Orders and Directions of so Wise and Gracious a Prince are Committed into the hands of suitable Officers and Ministers” (Preface, A2). The writer’s appraisal of Charles II’s politics represented the mainstream of the Restoration thinkers’ and politicians’ willingness to strengthen the commercial ties with the Turks and Moors since a strong economy insured stability and development to the nation.

An English-Moorish military alliance was subsequently established to secure the interests of the two countries against foreign assaults. In the peace treaty Articles of Peace Concluded and Agreed between His Excellency the Lord Bellasyse His Majesties Governor of His City and Garison of Tangier in Affrica And Cidi Hamet Hader Ben Ali Gayland, Prince of West Barbary, &c. The Second of April, 1666. Printed by Command. London: Printed by Tho. Newcomb Living over Against Baynard’s Castle in Thames-Street 1666, both the English admiral and the Prince of the Barbary agreed on forming mutual military defense in case Tangier was attacked by foreign enemies: “That his Excellency *Cidi Hader Gayland* shall be obliged to assist the City of *Tangier*, with all his Forces against any Christian Enemy that shall offer to Land or attack the same” (B, 6). In

return, the English forces would assist the Moors against their enemies provided that they were not friends or allies to the English:

It is agreed on behalf of his Excellency the General of *Tangier*, that in case his Excellency *Cidi Hader Gayland*, shall have occasion of the assistance of any of the Ships belonging to the English Nation, against his Enemies, they not being in Amity with England, the said Ships being in the Bay of *Tangier*, shall assist him in all they can; but in case it shall so happen, that the said Enemies of *Cidi Hader Gayland*, shall be in Amity with England, then the said Ships, nor any of the English Nation, shall not be obliged to assist the said *Cidi Hader Gayland*, either by Land or Sea.

(B, 7)

To fortify the military cooperation, King Charles II, in an effort to enhance confidence with the Moors, agreed on supplying them with weapons as long as the peace treaty was valid: “He [Charles II] doth therefore grant unto his said Excellency *Cidi Hader Gayland*, Two hundred Barrels of Fine Powder. . . . Fifty Barrels to be delivered upon the signing of these Articles; and Fifty Barrels at the end of Three Months; and so at the end of every Three Months Fifty Barrels of Powder, so long as the Peace shall last” (B, 6).

King Charles II made also a peace treaty and military alliance with the Turkish Empire for securing the commercial routes against illegal piracy and for enriching trade between the two parts. In the treaty The Capitulations and Articles of Peace between the Majestie of the King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, and the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire as they have been Augmented, and Altered in the Times of every Ambassadour: And as now lately in the City of Adrianople in the Month of January 1661 they have been Augmented, Renewed, and Amplified with Diverse Additional Articles,

and Privileges, which Serve towards the Maintenance of a well Grounded Peace, and  
Securities of the Trade, and Trafficke of His Majesties Subjects in the Levant by His  
Excellency Heneage Earle of Winchilsea Embassadour Extraordinary from His Majestie  
Charles the Second, King of Great Brittain, France, and Ireland to Sultan Mahomet Han  
the most Puissant Prince, and Emperour of the Turks: Set forth, and Published by Paul  
Ricaut, Esquire, Secretary to his Excellencie the Lord Embassadour, Printed at  
Constantinople: by Abraham Gabai, 1663, the Turkish Sultan pledged that he would grant  
the English merchants full security over the Turkish land:

First that the said Nation and the English merchants and any other nation or  
merchants which are or shall come under the English banner and protection, with  
their ships small and great merchandize, faculties, and all other their goods may  
always pass safe in our Seas, and freely and in all security may come and go into  
any part of the Imperial limits of our dominions in such sort that neither any of the  
nation, their goods, and faculties shall receive any hindrance, or molestation from  
any person whatsoever. (A1, 2)

Even at the moment of "shipwreck," the Turkish Sultan assured that "all the  
Vessels" of either the Turkish navy or of "private men" would present "assistance,  
succour, and help" (A2, 3). Furthermore, the treaty stated that all English captives and  
"slaves" would be liberated from slavery and captivity: "All Englishmen, or Subjects of  
England, which shall be found slaves in our State . . . shall be set free and delivered to the  
Embassadour or Consul" (A2, 4). Again, the Turks, just like the Moors, allied with King  
Charles II against piracy, which threatened the safety of the English merchants' souls and  
their goods. That sort of military cooperation against piracy ended the state of the western

anxiety of piracy in the Mediterranean: “If the pyrates . . . have robbed, or spoiled their [English merchants’] goods and faculties . . . our ministers shall with all diligence seek out such offendours and severely punish them, and . . . that all such goods, ships, money, and whatsoever hath been taken away from the English nation, shall be presently, justly and absolutely restored to them” (A2, 5). The Turkish Sultan promised to fight against not only the Turkish pirates, but also the Moorish pirates, who were crossing the Turkish dominions:

We [the Turkish Sultan] do ordain that several Imperial commands be given, for the entire restitution of all goods and merchandize to the English Nation so taken away, And that all such English as have been taken and made slaves, or imprisoned by the said pyrates shall be immediately set free. And after the date of this our Imperial Capitulations; if it shall be known that the said Pyrates, of Tunis and Algier, shall rob them again, and shall use, and continue their outrages, and will not restore their goods and men, We do command that the said pyrates, be not received into any Port of our dominions. (B2, 15)

In 1686, James II, the new English Catholic King, renewed the same peace treaty with the Moors and Turks. King James II continued the policy of his brother predecessor, Charles II, of strengthening terms of friendship and alliance with the Turks and Moors. Even though James II and Charles II had different religious affiliations, peace with the Oriental Turks and Moors was a strategic priority of the English leaders. In the peace treaty Articles of Peace and Commerce between the most Serene and Mighty Prince James II by the Grace of God, King of Great Britain, France and Ireland, Defender of the Christian Faith. And the most Illustrious Lords, the Douletli Basha, Aga and Governours

of the Famous City and Kingdom of Algiers in Barbary: Ratified and Confirmed by Sir William Soame Baroner, His Majesties Ambassador to the Grand Signior, on the Fifth of April, Old Style, 1686. Published by His Majesties Command. Printed by Thomas Newcomb in the Savoy. 1687, King James II, who confirmed and renewed the peace treaty as it was firstly signed by his brother, King Charles II, pledged to comply with the articles of peace and to punish violators:

That in case it shall happen hereafter, That any thing is done or committed contrary to this Treaty, whether by the Subjects of the one or the other Party, the Treaty notwithstanding shall subsist in full force, and such Contraventions shall not occasion the Breach of this Peace, Friendship, and good Correspondence . . . and if the Fault was committed by any Private Subjects of either Party, they alone shall be punished as Breakers of the Peace, and Disturbers of the Public Quiet. And Our Faith shall be Our Faith, and Our Word Our Word. (C, 17-18)

James II's description of the violators of the peace agreement as "Breakers of the Peace, and Disturbers of the Public Quiet" established a discursive rule of prohibition, through which all irrelevant and antagonistic statements about the Turks and Moors were excluded and punished. In other words, the Restoration discourse of Orientalism constituted a complex mechanism, which prescribed, governed, and supervised writers' statements about the oriental Turk and Moor. Therefore, the discourse of Orientalism influenced individual writers and not vice versa, since violating the discursive rules of the peace treaty and moderation to the oriental Turks and Moors "shall not occasion the Breach of this Peace, Friendship, and good Correspondence." Rather, it would be considered a personal offense, which deserved punishment.

The oriental Turks and Moors, who, in turn, agreed on renewing and maintaining the peace with England as it was at the time of King Charles II, promised to supervise and monitor the fulfillment of the articles of peace and to punish violators from their side:

We the most Excellent Signiors, present Governors of the Noble City and Kingdom of *Tunis* . . . have seen, perused, approved the above recited Articles of Peace, and do now for ourselves and the whole Body of our Militia, by these present, Accept, Approve, Ratifie and Confirm . . . Articles of Peace and Commerce, in the same Manner and Form as they are Inserted and Declared . . . , hereby firmly promising on our Faith, Sacredly and Inviolably to observe and maintain the said Peace, in every particular, with his said now Majesty *James* the Second, King of *Great Britain* . . . and to cause all our People, of what Degree and Quality so ever, punctually to observe and keep all and every Article thereof, from henceforth for ever, and that if any of our People shall at any time violate and break any part of the said Articles, they shall be punished with the greatest severity at their return into our Dominions of *Tunis*. (C2, 20-1)

The oriental Governors' use of discursive terms, such as "punctually to observe," "maintain," "cause all our People," "keep all and every Article," and "punished," indicates, in Foucault's terminology, the Panopticon mechanism, through which the state controls and governs the circulation of discursive statements. The observing eye of the Panopticon was always alert to register, regulate, and supervise the formation of statements about the peace and tolerance, which was a state's priority of development and commerce.

Like King James II and the Turkish/Moorish governors, King Charles II insisted on the complete respect and obedience to the articles of peace with the oriental Turks and Moors and warned of punishment to the violators. In the pamphlet By the King, A Proclamation Touching the Articles of Peace with Argiers, Tunis, and Tripoli, London: Printed by John Bill and Christopher Barker, Printers to the Kings most Excellent Majesty, 1662, King Charles II emphasized the importance of the peace agreement with the oriental Turks and Moors and ordered the English subjects to adhere to its articles since peace was related to the national interest and economic prosperity:

His Majesty . . . was graciously pleased (out of the tender regard he hath to the good of Trade and navigation) at a great expense of Treasure, to send a fleet into the *Mediterranean* Seas, which it hath pleased Almighty God so to prosper, as to bring that undertaking to the desired issue of Peace, on terms honourable and advantageous to the Trade and Navigation of these his Majesties Kingdoms. . . . And his Majesty both hereby strictly Charge and Command, that the said Articles Of Peace between his Majesty and the City and Kingdom of *Argiers* . . . be by all his Majesties Subjects of what degree or quality so ever, observed and performed, upon pains of the most severe punishments due to the contemners of his Majesties Commands, and violators of Publick faith.

Again, King Charles II's use of terms, such as "strictly Charge," "Command," "Majesties Subjects," "observed," "performed," "punishments," "contemners," and "violators," reflected the newly adopted discursive rules and statements, which controlled and supervised the circulation of authentic and accepted statements of the peace with the Turks and Moors. King Charles II's disciplinary discourse set the rules of moderation and

tolerance to the discourse of Orientalism in the Restoration era; moreover, it excluded the false, inauthentic, and irrelevant statements of the “violators” and “contemners” from the state’s tendencies and the English culture.

