CEU Medieval Studies

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

Seda Erkoç

After the economic developments of the sixteenth century, the Ottoman world came to occupy a central place in the consciousness of the English, who first encountered it through commerce. The English were eager to learn about the Ottomans, as the Turk was not only an exotic Other or partner in trade, but also a threat that was coming closer day by day. All over Europe, information was in demand not only on the religion, culture, and costumes of the Turk or Turkish wars with European states, but also on events that were taking place within the borders of the empire. According to Matthias A. Shaaber, in the period 1476 to 1622, more news was printed in England about the Turks than any other nation after the French and the Dutch.[1]

In this bulk of first-hand information coming through the official reports and records, personal letters of diplomats and ambassadors, travel accounts of pilgrims, adventurers and tradesmen, and even through the accounts of the slaves, the story of the death of Sehzade Mustafa also leaked into Europe. In 1553, Sehzade Mustafa, the eldest son of Suleyman the Magnificent and the expected heir to the throne, was strangled at the command of his father. This story was recorded by contemporary chroniclers and numerous mourning poems were dedicated to Mustafa's death on the Ottoman side.[2] After two years, in 1555, Nicolas à Moffan's Latin text,

---

[1] As quoted in Suheyla Artemel, "The great Turk's Particular Inclination to Red Herring: The Popular Image of the Turk during the Renaissance in England," *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 5, no. 2. (1995): 189 (hereafter: Artemel, "Red Herring").

[2] Basic Ottoman sources that record the event are: Nişancı Mehmed Paşa, *Hadisat* [The Events], ed. Enver Yaşarbaş (İstanbul: Kit-san Matbaacılık, 1983); Müneccimbaşi Ahmed Dede, *Sahaif-ül-Ahbar fi Vekayi-ül-a'sar* [Pages of the Knowledge on the Events of Years], tr. İsmail Erünsal (İstanbul: Tercuman, 1974); Hasan Bey-zade Ahmed Paşa, *Hasan Bey-zade Tarihi* [The History of Hasan Bey-zade], ed. Şevki Nezihi Aykut (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basım Evi, 2004); İbrahim Peçevi, *Peçevi Tarihi* [The History of Peçevi], ed. Murat Uraz (İstanbul: Neşriyat Yurdu, 1968); Solak-zade Mehmed Hemdemi Çelebi, *Solak-zade Tarihi* [The History of Solak-zade], ed. Vahid Çabuk (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1989); and the poems of Yahya Bey, Samî, Funûnî, Rahmî, Fazlî, Nisayî, Mudamî entitled "Mersiye" [Mourning Poem] in Mehmed Çavuşoğlu, "Sehzade Mustafa Mersiyeleri" [Mourning Poems for Sehzade Mustafa] *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi* 12 (1982): 641-686.

entitled *Soltani Solymanni Turcorum Imperatoris horrendum facinus, scelerato in proprium filium, natu maximum, Soltanum Mustapham, parricidio, anno domini 1553 patratum*, appeared in Europe and set off the repercussions of the story there.[3] When Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq's well-known letters were published 1581, the story of Mustapha, which had been circulating in Europe in Latin and vernaculars for some time, attracted much more attention.[4]

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

The aim of this article is to analyze the reconstructions of this episode of Ottoman history in the English context. Through evaluating two English plays, the anonymous Cambridge play *Solymannidae* and Fulke Greville's *The Tragedy of Mustapha*, with specific attention to their alterations of the Suleyman-Mustafa story, this article tries to reach a deeper reading of the texts than the present literature offers.[7] Although these plays have been analyzed and commented on to

[3] Nicolas à Moffan, *Soltani Solymanni Turcorum Imperatoris horrendum facinus, scelerato in proprium filium, natu maximum, Soltanum Mustapham, parricidio, anno domini 1553 patratum* [The Horrible Act of Sultan Solyman Emperor of the Turks and the Wicked Murder of his Son Sultan Mustapha] (Paris, 1555). For information on Moffan see D. Hoefler, *Nouvelle biographie générale: depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à nos jours, avec les renseignements bibliographiques et l'indication des sources à consulter* (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1852-1866).

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

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

[6] An anonymous Cambridge play, *Solymannidae*, Fulke Greville's *The Tragedy of Mustapha* and Roger Boyle's *The Tragedy of Mustapha, the Son of Solyman the Magnificent*, besides a later one, David Mallet's *Mustapha* (London, 1739).

[7] The most recent literature on these plays is the influential articles and monographs of Daniel Vitkus, Jonathan Burton, Matthew Dimmock, and Linda McJannet. In numerous articles Daniel Vitkus has

some extent in conjunction with the other plays that represent the Turk in one way or another, this study will be unique in its analysis of two English texts which are repercussions of a single historical event in the light of and compared to Western historical constructions of the same story.