The visit of the Moroccan Ambassador, Kaid Mohammad Ben Hadu, to England in 1682, which acquired a royal attention, was a real representation of the Restoration phenomenon of the discourse of the “cultural renegade.” The objectives of Ben Hadu’s visit to London were to discuss a peace agreement and military cooperation between Morocco and England. King Charles II was interested in securing Tangier, which was occupied by Portugal and was later given to Charles II as a dowry of his marriage to the Portuguese princess, Catherine of Braganza.<sup>29</sup> In his book Tangier: England’s Lost Atlantic Outpost 1661-1684 (1912), E. M. G. Routh describes the royal reception of the Moroccan Ambassador both in Tangier and London. The Colonel Kirke, governor of Tangier, received and welcomed the visit of Ben Hadu: “Pole Fort fired a salute as they passed. . . . Within the town all was astir; the Mayor and Corporation in their robes welcomed the Ambassador with a speech made by the Recorder; all the streets were lined with troops; salutes were fired from all the guns” (221). Before Ben Hadu left to London, Kirke reported of him as “of good temper and understanding, and temperate” (qtd. in Routh 222). King Charles II ordered that “Royal coaches” (222) be sent to carry Ben Hadu and the Moorish delegate throughout the city of London. King Charles II’s first meeting with the Moroccan Ambassador at the royal court included many of the English “nobility” and the exchange of letters of correspondence between the two countries. The events of the meeting were recorded in London Gazette of 11<sup>th</sup> January 1681:

---

<sup>29</sup> See Charles Carrington’s The British Overseas: Exploits of a Nation of Shopkeepers (London: Cambridge, 1968) 43-46. Also, see Linda Colley’s Captives: Britain, Empire and the World 1600-1850 (New York: Anchor Books, 2002) 23-37.

This day the Ambassador from the King of Fez and Morocco had his publick Audience of their Majesties; he was brought from his House in the Strand by the Right Honorable the Earl of Ranelagh, one of the gentlemen of his Majesties bed-chamber . . . followed with a great many other coaches with 6 horses apiece, to Whitehal, in the usual manner, and was conducted through his Majesties Foot Guards to the Council Chamber . . . and led up to their Majesties, who were seated under the State, attended by a great number of the Nobility and Gentry, and his Majesties band of Gentlemen Pensioners, and Yeomen of the Guard. The Ambassador having made a short speech, presented to His Majesty a letter from the King his Master. . . . After which His Majesty was pleased to ask the Ambassador of the health of the King of Fez; and the Ambassador having answered thereunto, and finished what else he had to say, was reconducted in the same manner he came, to his House. (qtd. in Routh 223-24)

The English writers' statements of appraisal of the Moroccan Ambassador revealed, on the one hand, the political and cultural openness between England and the oriental Turks and Moors, and on the other hand, it disclosed the circulation of what were authentic and acceptable statements about the Orient in England during the Restoration. For example, in The Diary of John Evelyn, Evelyn described the Moroccan Ambassador's visit to London: "The Ambassador was an handsom person, well featur'd, and of a wise looke, subtile, and extreamely Civile: Their Presents were *Lions & Estridges &c*: Their Errant, about a Peace at Tangire &c" (266). Evelyn referred to the royal interest to entertain the Moroccan Ambassador since he was "ordered" to accompany and "complement" the Ambassador: "To our *Society*, where the *Morocco*

*Ambassador* being honorarily admitted, & subscribing his Name & Titles in *Arabic*, I was ordered by the *Council*, to go and complement him, &c” (283). For Evelyn, the Moroccan Ambassador and the accompanied Moors exhibited a model of gentility in their dress, speech, and behavior:

The *Ambassador & Retinue* behaved themselves with extraordinary Moderation & modestie. . . . The *Moores* neither admiring or seeming to regard anything, furniture or the like with any earnestnesse; and but decently tasting of the banquet: They drank a little Milk & Water, but not a drop of Wine, also they drank of a sorbet & Jacolatte: did not looke about nor stare on the Ladys, or expresse the least of surprize, but with a Courtly negligence in pace, Countenance, & whole behaviour, answering onely to such questions as were asked, with a greate deale of Wit & Gallantrie, & so gravely tooke leave. (268)

The Moroccan Ambassador was interested to learn about the cultural and popular aspects of the British culture. Therefore, he, as reported by Evelyn, went to “Hide-Park” to practice “Horsmanship,” attended the “Theaters,” and visited “Cambridge,” “Oxford” and the “Queen’s College”:

[He] went often to *Hide-Park* on *horse back*, where he and his retinue shewed their extraordinary activity in Horsmanship, and the flinging & Catching their launces at full speede; They rid very short, & could stand up right in full speede, managing their speares with incredible agility. He also went sometimes to our *Theaters*, where when upon any foolish or fantastical action he could not forbear laughing, he endeavored to hide it with extraordinary modesty & gravity. (268-69)

The Ambassador's visit to the British universities was also celebrated by King Charles II, the university professors, and the vice-chancellors since educational exchange typically enhances cultural convergence and human correspondence. In Foucauldian analysis of discourse, institutions like universities, schools, and hospitals supervise the circulation of true, authentic, and legitimate statements and exclude the irrelevant ones. In this context, the "disciplinary institutions" of Cambridge, Oxford, and the Queen's College had multifunctional roles—namely, cultural (openness with the oriental culture) and political (circulating the King's tendencies of strengthening trade and military alliance with the Turks and Moors). In the Annals of Cambridge, Charles Henry Cooper registered the Ambassador's visit to Cambridge:

On the 1st of April, the Ambassador from the Emperor of Morocco visited the University, the following is an account of his reception: The 1<sup>st</sup> of April 1682 . . . came his Excellency [Hamet Ben Haddu Ottor] Morocco Embassadour to Cambridge and 3 others of the same nacion with him in the Kings Coach, and about 6 more of his attendants on horseback. . . . They were invited hither by the University & received onely by them at the Regent Walke. (The Maior & Aldermen not appearing) the Vicechancellor & heads in their Searlet; they gave them a banquet in the Regent house . . . . (595)

At Oxford, the Moroccan Ambassador enjoyed a hearty reception by its "vicechancellor" and the professors. King Charles II, who performed the "eye of power" in Foucauldian analysis of discourse, sent orders to the vice-chancellor of Oxford to receive and welcome the Moorish guest due to the latter's political importance to England: "May 28, Sunday. Notice came to the vicechancellor that the ambassador from

the Emperour of Fess and Morocco would visit the University next Tuesday” (qtd. in Routh 227). The Ambassador admired meeting with the Oxford professors since some of them like “Dr. Edward Pocock” were speaking and teaching Arabic:

At the end of May he paid a visit to Oxford, where he stayed for a night and did a great deal of sightseeing on the following day. . . . The ambassador came from Windsore in one of the king’s coaches of 6 horses, with another with him: put in at Sir Timothy Tirrils at Shotover about 4 in the afternoon where he had a banquet. Afterwards came towards Oxford and at the bottom of Shotover next to Oxon he was there met by at least 100 scholars on horsebacke. Dr Yerbury saluted him in the University name in English, which he took by interpretation. About 8 of the clocke at night came into Oxford Hamet Ben Hamet Ben Haddu Ottur embassadour from the emperour of Morocco and put in at the Angell inn. . . . Where being settled, the vicechancellor and Doctors . . . congratulated his arrival; and the orator spoke a little speech and (Dr Edward) Pocock something in (A)rabick which made him laugh. (qtd. in Routh 226-27)

At the Queen’s College, the Ambassador was also cordially received by the university president and the professors, who supplied Ben Hadu with Arabic books and offered him a campus tour, which included the “theater”:

In the morning about 8 or 9 he went to Queen’s College and saw the Chapel Hall . . . thence to the Physick Garden where Dr (Robert) Morison harangued him. Thence to Magd. Coll. where the president spake something to him; went into the Chappell beheld the windows and paintings; thence round the cloister. And so to New Coll. where he saw the Chappell while the organ played. Thence to St John’s. Thence to

Wadham. Thence to Allsouls; saw their chappell. Thence to Universe. Coll. . . . At 3 the people were seated in the Theater but the ambassador being indisposed after dinner and sleepe came not till 5 of the clock. Being seated in a seat of state on the right hand of the vicechancellor, (William) Wiat the Orator spake a Latin speech. Which done, followed instrumental and vocal Musick . . . . Tis thought that there was in the Theater 3000 people and a thousand without that could not get in. . . . He went thence up to the public library where he was entertained with an Arabick speech by Dr Thomas Hyds which he understood. . . . Thence about 9 he went to the Angell and afterwards the vicechancellor presented to him certain books in Arabick. (qtd. in Routh 227-28)

Not only the Restoration universities responded to the pleasantries of King Charles II, but also the theater, as a “disciplinary institution,” transformed and modified the discursive rules of depicting the Turks and Moors. English dramatists, such as Elkanah Settle (1648-1724), imitated the discursive rules of dramatizing the oriental Turk and Moor, which were set by John Dryden, who, Foucault’s terminology, functioned as the “founder of discursivity” since he not only wrote his own text (plays) but also defined the rules of the heroic drama, which emphasized the concepts of virtue and “cultural renegade,” of which oriental characters are not deprived. In his plays The Empress of Morocco (1673) and The Heir of Morocco (1673), Elkanah Settle dramatizes virtuous and chaste male and female oriental Moors—Muly Hamet and Muly Labas (male characters) and Morena and Mariamne (female characters) in The Empress of Morocco, Altomar (male character) and Artemira (female character) in The Heir of Morocco.

Settle's oriental heroes and heroines share with John Dryden's and Sir William Davenant's oriental characters the traits of nobility, chastity, and "cultural renegade."

Elkanah Settle's The Empress of Morocco (1673) reflects upon the typical continuation and circulation of moderate dramatization of oriental characters on the Restoration stage. Muly Hamet, the Moorish general of the Emperor's army, is a model of bravery, virtue, loyalty to the Moorish Emperor, Muly Labas, and Morocco. He achieves successive victories to Morocco and shows loyalty to his Moorish Emperor:

I only, Sir, my Duty have pursu'd:

And acts of Duty merit no applause,

I owe my Lawrels to my Royal Cause.

My Actions all are on your Name enroll'd,

Since 'tis from you my Conqu'ring Pow'r I hold. (II.i.32-6)

He is always ready to defend his country and king from any foreign invasion. When hearing that his Emperor is subject to invasion by "Taffaletta's Arms," the Emperor's father-in-law, Muly Hamet, brings back the army to defend his Emperor and country: "Hearing whose Force Morocco will invade, / I have brought home your Army to your aid" (II.i.69-70). Muly Hamet, receiving the soldiers' and the king's admiration for his valor and loyalty, is declared by the king as "Defender of a Crown": "Whilst they behold triumphant on one Throne / The Wearer and Defender of a Crown. / Lead on-----" (II.i.128-30).

Muly Hamet's love for Mariamne, the Emperor's sister, is virtuous. For him, love motivates him for victory, self-realization and "glory": "War has taught my Hands to aime / At Glory, to deserve a Lovers Name; / Since my Ambition has your Heart

pursu'd" (II.i.100-03). Their virtuous love is celebrated and blessed by the Moroccan King, who finds Muly Hamet a perfect model of bravery and loyalty: "That vaster Debt I owe She shall discharge. / To pay what so much Merit does require, / I do command you love, where I admire" (II.i.109-11). Muly Hamet and Mariamne's love is glorified by the Emperor's consent of their attachment:

Muly Hamet. Though Mariamne's Love appear'd before  
The highest Happiness Fate had in store,  
Yet when I view it, as an Offering  
Made by the Hand of an obliging King,  
It takes new Charms, looks brighter, lends new Heat.  
No Objects are so Glorious or so Great,  
But what may still a Greater Form put on,  
As Optick Glasses magnifie the Sun. (II.i.112-19)

The Emperor's approval of their love does not indicate any enforcement on either part since both of Muly Hamet and the Empress, Mariamne, share the same feelings of fondness and devotion. The Emperor's applause adds more harmony to their virtuous love.

In spite of the intrigues, which are set by the Queen Mother to separate Muly Hamet and the Moroccan Emperor, Muly Hamet remains faithful and loyal to his Emperor and country. Laula, the mother of the Emperor, falsely accuses Muly Hamet of attempting to "ravish" (III.i.181) her till Crimalhaz, the Queen Mother's Machiavellian lover, interferes to aid her. Laula's plots against Muly Hamet's aim to cast him away since he discovers her secret profane love with Crimalhaz, the usurper of the Moroccan throne. Believing

the false story of the Queen Mother, the Moroccan Emperor decides to sentence Muly Hamet to death in accordance with Islamic laws: "Muly Hamet, for this Guilt our Prophets Breath / Has in his sacred Laws pronounc'd your Death" (III.i.256-57).

However, owing to the effect of Mariamne's appeals, the Emperor reconsiders the death sentence and decides to exile Muly Hamet. Mariamne never suspects the innocence of Muly Hamet nor deserts her love to him: "Tortures, nor Chains, shall not my Love rebate: / I'll share his Breast, though I should share his Fate" (III.ii.152-53). Therefore, the Emperor's alleviation of the death sentence consoles Mariamne's sadness of the lovers' departure:

Sister, your noble Pride has made me kind:  
I'll give him that Reward which You design'd.  
Your Courteous hand his Freedom did restore;  
And I'll repeat what you pronounc't before:  
Be gone, and never see Morocco more. (III.ii.154-58)

The Emperor's decision of exile does not shake Muly Hamet's self-confidence or his loyalty to the Emperor:

I must obey you, and embrace my Doom  
With the same patience Saints do Martyrdom.  
Only their Suffering's a Reward receive;  
They Die to meet that Happiness I leave:  
They Die, that in their deaths they Heaven may find:  
But in my Princess, I leave Mine behind.  
I lose the power to serve so good a King:

So Good, that 'twould as great a Bliss confer

To Die for You, as 'tis to Live for Her. (III.ii.192-200)

Muly Hamet's use of the words "Heaven," "Saints," and "Martyrdom" indicates Restoration dramatization of the oriental Turks and Moors as faithful believers, rather than atheists. That represents the gradual transformation of the western perception of Islam from paganism, as was the case in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, to a monotheistic religion such as Christianity and Judaism.

While in exile, Muly Hamet suffers the agonies of distance from his Emperor, his beloved, and Morocco:

My Country, Princess, and my King forsook:

Stormes to my Miseries like attendants look.

These Tempests Sir, are to my Sufferings due:

When my King Frowns, 'tis just that Heav'n frown too. (IV.ii.5-8)

Muly Hamet's sense of lamentation and remorse results from a belief on the holiness of monarchs since obedience to "Heav'n" entails a similar compliance to the "King." His exile prevents him from rescuing the Moroccan Emperor from the snares and trickery of the Queen Mother and Crimalhaz, who steals the Emperor's "Gold," "bribes" the soldiers, and leads a military coup against the Moorish Emperor. Being exiled and debilitated to aid his Emperor against the rebels, Muly Hamet compares his exile experience to repulsion from "Heaven":

Condemn'd never to see Morocco more!

Thus am I doom'd to quit all I Adore:

As prophane Sinners are from Altars driven,

Banish'd the Temple to be banisht Heaven.

Horroure and Tortures now my Jaylours be,

Who paints Damnation needs but Copy me. (IV.ii.141-46)

Muly Hamet is the savior and restorer of peace to Morocco. The Machiavellian Crimalhaz along with the Queen Mother plots against the Emperor of Morocco and usurps his throne. The Young Queen, wife of the Emperor, kills her husband by mistake since she is deluded by the Queen Mother that the Emperor is Crimalhaz, who is supposed to “kill” her “Husband” (IV.iii.102) and to “Ravish” (IV.iii.101) her. The absence of Muly Hamet from Morocco causes chaos to its legitimate royal throne and the safety of its people; therefore, Crimalhaz exploits Muly Hamet’s banishment to serve his malignant cause:

Muly Hamet and Mariamne are the last

Of the Imperial Race, that have not past

To th’ other World, to make me room in this.

But though your hand did of his murder miss:

Howe’re his exile has restrain’d his Pow’r. (V.i.21-5)

Muly Hamet unites his power with Taffalets, the former enemy of Morocco, and leads in triumph over the vicious Crimalhaz. The bravery and virtue of Muly Hamet reconcile Morocco’s former enemies to fight side by side with the Moorish cause. Hametalhaz, “Confident” of Crimalhaz, reports the news of “triumph,” which is achieved by Muly Hamet and Taffalets: “By their own hands the Gates were straight pul’d down, / And he in Triumph marcht into the Town. / They [soldiers] paid to him what to their King they owe” (V.i.215-17). The arrival of Muly Hamet destabilizes the evil powers of the throne

usurpers and ushers horror in their hearts since Muly Hamet's mission is to restore peace and stability to Morocco after years of chaos. Hametalhaz warns Crimalhaz of the power of Muly Hamet and of the futility of fighting against him: "The furious Muly Hamet leads 'em on, / Whose Fortune, and whose Sword has Wonders done. / Your Guards hew'd down, He by no Force withstood" (V.i.240-42). Muly Hamet restores peace to the princess, Mariamne, who loses her brother and suffers the atrocity of the throne usurpers. The heroic reunion of the lovers after seasons of agony and separation dramatizes Muly Hamet's assurance of revenging Mariamne's affliction:

Here at your Feet, kind Providence has thrown  
Your banisht Lover, and your Ravisht Crown.  
Your influence, and my Armes so happy prov'd;  
Th' usurpers Scepter's to your Hand remov'd;  
His blood, when he his forfeit Head dares show,  
Shall pay what to your Brothers Dust I owe. (V.ii.13-18)

Muly Hamet prefers virtue and chastity over "crowns." His love to Mariamne is neither political nor Machiavellian since he decides to surrender his crown to the vicious Crimalhaz in order to save her life: "My Lawrels, Crowns, and Empires are all yours [Crimalhaz's]" (V.ii.69). Crimalhaz threatens to stab Mariamne unless Muly Hamet swears that he surrenders the throne and protects her. Anxious of his beloved's life, Muly Hamet agrees reluctantly to Crimalhaz's conditions: "For her Lives ransome I this off'ring make: / Morocco and your [Crimalhaz's] Crown I'll give you back. / To my last blood I will your life defend" (V.ii.71-3). For Muly Hamet, Providence saves the life of his beloved since their love is virtuous and purely innocent:

What Miracle of Honour has fate sent?

Sure Heav'n acts Wonders! Wonders, no 'tis none-----

What have th' high'r Powers to do but to take care

Of so much Vertue and a Face so Fair? (V.ii.128-31)

For him, "Honour" and "Love" are more precious than thrones: "Such Honour and such Love! I am Conquer'd here" (V.ii.172). Muly Hamet's oriental model of monarchical tolerance, peace, love, bravery, and virtue is celebrated in Settle's play since that model teaches a lesson that legitimate and virtuous monarchs are supported by Providence and by public. Abdelcador, the close friend of Muly Hamet, comments on the bright destiny of legitimate monarchs: "See the reward of Treason; Death's thing / Distinguishes th' Usurper from the King. / Kings are immortal, and from Life remove" (V.ii.213-15). Therefore, Muly Hamet characterizes his reign with love and virtue since he does not greedily pursue thrones nor commit massacres against people for its sake; rather, thrones are adequate rewards to the virtuous monarchs:

My Justice ended; now I'le meet a Crown:

Crowns are the Common Prizes I have won.

Those are Entayld on Courage. No 'tis You

Can only yield a Bliss that's great and new.

The Charm of Crowns to Love but dull appears:

Raigning's a whole life toyl, the work of Years.

In love a day, an hour, a minut's Bliss,

Is all Flight, Rapture, Flame, and Extasies.

Love's livelyer Joyes so quick and active move;

An Age in Empire's but an Hour in Love. (V.ii.219-28)

In Settle's The Empress of Morocco, the oriental woman is also depicted as virtuous and honorable. In the play, the model of the chaste oriental woman is represented by Morena, the wife of the Moroccan Emperor, and Mariamne, sister of the Emperor and beloved of Muly Hamet. Challenging the parental authority, Morena's love to Muly Labas is devout and steadfast. Even though her father, Taffaletta, refuses his daughter's love and moves a huge army to restore her, she decides to defend her love and marriage to Muly Labas:

Hold, Sir [Muly Labas], and your unmanly fears remove,

And shew your Courage equal to your Love:

Let us to Death in solemn Triumph go,

As to the nobler Nuptials of the two. (I.i.77-80)

Morena longs for her innocent love to Muly Labas, the Moroccan Emperor, to restore "peace" to the conquering fathers, who object to their love: "Gentle as Nature in its Infancy; / Till soften'd by our Charms their Furies cease, / And their Revenge dissolves into a Peace" (I.i.94-6). A woman with a strong personality, Morena sacrifices the "Crown" for the sake of maintaining her love to Muly Labas: "With you I fled my Countrey, left a Crown" (I.i.23). Her love to Muly Labas remains faithful and solid even after his death as her later life turns to remorse and ruefulness. She becomes obsessed with taking revenge against the usurpers, who arrange the assassination of the Emperor. She finds happiness and victory in death since she wishes reconciliation with her husband at "Heaven." At the death scene, Morena remains strong in front of her killer, the Queen Mother, since death means to her reunion with the lover in "Heaven":

My Soul to Him - - - - take - - - all I leave behind.

Thy death, Dear Saint; reveng'd, and mine so near,

Such charming objects to my Thoughts appear:

In hopes I shall meet Thee, my Joy's so high,

Methinks I visit Heav'n, before I die. (V.i.138-42)

Mariamne, in short, is another virtuous oriental woman model. In the play, she communicates harmoniously with the Moroccan court, her brother Emperor, Muly Hamet, and her country—namely, Morocco. As a woman with a strong personality, she is a source of inspiration and motivation to the Emperor and Muly Hamet. For Muly Hamet, Mariamne motivates him for achieving victories for Morocco: “Now I'm a Conquerour, Mariamne's Name alone / Has Triumph in't; I from this hour am made / Greater than if I wore those Crowns I won” (II.i.85-7). She makes decisive judgments about the Emperor's and Muly Hamet's behaviors. For example, she rescues Muly Hamet, who is accused falsely of ravishing the Queen Mother, from imprisonment: “I have lent / Your Freedom only as your Banishment: / That being releas'd, you might Morocco fly” (III.ii.29-31). Though the Emperor refuses her appeals to release Muly Hamet, Mariamne's firm confrontation changes the Emperor's sentence:

Mariamne. Knew you [Emperor] his Innocence, you would approve

Both his just Liberty, and my just Love.

But, Sir, you know, I'm Sister to a King:

And in that Name I dare do any thing;

Make where I please my Heart an Offering. (III.ii.147-51)

In short, she endangers her life to rescue Muly Hamet from the usurpers' plots against him since love means to her self-sacrifice and devotion: "Those Stars that smile on Lovers, brought me here. / I for Your sake my wandring steps engage: / Devotion is the rise of Pilgrimage" (IV.ii.22-4). For her, love does not mean submission, rather "glory" and "pride": "Mariamne has this glory on her side, / That kindness you call Love, I call my Pride" (IV.ii.39-40). Moreover, Mariamne, representing a revolutionary and powerful female voice in the play, challenges the threatening of the usurpers to kill her and to humiliate her pride. She meritoriously exemplifies bravery and heroism in the face of the usurpers: "Mariamne scorns to die less than a Queen" (V.ii.85).

In his play The Heir of Morocco (1673), Elkanah Settle rearticulates the same Restoration discursive statement of the theme of the heroism and virtue of oriental heroes and heroines. In the play, Altomar, the admiral of the Moorish army, displays another example of bravery, virtue, loyalty, and tolerance. Admired by the Moorish soldiers, Altomar consistently leads them to victories. Albuzeiden, King of Algiers, celebrates the heroic services of Altomar to his king and country: "Rise noble Youth, thou Darling of the Stars, / Whilst I have thy Heroick Arm to cut / My way to Fame, and my triumphant Fleet" (I.i.194-96). Also, Meroin refers to the valiance of Altomar in the battlefield: "Our wonderful Success! Where lies the Wonder? / Could your great Fathers Arms be less victorious / When led by *Altomar*, the Valiant *Altomar*? " (I.i.48-50). However, Altomar's harmonious relationship with the king of Algiers deteriorates severely when the king decides to enforce his daughter, Artemira, to marry Gayland, a usurping king. The king's decision enrages Altomar because he does not expect that his true love to Artemira will be unwelcomed and destroyed by the king:

Now by my Life you [the king] wrong her:  
I won her nobly, by yon' bright Eternals,  
I took her Heart by Storm: Her guarded Breast  
Stood my long Siege, with all her Sexes Pride. (I.i.258-61)

Altomar contrasts his love to Artemira, which is "nobly" won, to the materialistic ambition of king Albuzeiden to broaden his empire and to get Gayland's commendation at the expense of his daughter's happiness. Altomar's services to the Moorish crown, from King Albuzeiden's point of view, do not equal the thrones and the "Trophies," which he may obtain from Gayland:

But my dear *Altomar*, 'tis not enough  
Thy Conquering Arm has made me great abroad,  
But Triumphs wait me nearer home; new Trophies  
Lie at my Feet, whilst pressing Glories crowd  
Under my Battlements—The mighty *Gayland*,  
The long-fam'd Terror of our *Africk* World. (I.i.205-10)

For Altomar, the King's justification for his decision is not convincing enough since his virtuous love and services to the court overvalue the materialistic bribes of Gayland. Therefore, he reminds the king of the unfair treatment, which a loyal knight and virtuous lover receives:

Ungrateful King, is this the black Reward,  
Which you return your Conquering Soldiers Toys?  
Have I for this, from all the Ports of Fame,  
Past all the Storms of Fate to make you glorious? (I.i.312-15)

Altomar remains loyal to the Moorish king even after his banishment and imprisonment at the commands of the king. For example, he rescues the king from Merion's assassinating attack and kills the usurpers. For Altomar, loyalty to the king is a virtue, which honest knights nobly maintain: "Thus low, great Sir, I bend my prostrate Soul, / O'er-whelm'd with Glory, and o'er-charg'd with Bliss: / For I have saved the Royal *Albuzeiden*" (III.ii.127-29). Altomar's loyalty to the king goes beyond materialistic pursuits and ambitions because he has the opportunity to save his love to Artemira and to inherit the throne by allowing the king to die at the hands of the usurper, Merion, but he behaves according to the principles of bravery, honesty, loyalty, and virtue:

But know, mistaken Prince, I've not commanded  
Your Navy, fought your Battles, propt your Throne  
To see my Sovereign die, that Sacred Lord.  
That awful Man that gave my Princess Life,  
Must never die whilst I've a Sword to save him. (III.i.264-68)

That chivalric action receives the admiration of not only Artemira but also of King Albuzeiden: "How he tires me!" (III.i.270). Moreover, Altomar gives another example of loyalty and tolerance at his death when he forgives King Albuzeiden's execution and maltreatment to him. Killing Gayland in a sword dual, Altomar is sentenced to death by King Albuzeiden. However, a messenger arrives at the Moorish court to inform that Altomar, whose real name is "Muly Mesude," is in fact the legitimate heir of the Moorish throne since he is the son of the murdered king "Muly Labas":

Yes Sir, the Blood of their last murder'd Monarch  
*Muly Labas* runs in his Veins; his true Name

*Muly-Mesude*; but by a borrow'd Title,  
Preserved an Infant in the Court of *Egypt*,

T'escape the mortal Rage of the old Bloody Empress. (V.i.140-44)

Altomar, to the surprise of King Albuzeiden, forgives the wrongs of the repentant king and recommends to his heir, "Cialto," who is Altomar's brother, not to take revenge against King Albuzeiden since he is his father-in-law and the father of his "Royal Bride":

Sir, your untimely Kindness comes too late:

But to acknowledge these last Sparks of Pity,

You Sir, that come t' invite me to a Throne,

Bear back my dying Sighs to my kind Subjects:

Tell 'em I have a Brother call'd *Cialto*,

A Souldier in the *Persian Sophy's* Camp.

Let him know e'er the Imperial Diadem

Circles his radiant Brow, that 'tis the last

Request of his expiring Brother, that

The Wrongs of *Altomar* be ne'er remember'd.

No Schriech-owl Fame dare croak my dying Wounds;

But let him cherish this dear Sacred Prince:

For he's the Father to my Royal Bride;

And his kind Hand has given me *Artemira*. (V.i.200-13)

King Albuzeiden, despite his villainous practices against Altomar, transforms at the end of the play into a repentant father and king. Recognizing the harm and injury, which he causes to his daughter and the royal Altomar, King Albuzeiden amends his mistakes

since he blesses the marriage of Altomar and Artemira and pays royal obedience to Altomar: “Yes, Fates, what have I done? / A deed for which the Furies want a Name: / Martyr’d a Monarch on a Gibbet!” (V.i.155-57). For King Albuzeiden, disobeying the legitimate monarch entails heavenly damnation since he commits a crime not only against the king but also God. Therefore, the death of Altomar terrifies King Albuzeiden since he knows the horrible destiny of usurpers and regicides:

Oh *Altomar*, most sacred injured Lord,  
What dismal Wrongs does Heaven ordain for thee?  
What Plagues, what Hells for me?  
The only man of all Heav’ns whole Creation,  
That could have made me great, my Daughter blest,  
Her Love immortal, and my Name eternal,  
I have most barbarously massacred,  
The noblest Blood that Royal Veins e’er held,  
I have let out to drown the sinking World. (V.i.164-72)

That state of pessimism and repentance leads King Albuzeiden to stab himself in order to, on the one hand, expiate his sins against his daughter and Altomar, and on the other hand to reunite them in death. Comparing his injustices to a monster of “Guilt” and “Shame,” which devours the innocent “Vertue” and is represented by Altomar and the Princess, Artemira, King Albuzeiden allegorically equates the misfortunes, which harm Altomar and Artemira to a “Storm,” which “wracks” the peace of the lovers and the royal king. Therefore, King Albuzeiden believes that his death is a “Noble Deed”:

No, ’tis a Noble Deed,

Should Guilt and Shame survive when Vertue bleeds?

I'm but the meanest Wretch this Storm has wrack'd.

That pair of faithful Lovers died before me.

When Natures Wealth, all her rich Fraught sinks down,

Surely the Lumber of the World may drown.

*Morat*, as e'er thou lov'st thy dying King,

See my Bones lodg'd in that wrong'd Prince's Grave;

But let me humbly his blest Relicks meet;

Lay my Head low beneath his Royal Feet. (V.i.268-77)

In the play, the oriental woman is depicted as virtuous, courageous, and revolutionary. Artemira, objecting to the patriarchal authority of her father, who endeavors to enforce her to accept a political marriage to Gayland, remains nevertheless solid and courageous in the face of her father's and Gayland's threats to keep her away from her lover, Altomar. She remonstrates against her father's "inhumane" decision of breaking her love to Altomar:

Is this your Promise dear inhumane Father?

Did you for this with so much cruel Eloquences

Repeat the Charming Story of his [Altomar's] Conquests,

Drawing his Picture so Divine, so Lovely?

And bid me when this gallant Prince return'd

A Conqueror, prepare to make him mine? (I.i.241-46)

Keeping her true love vows to Altomar, she does not surrender to the materialistic temptations of thrones and luxury. Rather, described by her father as "Rebel Daughter"

(II.ii.215), she defends her choice of love to Altomar: "My Paradise in him, him only lies,  
/ And Love's a Flower which once transplanted "(I.i.360-61). For her, love is not a  
bargain to be won; rather, "Love is the very Soul of the Creation" (II.ii.172). Therefore,  
she allegorically compares her love to Altomar to a "Diamond," which loses its value if  
fragmented into pieces: "Can I love twice? She whose divided Heart / Admits more  
Loves than one, does but like her / That breaks a precious Diamond into Sparks"  
(II.ii.174-76).

Artemira declares herself an "invincible" woman since all of Gayland's and her  
father's endeavors to convince her of getting married to Gayland are in vain since she  
vows to maintain her virtue, true love, and principle:

By *Alla*, and his own Imperial Honor,  
He'll never marry me, till he has conquer'd me.  
Now when I meet the shining Meteor next,  
I'll own our Loves, and tell him I'm invincible. (III.ii.25-8)

She moralizes the meaning of true love and rejects paternal prescriptions: "If you [her  
father] but knew what Love meant, / Then you would speak with Mercy, then you'd pity"  
(III.ii.68-9). Revolutionizing the role of woman, she clearly challenges societal taboos  
such as woman's submission and weakness to patriarchy. In this sense, she revolts  
against her prescribed role, which is set by her father: "Prepare, fond Girl, to obey thy  
Father's Will" (I.i.288). For her, the patriarchal "Will" restricts her freedom,  
emancipation, and self-assurance since her recognition of love relates solely to her  
perception and convention:

But the Command's impossible.

I have loved once, and ne'er can love agen.

True Love's

A bird of Paradise, when once on Wing,

It keeps the Airy Region, where it flies,

And never lights before it falls and dies. (III.ii.73-8)

Playing a main role in the reformation of masculinity, Artemira triumphs over detrimental patriarchal norms. She chooses death to defeat, on the one hand, the masculine restrictions and limitations to her self-development, and on the other hand, to rejoin her dead lover, Altomar, in Heaven. Even though her father repents the death of Altomar, she does not accept his remorse since it comes too late. She blames her father's opportunistic tendency since what matters to him is only Altomar, who appears to be the royal legitimate heir of Morocco, rather than the honest and virtuous lover:

Has he [Altomar] more Love, more Charms, more Hearts to give me,

Because he's Heir t' a Crown. Ah no, he was

To me my King, my World, my Heaven before,

And Crowns and Empires could not make him more. (V.i.227-30)

Artemira's death, which unravels the materialistic obstacles of preventing the union of the lovers, achieves her goals and ideals of virtue, courage, and reunion with the lover: "Ha! Is't my Love that calls me? See / His mourning Chariot hastens me away. / I come my *Altomar*, my Life I come." (V.i.253-55). Moreover, her death reforms the villainy of King Albuzeiden, who laments the deaths of his daughter and Altomar and stabs himself in order to purify his wrongs: "Was ever wretched Father damn'd as I am?" (V.i.263).

Elkanah Settle's The Empress of Morocco (1673) and The Heir of Morocco (1673) manifest the circulation of the Restoration discourse of Orientalism, which included radical modification, transformation, and moderate representation of the oriental Turks and Moors. In Foucauldian analysis of discourse, the mechanism of discourse production is always elastic, changeable, and modifiable since it adapts its discursive rules in accordance with the politics of each time and place. King Charles II's tolerant and open politics with the oriental Turks and Moors influenced the archaeological transformation of the discourse of Orientalism in the Restoration era. Settle's characterization of the orient corresponds to the dramatic discursive rules, established by John Dryden, who played the role of the "founder of discursivity" since he not only wrote his own texts but also set the rules of the heroic drama. Elkanah Settle's and John Dryden's oriental male/female characters share the virtues of loyalty, bravery, honesty, chastity, and heroism. For example, Almanzor and Almahide in John Dryden's The Conquest of Granada (1672), Donna Jacinta in Dryden's An Evening's Love (1668), Ysabinda in Dryden's Amboyna (1673), Cleopatra in Dryden's All for Love (1678), Troilus and Cressida in Dryden's Troilus and Cressida (1679), and Muley-Zeydan in Dryden's Don Sebastian (1689), resemble the virtuous characterization of Elkanah Settle's Muly Hamet and Mariamne in The Empress of Morocco and Altomar and Artemira in The Heir of Morocco. The Restoration theater, which played the role of the "disciplinary institution," presented "institutional support," in Foucauldian analysis of discourse, to the foreign policies of Charles II and James II since it dramatized the English, Moorish, and Turkish monarchs' tendencies to maintain "Respect and Friendship," which were emphasized in the Articles of Peace between England and the oriental Turks and Moors. Moreover, the

theater's intervention practiced the discursive "procedures of exclusion" and "prohibition" of antagonistic dramatization and statements against the oriental Turks and Moors as was in Renaissance.

Elkanah Settle's plays maintain the validity of the discursive statement of warning the violators of the "Peace, Friendship, and good Correspondence" between the England of Charles II and James II and the oriental Turks and Moors. Settle's moderate depiction of the Moors avoids King Charles II's delineation of the breakers as "the contemners of his Majesties Commands, and violators of Publick faith." In other words, Settle's plays reveal the "panopticon" role of the Restoration theater in administering, supervising, and controlling the dramatization of the allies and enemies of England. Allegorically, the antagonistic depiction of the oriental Turk and Moor was excluded from the English public life just as the "leper" was abstained from interacting with other people in order to protect the health of individuals. The "invisibility" of surveillance changed the audience as well as the dramatists to become self-observers upon their reaction and treatment of the oriental Turks and Moors, who became part of the English "Publick faith," as it was put in King Charles II's words.

In this sense, the "panopticon" of the Restoration theater played a positive role of "alter[ing] behaviour, train[ing] or correct[ing] individuals," as it is described in Foucauldian analysis of the "panopticon." That behavioral modification of the Restoration audience aimed to familiarize the oriental Turk and Moor with the English politics and culture. Therefore, the "panopticon" supervised the production of Orientalism, which became a source of growth and economic development since Foucault explains that the "panopticon" performs various functions—namely, "to increase

production, to develop the economy, spread education, raise the level of public morality; to increase and multiply.” Just as “hospitals,” in Foucauldian analysis of the “panopticon,” expanded their function from treating patients to preventing the spread of “epidemic diseases” via observing the outside “population,” the Restoration theater extended its entertainment function to teach lessons of respect and acceptance of the oriental Turk and Moor in English society. The theater participated in moving the Turks and Moors out of the circle of hostility to the sphere of “treat[ing] one another with all possible Respect and Friendship,” as the articles of peace affirm.

Settle’s elevation and celebration of oriental heroes and heroines—Muly Hamet and Mariamne in The Empress of Morocco and Altomar and Artemira in The Heir of Morocco—were not an arbitrary dramatization of entertaining the audience; rather, they were part of a systemically-inculcated state teaching program, which institutionalized Orientalism to a discourse of toleration and of “cultural renegade.” As a result, Settle’s plays encourage the audience’s identification with the bravery and virtue of Muly Hamet, Mariamne, Altomar, and Artemira, who penetrated into the English audience consciousness. In this context, Settle, like John Dryden, Sir William Davenant and other Restoration dramatists, is an “ideological product,” as described in Foucauldian analysis of the “author function,” since he was both a product of and a promulgator of the Restoration discourse of moderation to the oriental Turks and Moors. Settle did not create meaning to his texts; rather, he himself was influenced and created by the production of the discourse of his era. In this sense, Settle, John Dryden, and Sir William Davenant shared a similar style of writing and author function.

## CONCLUSION

This study sheds light on the transformation of the discourse of Orientalism from the Renaissance to the Restoration political and cultural thought. Even though both of the Renaissance and the Restoration periods were chronologically close, the study emphasizes the pervasive discursive transformation of the western perception of the oriental Turk and Moor in the two periods. Whereas in Renaissance drama, the oriental Turks and Moors were considered as terroristic “greedie lyon[s],” in Knolles’s terminology, the Restoration dramatists such as John Dryden, Sir William Davenant, Neville Payne, and Elkanah Settle developed the character of the “cultural renegade”—called throughout this dissertation the “Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist,” who transcends religious limitations, revolutionizes cultural rapprochement, and celebrates both Islam and Christianity. Therefore, this study emphasizes the dramatic transformation of the Renaissance anxiety of the concept of the religious renegade, who prefers one culture and religion over the other, to the Restoration “cultural renegade”—that is, the “Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protoagist”—who as a cross-cultural, revolutionary and political activist, transcends the limitations of place, religion, and nation and interfaces other cultures without losing his/her religion or culture. This dissertation examines how Restoration drama deconstructs three major Renaissance concepts—namely, the religious renegade; identification with the Roman imperial legacy as represented by John Dryden’s All for Love (1678), Tyrannick Love (1669); and the Renaissance anxiety of the notion of the “Trojan Turks” as represented by John Dryden’s Troilus and Cressida (1679).

This study develops the concept of the “cultural renegade” as a way of analyzing more critically the Restoration drama. Even though many previous studies have dealt with the image of the oriental Turk and Moor, along with the western recognition of Islam in Renaissance and Restoration drama, none of them addresses the dramatic development of the Restoration “cultural renegade” in contrast to the Renaissance religious renegade. Therefore, the study emphasizes the Restoration denouncement of Richard Knolles’s, the first British Renaissance historian of the Turks’ affairs, description of the Turkish Empire in his book The Generall Historie of the Turkes from the First Beginning of that Nation to the Rising of the Ottoman Familie: With all the Notable Expeditions of the Christians Princes against them. Together with the Lives and Conquests of the Othoman Kings and Emperours Faithfullie collected out of the best Histories, both Ancient and Modern, and Digested into one Continuat Historie Until this Present Year 1603, as “the terrour of the world”:

The glorious Empire of the Turkes, the present terrour of the world, hath amongst other things nothing in it more wonderfull or strange, than the poore beginning of itself; so small and obscure, as that it is not well known unto themselves, or agreed upon even among the best writers of their histories, from whence this barbarous nation that now so triumphant over the best part of the world, first crept out or tooke their beginning. (B, 1)

Richard Knolles’s chronicle appeared early in the seventeenth century and obviously impacted many Renaissance dramatists such as William Shakespeare, Christopher Marlowe, John Mason, Robert Daborne and many others, since it coincided with the culmination of the military and imperial power of the Turks; nevertheless, the

notion of the “terror” of the Turks was not accepted as a discursive fact in Restoration England, which signed Articles of Peace, military alliance, and trade treaties with the oriental Turks and Moors. Therefore, the study corrects the assumption that Knolles’s notion of the “terror” of the Turks circulated throughout England in the late seventeenth century. In selected Renaissance plays—William Shakespeare’s Othello (1604), John Mason’s The Turke (1607), and Robert Daborne’s A Christian Turned Turk (1612)—the reader sees how the image of the Oriental Turk and Moor as terroristic “greedie lyon” and the concept of the religious renegade, who prefers one religion and culture over the other, have been constructed. On the contrary, the Restoration drama, celebrating friendship, commerce, and correspondence with the oriental Turks and Moors, dramatizes the character of the “cultural renegade”—Alphonso, Solyman, Ianthe, and Roxolana in William Davenant’s The Siege of Rhodes (Parts 1/2) (1656-1663); Almanzor and Almahide in John Dryden’s The Conquest of Granada (Parts 1/2) (1672); Wildblood and Donna Jacinta in Dryden’s An Evening’s Love (1668); Dorax in Dryden’s Don Sebastian (1689); Towerson and Ysabinda in Dryden’s Amboyna (1673); and Thomazo in Henry Neville Payne’s The Siege of Constantinople (1675)—who seeks cultural rapprochement, rejects religious intolerance, and celebrates multiculturalism.

Also, this study traces the cultural and political transformation of the western identification with the imperial role of the Greco-Roman heritage in Renaissance and Restoration. Whereas the Renaissance idealized and mystified the cultural and imperial impact of the Roman Empire as a morally political institution, the Restoration—represented by the drama of John Dryden—demythified and demonized the Greco-Roman heritage as corrupted by colonization and conquest of the East. In John Dryden’s

selected plays All for Love (1678), Tyrannick Love (1669), and Troilus and Cressida (1679), the Greco-Roman Emperor—whether it be Octavius Caesar in All for Love, Maximin in Tyrannick Love, and Agamemnon and Ulysses in Troilus and Cressida—is a dictator, who tyrannizes his nation and subdues the oriental nations’ wealth and land. Dryden’s plays celebrate the heroism of oriental male and female characters—Cleopatra in All for Love, Princess of Alexandria of Egypt and Porphyrius in Tyrannick Love, and Cressida, Troilus and Hector in Troilus and Cressida—who revolt against the Greco-Roman colonialism and oppression of the East. Moreover, this study traces the notion of the “Trojan Turk,” the idea of whether the Turks were the descendants of the Trojans or not, in Renaissance and Restoration periods. Unlike the Renaissance, John Dryden’s Troilus and Cressida (1679), confirming the credibility of the notion of the “Trojan Turk,” sympathizes with the Trojan male/female characters and associates them with Trojan descendency.

This study applies the Foucauldian concept of discourse and discursive formation to the discourse circulation of Orientalism in Renaissance and Restoration. Since discourse, in Foucault’s analysis, is always subject to change, transformation, and modification, its discursive rules and statements are modified in accordance with the political and economic factors, which vary from one culture and time to another. The mechanism of discourse is supervised by, what Foucault calls, the “procedures of exclusion” and “prohibition,” which control the circulation of authentic and true statements in societies and exclude the irrelevant ones. Therefore, what was accepted as fact in the past may not necessarily be accepted in the present since the economic, social, and political factors revise, modify, reevaluate, and displace the discursive statements of the past. The

“panopticon” and surveillance system of Restoration developed the function of the “disciplinary institutions,” in Foucault’s terminology, such as the theater and universities not only to entertain audiences, but also to supervise the circulation of the discursive statements of moderation to the oriental Turk and Moor. This study utilizes some of Foucauldian terminologies of discourse mechanism such as “discursive statements,” “discursive rules,” “panopticon,” “surveillance,” and many others in order to explain the transformation of the discourse of Orientalism from antagonism, as it was in the Renaissance, to “Respect and Friendship” and correspondence with the Oriental Turk and Moor in the Restoration era.

Despite Edward Said's brilliant insights, his book Orientalism does not address the issue of the discursive transformation of the discourse of Orientalism in Renaissance and Restoration periods. For him, the discourse of Orientalism is static and unchangeable in the western perception since the time of the Middle Ages: "Orientalism assumed an unchanging Orient, absolutely different (the reasons change from epoch to epoch) from the West" (96). In other words, Orientalism is a "closed system," which does not transform nor modify its statements at all times of western thought: "And so, indeed, is the Orientalist attitude in general. It shares with magic and with mythology the self-containing, self-reinforcing character of a closed system, in which objects are what they are because they are what they are, for once, for all time, for ontological reasons that no empirical material can either dislodge or alter" (70). Therefore, the Orient, according to Said, remains the silent and abstract "European invention," which maintains the dichotomy of the western moral and material superiority over the uncivilized Orient:

"The Orient was almost a European invention, and had been since antiquity a place of romance, exotic beings, haunting memories and landscapes, remarkable experiences" (1).

Said's discussion of Orientalism does not refer to the enormous transformation and modification to the discursive statements of the discourse of Orientalism in the Restoration period when King Charles II and James II insisted on promoting and maintaining "all possible Respect and Friendship" (Treaty B2, 3-4), in the words of King Charles II's, with the oriental Turks and Moors, and James II's. Charles II renewed the Articles of Peace, and he described the violators of the peace agreement with the oriental Turks and Moors as "Breakers of the Peace, and Disturbers of the Public Quiet" (Articles C, 17-18). Therefore, Said's discussion of Orientalism, based upon generalization of the East-West relationship, does not dig deeply in the complex network of the economic, political and cultural correspondence between the England of the Restoration and the oriental Turk and Moor. Rather, he defines Orientalism as a metaphysical branch of knowledge which distinguishes between the Orient and the "Occident": "Orientalism is a style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between 'the Orient' and (most of the time) 'the Occident'" (2).

Also, Said refers to the conspiracy between the western theater and the imperial project of colonizing the East "between the "Middle Ages and the eighteenth century" (63). According to Said, the dramatization of the Orient on the western stage is reductive and unrealistic since it "confines" the history and cultural diversity of the Orient to what is represented on the stage: "The idea of representation is a theatrical one: the Orient is the stage on which the whole East is confined. On this stage will appear figures whose role it is to represent the larger whole from which they emanate" (63). For Said, western

dramatists such as “Asiosto, Milton, Marlowe, Tasso, Shakespeare, Cervantes” collaborated with the western imperial project of colonizing the East since they reflected upon the “riches” of oriental lands:

In the depths of this Oriental stage stands a prodigious cultural repertoire whose individual items evoke a fabulously rich world: the Sphinx, Cleopatra, Eden, Troy, Sodom and Gomorrah, Astarte, Isis and Osiris, Sheba, Babylon, the Genii, the Magi, Nineveh, Prester John, Mahomet, and dozens more; settings, in some cases names only, half-imagined, half-known; monsters, devils, heroes; terrors, pleasures, desires. The European imagination was nourished extensively from this repertoire: between the Middle Ages and the eighteenth century such major authors as Ariosto, Milton, Marlowe, Tasso, Shakespeare, Cervantes . . . drew on the Orient’s riches for their productions, in ways that sharpened the outlines of imagery, ideas, and figures populating it. (63)

Again, Said does not address the specificity of the function of the Restoration theater, which reflected the court’s aspirations to develop the economy of England by establishing foreign trade agreements and peace treaties with the Turks and Moors. According to Foucault, the process of “the state-control of the mechanisms of discipline” in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries explains the state’s interference in the work and formation of many societal institutions by connecting them to the monarch’s authority through a complex network of supervision, discipline, and respect to the state’s agendas. In other words, the Restoration theater, as “disciplinary institution” in Foucault’s terminology, played the “positive role” of introducing and propagating the court’s openness with the Orient and contributed to the creation of a cultural convergence

with other nations and cultures. In this context, the Restoration theater fulfilled “the swarming of disciplinary mechanisms,” which is, in Foucauldian analysis of discourse, the functional expansion of the “disciplinary institutions” since the theater played a multiplicity of roles or functions of dramatizing the oriental Turk and Moor—namely, a political function (propagating Charles II’s foreign policies) and a cultural role (appraising multiculturalism). As this study shows, the Restoration theater, which, in Foucault’s terminology, practiced the “procedures of exclusion” of antagonistic dramatization to the oriental Turk and Moors, revised and modified the discursive statements of Renaissance drama in order to adapt King Charles II’s and James II’s proclamations, which designated the oriental Turks and Moors as part of England’s “Publick faith,” in King Charles II’s terminology.

This study recommends further research and analysis of other Restoration plays, which deal with the concept of the “cultural renegade”—that is, the “Restoration gone cultural revolutionary protagonist”—and further explore the discursive transformation of the discourse of Orientalism in the England of Charles II and James II. A partial use of such plays include Roger Boyle’s The Tragedy of Mustapha (1665), Settle’s Ibrahim, The Illustrious Bassa (1669), and Cambyzes, King of Persia (1671), Thomas Southerne’s The Persian Prince, or the Loyal Brother (1682), Mrs. Pix’s Ibrahim, The Thirteenth Emperour of the Turks (1696), Aphra Behn’s Abdelezar, or the Moor’s Revenge (1677), and Nicholas Rowe’s Tamerlane (1702). Moreover, this study speaks to the need for additional research on the influence of the positive role of the Restoration theater on the drama of the eighteenth century. The Restoration period, which to this point has attracted little critical attention, is a rich and complex era in the history of England, which, despite

its short-term duration (1660-1688), experienced a complex network of reevaluation, transformation, modification, and exclusion to the discursive statements of the past Greco-Roman and Renaissance voices and distinguished itself as an era of cultural rapprochement and moderation.

## WORKS CITED

- Adams, Joseph Q. Introduction. The Turke. By John Mason. Ed. Joseph Q. Adams, Jr. Vaduz: Kraus Reprint LTD, 1963. III-XXII.
- Ahmad. Sultan. "Letters from the Great Turke lately Sent unto the Holy Father the Pope and to Rodulphus Naming himself King of Hungarie, and to all the Kings and Princes of Christendom Translated out of the Hebrue Tongue into Italian, and out of the Italian into French and now into English out of the French Coppie, Imprinted at London: By John Windet, and are to be Sold [by C. Burby] at the White Swan in Pauls-Church Yard, 1606." London, 1606. ProQuest. Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 3 Feb. 2010 <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.
- Algeria. Articles of Peace and Commerce between the most Serene and Mighty Prince James II by the Grace of God, King of Great Britain, France and Ireland, Defender of the Christian Faith. And the most Illustrious Lords, the Douletli Basha, Aga and Governours of the Famous City and Kingdom of Algiers in Barbary: Ratified and Confirmed by Sir William Soame Baroner, His Majesties Ambassador to the Grand Signior, on the Fifth of April, Old Style, 1686. Published by His Majesties Command. Printed by Thomas Newcomb in the Savoy. 1687. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 15 Dec. 2010 <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.
- Angelus, Christophorus. Christopher Angell, a Grecian, who Tasted of many Stripes and Torments Inflicted by the Turkes for the Faith which he had in Christ Jesus, at Oxford: Printed by John Lichfield, and James Short, Printers to the Famous University, 1617. Oxford, 1617. ProQuest. Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 3 Feb. 2010 <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.

- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Ashley, Maurice. The Glorious Revolution of 1688. New York: Scribner, 1966.
- Barroll, Leeds. "Mythologizing the Ottoman: The Jew of Malta and The Battle of Alcazar." Remapping the Mediterranean World in Early Modern English Writings. Ed. Goran V. Stanivukovic. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. 117-30.
- Barthelemy, Anthony Gerard. Black Face Maligned Race: The Representation of Blacks in English Drama from Shakespeare to Southerne. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1987.
- Birchwood, Matthew. Staging Islam in England: Drama and Culture, 1640-1685. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, Limited, 2007.
- Blair, Joel. "Dryden's Ceremonial Hero." Critics on Dryden. Ed. Robert McHenry and David G. Louge. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1973. 76-88.
- Brown, Laura. English Dramatic Form, 1660-1760: An Essay in Generic History. New Haven: Yale UP, 1981.
- Bywaters, David. Dryden in Revolutionary England. Berkeley: California UP, 1991.
- Carroll, Clare. "Humanism and English Literature in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries." The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism. Ed. Jill Kraye. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. 246-68.
- Cartwright, John. The Preachers Travels wherein is Set down a True Journal to the Confines of the East Indies, through the Great Countries of Syria, Mesopotamia, Armenia, Media, Hircania and Parthia. With the Authors Return by the Way of Persia, Susiana, Assiria, Chaldaeae, and Arabia. Containing a full Survey of the Kingdom

of Persia: And in what Terms the Persian Stands with the Great Turk at this Day: Also a True Relation of Sir Anthony Sherleys Entertainment there: And the Estate that his Brother, M. Robert Sherley Lived in after his Departure for Christendom. With the Description of a Port in the Persian Gulf, Commodious for our East Indian Merchants; and a Brief Rehearsal of some Gross Absurdities in the Turkish Alcoran. Penned by I. C. sometimes Student in Magdalen College in Oxford, London: Printed [by William Stansby] for Thomas Thorppe, and are to be Sold by Walter Burre, 1611. London, 1611. ProQuest. Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 3 Feb. 2010 <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.

Cawley, Robert Ralston. "George Gascoigne and the Siege of Famagusta." Modern Language Notes 43 (1928): 296-300. JSTOR. 3 Feb. 2010 <<http://www.jstor.org/search>>.

Chambers, David. Popes, Cardinals, and War: The Military Church in Renaissance and Early Modern Europe. London: I. B. Tauris & Co, 2006.

Champion, J. A. I. The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and Its Enemies, 1660-1730. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.

Chew, Samuel C. The Crescent and the Rose: Islam and England during the Renaissance. 1937. New York: Octagon Books, 1965.

Church of England. "A Form to be Used in Common prayer every Wednesday and Friday, within the City and Dioces of Norwich to Excite all Goodly People to Pray Unto God for the Delivery of those Christians, that are now Invaded by the Turks, Imprinted at London: By John Waley, [1566]." London, 1566. ProQuest. Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 3 Feb. 2010

<<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.

Clarke, Samuel. The Life and Death of Julius Caesar, the First Founder of the Roman Empire as also, The Life and Death of Augustus Caesar, in whose Reign Our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ was Borne. London, 1665. ProQuest. Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 23 July. 2010

<<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.

Cohen, Walter. "Antony and Cleopatra." The Norton Shakespeare. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1997. 2619-27.

Cooper, Charles Henry. Annals of Cambridge. Vol. V. Ed. John William Cooper. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1908.

D'Amico, Jack. The Moor in English Renaissance Drama. Gainesville: South Florida UP, 1991.

Daborne, Robert. A Christian Turned Turk. Three Turk Plays from Early Modern England. Ed. Daniel J. Vitkus. New York: Columbia UP, 2000. 148-239.

Davenant, William. The Siege of Rhodes Part (1/2). The Siege of Rhodes: A Critical Edition. Ed. Ann-Mari Hedback. Uppsala: Ka-We Composer & Fotosats, 1973.

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

Dryden, John. All for Love. The Works of John Dryden. Ed. Alan Roper and Vinton A. Dearing. Vol. 13. Berkeley: California UP, 1984. 3-111.

---. Amboyna. The Works of John Dryden. Ed. Vinton A. Dearing. Vol. 12. Berkeley: California UP, 1994. 7-77.

---. An Evening's Love. The Works of John Dryden. Ed. H. T. Swedenberg, JR. et al.

- Vol. 10. Berkeley: California UP, 1970. 214-314.
- . Dedication. All for Love. The Works of John Dryden. By Dryden. Ed. Alan Roper and Vinton A. Dearing. Vol. 13. Berkeley: California UP, 1984. 3-9.
- . Don Sebastian. The Works of John Dryden. Ed. H. T. Swedenberg, JR. et al. Vol. 15. Berkeley: California UP, 1976. 75-219.
- . "Of Heroic Playes." The Works of John Dryden. Ed. H. T. Swedenberg et al. Vol. 11. Berkeley: California UP, 1978. 8-18.
- . The Conquest of Granada (Part1/2). The Works of John Dryden. Ed. H. T. Swedenberg, JR. et al. Vol. 11. Berkeley: California UP, 1978. 3-202.
- . Troilus and Cressida. The Works of John Dryden. Ed. Alan Roper and Vinton A. Dearing. Vol. 13. Berkeley: California UP, 1984. 219-355.
- . Tyrannick Love. The Works of John Dryden. Ed. H. T. Swedenberg, JR. et al. Vol. 10. Berkeley: California UP, 1970. 107-93.

England and Wales. Articles of Peace Between his Sacred Majesty, Charles II King of Great Brittain, France and Ireland, &c. And the City and Kingdom of Algiers; Concluded by Thomas Allen Esq. Admiral of His Said Majesty of Great Brittain's Ships in the Mediterranean Seas, &c. London, Printed by Thomas Mabb, Dwelling on St. Paul's Wharff, 1664. ProQuest. Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 15 Dec. 2010 <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.

England and Wales. Articles of Peace Concluded and Agreed between His Excellency the Lord Bellasyse His Majesties Governor of His City and Garison of Tangier in Affrica And Cidi Hamet Hader Ben Ali Gayland, Prince of West Barbary, &c. The Second of April, 1666. Printed by Command. London: Printed by Tho. Newcomb Living over

Against Baynard's Castle in Thames-Street. 1666. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 15 Dec. 2010 <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.

England and Wales. Sovereign (1660-1685: Charles II). By the King, A Proclamation Touching the Articles of Peace with Argiers, Tunis, and Tripoli, London: Printed by John Bill and Christopher Barker, Printers to the Kings most Excellent Majesty, 1662. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 15 Dec. 2010 <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.

England and Wales. The Capitulations and Articles of Peace between the Majestie of the King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, and the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire as they have been Augmented, and Altered in the Times of every Ambassadour: And as now lately in the City of Adrianople in the Month of January 1661 they have been Augmented, Renewed, and Amplified with Diverse Additional Articles, and Privileges, which Serve towards the Maintenance of a well Grounded Peace, and Securities of the Trade, and Trafficke of His Majesties Subjects in the Levant by His Excellency Heneage Earle of Winchilsea Embassadour Extraordinary from His Majestie Charles the Second, King of Great Brittain, France, and Ireland to Sultan Mahomet Han the most Puissant Prince, and Emperour of the Turks: Set forth, and Published by Paul Ricaut, Esquire, Secretary to his Excellencie the Lord Embassadour, Printed at Constantinople: by Abraham Gabai, 1663. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 15 Dec. 2010 <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.

Estate of Christians, Living under the Subjection of the Turke and also the Warres between the Christians and the Turke, beginning 1592. And Continuing till the End of 1593. , London: Printed by [T. Scarlet for] John Wolf, 1595. London, 1595. ProQuest. Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 3 Feb. 2010

<<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.

Evelyn, John. The Diary of John Evelyn. Vol. IV. Ed. E. S. DE Beer. London: Oxford UP, 1955.

Fix, Andrew C. The Renaissance, the Reformation, and the Rise of Nations. Virginia: The Teaching Company, 2005.

Fletcher, Richard A. Moorish Spain. 1993. Berkeley: California UP, 2006.

Fox, George. To the Great Turk and His King at Algiers. 1680. ProQuest. Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 12 May 2010

<<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.

Foxe, John. "The Sermon of Christ Crucified, Preached at Paules Crosse the Friday Before Easter, Commonly Called Goodfryday Written and Dedicated to all such as Labour and be Heavy Laden in Conscience, to be Read for their Spiritual Comfort/ By John Foxe; Newly Recognized [sic] by the Author. At London: Imprinted by John Day, over Aldersgate, 1570." London, 1570. ProQuest. Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 3 Feb. 2010 <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.

Foucault, Michel. The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972.

---. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. New York: Vintage Books, 1977.

---. "The Order of Discourse." Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader. Ed. Robert Young. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981. 48-78.

---. "What is an Author." The Foucault Reader. Ed. Paul Robinow. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984. 101-20.

Goffman, Daniel. The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe. 2002. Cambridge:

Cambridge UP, 2003.

Gouge, William. "A Recovery from Apostacy Set out in a Sermon Preached in Stepny Church Neere London at the Receiving of a Penitent Renegado in the Church, Octob. 21. 1638. By William Gouge D.D. and Min. in Black-Friers London Herein is the History of the Surprizall and Admirable Escape of the Said Penitent., London: Printed by George Miller, for Ioshua Kirton, and Thomas Warren, at their Shop in Paul's Church-Yard, at the White Horse, 1639." London, 1639. ProQuest. Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 3 Feb. 2010  
<<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.

Harris, Tim. Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms, 1660-1685. 2005. London: Penguin, 2006.

---. Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy 1685-1720. London: Penguin, 2006.

Hedback, Ann-Mari. Introduction. The Siege of Rhodes: A Critical Edition. By William Davenant. Uppsala: Ka-We Composer & Fotosats, 1973. xi-Ixxviii.

Hingley, Richard. Roman Officers and English Gentlemen: The Imperial Origins of Roman Archaeology. London: Routledge, 2000.

Holt, P. M. A Seventeenth-Century Defender of Islam: Henry Stubbe (1632-76) and His Book. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, 1972.

Hutton, Ronald. Charles II: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Israel, Jonathan I. "Trade, Politics and Strategy: The Anglo-Dutch Wars in the Levant (1645-1675)." Friends and Rivals in the East: Studies in Anglo-Dutch Relations in

- the Levant from the Seventeenth to the Early Nineteenth Century. Ed. Alastair Hamilton, Alexander H. de Groot and Maurits H. Van den Boogert. Leiden: Brill, 2000. 11-24.
- . "The Emerging Empire: The Continental Perspective, 1650-1713." The Origins of Empire: British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century. Ed. Nicholas Canny and Alaine Low. Vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998. 423-44.
- Jacob, James R. Henry Stubbe, Radical Protestantism and the Early Enlightenment. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983.
- James I. King. "His Majesties Lepanto, or Heroicall Song being Part of his Poetical Exercises at Vacant Hours, Imprinted at London: By Simon Stafford, and Henry Hooke, 1603," London, 1603. ProQuest. Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 3 Feb. 2010 <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.
- Johnson, Lonnie R. Central Europe: Enemies, Neighbors, Friends. New York: Oxford UP, 2002.
- Kavenik, Frances M. British Drama, 1660-1779: A Critical History. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1995.
- Kinross, Lord. The Ottoman Centuries: The Rise and Fall of the Turkish Empire. New York: Morrow Quill, 1977.
- Knolles, Richard. The Generall Historie of the Turkes from the First Beginning of that Nation to the Rising of the Ottoman Familie: With all the Notable Expeditions of the Christians Princes against them. Together with the Lives and Conquests of the Othoman Kings and Emperours Faithfullie Collected out of the best Histories, both Ancient and Modern, and Digested into one Continuat Historie Until this Present Year

- 1603: by Richard Knolles, London: Printed by Adam Islip, 1603. ProQuest. Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 3 Feb. 2010 <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.
- Lach, Donald F. and Edwin J. Van Kley. Asia in the Making of Europe. Vol. 3. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1993.
- Langhans, Edward A. "The Theatre." The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre. Ed. Deborah Payne Fisk. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000. 1-18.
- Lewis, Bernard. Islam and the West. New York: Oxford UP, 1993.
- Loewenstein, Joseph. "Humanism and Seventeenth-Century English Literature." The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism. Ed. Jill Kraye. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. 269-93.
- Majid, Anouar. We are All Moors: Ending Centuries of Crusades against Muslims and Other Minorities. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 2009.
- Mann, Nicholas. "The Origins of Humanism." The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism. Ed. Jill Kraye. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. 1-19.
- Markley, Robert. The Far East and the English Imagination, 1660-1730. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006.
- Martinengo, Conte Nestore. The True Report of all the Success of Famagosta, of the Antique Writers Called Tamassus, a City in Cyprus in which the Whole Order of all the Skirmishes, Batteries, Mines, and Assaults Given to the Said Fortress, may Plainly Appear. Moreover the Names of the Captains, and the Number of the People Slain, as well of the Christians as of the Turks: Likewise of them who were Taken Prisoners: From the Beginning of the Said Siege until the End of the Same. Englished out of

- Italian by William Malim. With Certain Notes of his and Expositions of all the Turkish Words herein Necessary to be Known, Placed in the Margent, with a Short Description also of his of the Same Iland, Imprinted at London: By John Daye, An. 1572. London, 1572. ProQuest. Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 3 Feb. 2010 <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.
- Mason, John. The Turke. 1913. Ed. Joseph Q. Adams, Jr. Vaduz: Kraus Reprint LTD, 1963.
- Matar, Nabil. Britain and Barbary 1589-1689. Gainesville: Florida UP, 2005.
- . "Introduction: England and Mediterranean Captivity, 1577-1704." Introduction. Piracy, Slavery, and Redemption: Barbary Captivity Narratives from Early Modern England. Ed. Daniel J. Vitkus. New York: Columbia UP, 2001. 1-52.
- . Islam in Britain 1558-1685. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.
- . "Islam in Interregnum and Restoration England." The Seventeenth Century 6 (1991): 57-71.
- . Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery. New York: Columbia UP, 1999.
- Mayer, Kenneth Ingram. Cultural Renegade in Plutarch's Lives. Diss. The University of Texas at Austin, 1997. Dissertation & Theses: Full Text, ProQuest. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 15 Feb. 2010 <<http://proquest.umi.com>>.
- McFadden, George. Dryden the Public Writer 1660-1685. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1978.
- McKeon, Michael. "Politics of Discourses and the Rise of the Aesthetic in Seventeenth-Century England." Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England. Ed. Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker. Berkeley: California UP,

1987. 35-51.

Meserve, Margaret. Empires of Islam in Renaissance Historical Thought. Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 2008.

Murad IV. Sultan. "A Vaunting, Daring, and a Menacing Letter, Sent from Sultan Morat the Great Turk, from his Court at Constantinople, by his Embassadour Gobam, to Vladislaus King of Poland, &c. Which letter was Sent to the Christian, since the Truce Concluded between the Turke and the Persian in March Last; as by Many Copies whereof, may Appear, as it was Sent out of Poland. Wherein he Declares himself a Mortal Enemy to the Said Christian King, Threatening to invade his Kingdoms and Territories, with all Manner of Hostility. Whereunto is Annexed a Brief Relation of the Turkish Present Strength, both of Horse and Foot: With all the Victories the Turks have Prevailed against the Christians these Last Three Hundred Years. As also what Glorious Victories the Christians have Won against the Turkes, till this Present Year. 1638. Published by Authority, London: Printed by I. Okes, and are to be Sold by I. Cowper at his Shop at the East-End of St. Pauls Church, at the Sign of the Holy Lamb, 1638." London, 1638. ProQuest. Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 3 Feb. 2010 <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.

Murray, Peter. The Architecture of the Italian Renaissance. 1963. New York: Schocken Books, 1966.

Nauert, Charles G. The Age of Renaissance and Reformation. Lanham: America UP, 1981.

Noble, Thomas F. X. The Foundations of Western Civilization. Virginia: The Teaching Company, 2002.

Orr, Bridget. Empire on the English Stage 1660-1714. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.

Owen, Susan J. "Restoration Drama and Politics: An Overview." A Companion to Restoration Drama. Ed. Susan J. Owen. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001. 126-39.

Palmer, Roger, Earl of Castlemaine. An Account of the Present War between the Venetians and Turk with The State of Candie. 1666. ProQuest. Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 12 May 2010  
<<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.

Parry, V. J., "The Reign of Sulaiman the Magnificent, 1520-66." A History of the Ottoman Empire to 1730. Ed. M. A. Cook. London: Cambridge UP, 1976. 79-102.  
---. "The Successors of Sulaiman, 1566-1617." Cook 103-32.

Payne, Henry Neville. The Siege of Constantinople. 1675. ProQuest. Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 12 May 2010  
<<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.

Penn, William. An Essay towards the Present and Future Peace of Europe by the Establishment of an European Dyet, Parliament, or Estates. 1693. ProQuest. Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 12 May 2010  
<<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.

Perrot, John. A Visitation of Love and Gentle Greeting of the Turk. 1658. ProQuest. Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 12 May 2010  
<<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.

Peters, Edward. Inquisition. 1988. Berkeley: California UP, 1989.

Porter, Dennis. "Orientalism and Its Problems." Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader. Ed. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman. New York: Columbia

UP, 1994. 150-61.

Prager, Frank D. "Brunelleschi's Inventions and the 'Renewal of Roman Masonry

Work.'" Osiris 9 (1950): 457-554. JSTOR. 10 Sept. 2010

<<http://www.jstor.org/navigator-iup.passhe.edu>>.

R. D. Historical and Political Observations upon the Present State of Turkey Describing the Policy, Religion, Manners, and Military-Discipline of The Turks, with an Account of All the Battels, Sieges, and Other Remarkable Transactions and Revolutions, which have Happened from The Beginning of the Ottoman Empire to This Present Grand Seignor: to which is Added his Life, Containing all the Material Occurrences that Have Happened During his Reign: together with The Present State of Hungary and History of the Wars there to This Day. 1683. ProQuest. Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 12 May 2010 <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.

Ronald Hutton's Charles II: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989.

Routh, E. M. G. Tangier: England's Lost Atlantic Outpost 1661-1684. London: John Murray, 1912.

Runciman, Steven. "Teucris and Turci." Medieval and Middle Eastern Studies. Ed. Sami A. Hanna. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972. 344-48.

Rycaut, Paul. The Present State of the Ottoman Empire. 1668. rpt. New York: Arno Press, 1971.

Said, Edward. Culture and Imperialism. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.

---. Orientalism. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.

Scammell, Geoffrey Vaughn. The First Imperial Age: European Overseas Expansion C.

- 1400-1715. London: Unwin Hyman Ltd, 1989.
- Settle, Elkanah. The Empress of Morocco. 1673. Elkanah Settle's The Empress of Morocco and the Controversy Surrounding It: A Critical Edition. Ed. Anne T. Doyle. New York: Garland Publishing, 1987. 10-115.
- . The Heir of Morocco. The Heir of Morocco with The Death of Gayland. Acted at the Theatre Royal. By E. Settle. London, Printed for William Gademan at the Popes Head in the Lower Walk of the New Exchange. 1682. ProQuest. Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 15 Dec. 2010  
<<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.
- Shairani, Hafiz Mahmud Khan. Introduction. An Account of the Rise and Progress of Mahometanism with the Life of Mahomet: And a Vindication of him and his Religion from the Calumnies of the Christians. By Henry Stubbe. rpt. Lahore: Oxford and Cambridge Press, 1975. vii- xx.
- Shakespeare, William. Antony and Cleopatra. The Norton Shakespeare. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1997. 2629-706.
- . Othello. The Norton Shakespeare. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Norton & Company, 2008. 2119-91.
- Sherman, Arnold. "Pressure from Leadenhall: The East India Company Lobby, 1660-1678." The Business History Review. Vol. 50. No. 3 (1976): 329-55. JSTOR. 12 May. 2010 <<http://www.jstor.org.navigator-iup.passhe.edu>>.
- Smith, Byron Porter. Islam in English Literature. 1939. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Caravan Books, 1967.
- Stinger, Charles L. The Renaissance in Rome. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1985.

“Strangling and Death of the Great Turke, and his two sons with the Strange Preservation and Deliverance of his Uncle Mustapha from Perishing in Prison, with Hunger and Thirst, the Young Emperor Now Three Days before Having so Commanded. A Wonderful Story, and the Like never Heard of in our Modern Times, and yet all to Manifest the Glory and Providence of God, in the Preservation of Christendom in these Troublesome Times. Printed this Fifteenth of July., London: Printed by I. D[awson] for Nicholas Bourne and Thomas Archer, and are to be Sold at their Shops at the Exchange, and in Popes-Head Pallace, 1622.” London, 1622. ProQuest. Early English Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 3 Feb. 2010 <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.

Stubbe, Henry. An Account of the Rise and Progress of Mahometanism with the Life of Mahomet: And a Vindication of him and his Religion from the Calumnies of the Christians. 1674. Ed. Hafiz Mahmud Khan Shairani. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Lahore: Oxford and Cambridge Press, 1975.

Taylor, John. “A Brave and Valiant Sea-Fight, upon the Coast of Cornewell, the 17. of June Last Past Betwixt Three Turkish Pyrats, Men of Warre, and only One English Merchants Ship of Plimouth, (Called the Elizabeth) being not above 200. Tun. Wherein they all Behaved themselves so Valiantly, that (after a Long and Bloudy Fight) they Quit their Ship out of Hands of the Cruel Turke, with the Loss only of Three men, but Slew many of the Turks, to their Everlasting Honour. Written from Plimouth by a Good Hand, and Exemplified for the Delight of the Reader., London: Printed [by Elizabeth Purslowe, Bernard Alsop, and Thomas Fawcet] for Nathanael Butter, July 14. 1640. With Privilege, [1640],” London, 1640. ProQuest. Early English

Books Online. Indiana University of Pennsylvania Lib. 3 Feb.2010

<<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>.

Vaughan, Dorothy M. Europe and the Turk: A Pattern of Alliances 1350-1700. 1954.

New York: AMS, 1976.

Vitkus, Daniel J. "Early Modern Orientalism: Representations of Islam in Sixteenth-and-Seventeenth Century Europe," Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Europe:

Perception of Other. Ed. David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto. New York: St.

Martin's Press, 1999. 207-30.

---. Introduction. Three Turk Plays from Early Modern England. Ed. Daniel J. Vitkus.

New York: Columbia UP, 2000. 1-53.

---. Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630. New

York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Wheatcroft, Andrew. Infidels: A History of the Conflict between Christendom and Islam.

2003. New York: Random House, 2005.

Winn, James Anderson. John Dryden and His World. New Haven: Yale UP, 1987.

Wood, Alfred C. A History of the Levant Company. 1935. London: Frank Cass & Co., 1964.

Wragge, Richard. "A Description of a Voiage to Constantinople and Syria, Begun the 21

of March 1593 [n.s.1594], and Ended the 9 of August 1595, Wherein is Shewed the

Order of Delivering the Second Present by Master Edward Barton, Her Majesties

Ambassador, which was Sent from Her Majestie to Sultan Murad Can, Emperor of

Turkie." Early Modern Tales of Orient: A Critical Anthology. Ed. Kenneth Parker.

London: Routledge, 1999. 54-60.

Young, Robert J. C. Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction. Oxford: Blackwell  
Publishers, 2001.