The English and the Ottoman Image in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries

A precisely historicized depiction of English culture in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries indicates that the binary opposition of colonizer and colonized, so frequently employed by historians of the field to explain the Anglo-Mediterranean relationships of the era, turns out to be meaningless in this particular context. Despite the clear picture of the economic and political position of Europe in the face of the Ottomans in the Early Modern period and the complexity of the dual relationships between the power circles of the era, most of the modern literary studies on Early Modern England prefer reading the representations of the Other in English texts with the help of a dichotomy between Western domination, conquest

---

focused on Anglo-Mediterranean commercial relations and the influence of these relations on the Anglo-Islamic exchange on the stage. His specific emphasis on conversion or "turning Turk" became the main focus in his recent publication, *Turning Turk, English Theatre and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003). Matthew Dimmock in his *New Turkes, Dramatizing Islam and the Ottomans in Early Modern England* (Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2005) (hereafter: Dimmock, *New Turkes*) has analyzed all aspects of the representations of the Turk from 1529 to 1601. Jonathan Burton and Linda McJannet have not only affirmed the idea of going beyond the binarism of Said but also shifted the focus to some less well-known plays. For a full bibliography on the Ottoman image in Early Modern English literature see Daniel Vitkus, "Adventuring Heroes in the Mediterranean: Mapping the Boundaries of Anglo-Islamic Exchange on the Early Modern Stage," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 37 no. 1 (2007): 75-95 (hereafter: Vitkus, "Adventuring Heroes,"); Idem, "Early Modern Orientalism: Representations of Islam in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Europe," in *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. Michael Frassetto and David Blanks (London: Macmillan, 1999): 207-230 (hereafter: Vitkus, "Early Modern Orientalism"); Idem, *Three Turk Plays from Early Modern England: Selimus, A Christian Turned Turk and The Renegado* (New York: Colombia University Press, 2000); Idem, "Turning Turk in Othello: The Conversion and Damnation of the Moor," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 48, No. 2 (1997): 145-176; Idem, *Turning Turk. English Theatre and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003) (hereafter: Vitkus, *Turning Turk*); Dimmock, *New Turkes*; Jonathan Burton, *Traffic and Turning: Islam and English Drama 1579-1624* (Cranbury: Rosemont Publishing, 2005) (hereafter: Burton, *Traffic and Turning*); Linda McJannet, *The Sultan Speaks. Dialogue in English Plays and Histories about the Ottoman Turks* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006) (hereafter: McJannet, *The Sultan Speaks*).

and colonialism and Eastern inferiority, suppression and colonization.[8] This highly misleading dichotomy, however, ends in oversimplification of the representations of the Eastern Other in general and the Ottomans in particular. As Vitkus puts it, "the assumptions of postcolonial theory and criticism simply do not apply to an Early Modern Mediterranean context..."[9] English representations of the Ottomans and the Islamic world in general were constructed out of a flux of information from all sides as well as direct encounters and were not based on a simple colonizer/ colonized ideology.

Under the influence of Said's all-encompassing "Orientalism," most readings of the texts accept and assert the assumption that the attitude of Early Modern Europe towards the Eastern other remained "static and stereotypical."[10] Actually, the fixed stereotypical depictions of the Eastern Other as irrational, despotic, heretical, and fanatic come from eighteenth and nineteenth century representations rather than the Early Modern ones. A general evaluation of the sources that deal with the Eastern Other in one way or another indicates that tracing continuity and coherence in the Early Modern Western depictions of the East is quite problematic. Rather, what one gets out of this evaluation are discontinuity and the transformation of ideas and identifications. Contrary to Said's argument that Orientalism existed not though "its openness, its receptivity to the Orient," but through "internal repetitious consistency about its constitutive will-to-power over the orient," Early Modern texts about the Eastern Others present a variety of negative and positive ideas rather than consistent repetition.[11] As Çirakman puts it, "Europeans in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries seem to have had quite ambivalent impressions that range from sympathy, admiration, amazement and anxiety to fear and hatred."[12] Moreover, these ideas were by no means static. As a result of the constantly changing

---

[8] Stephan Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self Fashioning* (London: University of Chicago Press, 1984); Kim Hall, *Things of Darkness* (London: Cornell University Press, 1995); Jack D'Amico, *The Moor in English Renaissance Drama* (Tampa: University of Florida Press, 1991); Emily Bartels, "The Double Vision of the East: Imperialist Self-Construction in Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*, Part One," *Renaissance Drama* 23 (1992): 3-24. Although these authors refute Edward Said's *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979) (hereafter: Said, *Orientalism*), in their analyses they accept the existence of a "British Empire" in the Early Modern period.

[9] Vitkus, *Turning Turk*, 7.

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

[11] Said. *Orientalism*, 222.

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

CEU Medieval Studies

political, military, religious, and economic situation and the resulting alliances, the general characteristic of the attitudes towards the Eastern Other became practical ambivalence and ongoing transformation rather than ideological consistency.

Recent analysis of a variety of texts from Early Modern England has shown that the formation of English identity in this period cannot be explained by the overly simplistic categories of "self" and "other."[13] In great contrast to Said's attempt to present East and West as monolithic ideological constructs, there were no such unified ideological structures as the "European" self and the "non-European/ Eastern" other in the Early Modern period. "The East" or "the Orient" became a clearly defined geographical and cultural category for the English only after the formation of the British Empire and only after the beginning of "orientalism" as a style of thought "based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between the Orient and the Occident."[14] Until then, and particularly in the Early Modern setting, "the East" did not correspond to a homogeneous cultural/religious/ racial Other.[15] For the English, a monolithic, standardized Other did not exist in contrast to which they could form Englishness, but rather the Mediterranean Other was a patchwork that included a variable set of identity categories like race, religion, and language.[16] Therefore, it is certain that, firstly, the construction of the notions of Englishness in the Early Modern period cannot be easily explained through a binary opposition of the single self and a sole Other. Secondly, as Matar states, only in the eighteenth century did the lands of Islam become material for orientalist constructions. Before that period, it was the Muslim side that had the power of self-representation and the opposing parties had to deal with or reject these representations.[17]

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

[13] For a discussion of Englishness and the Other in the Early Modern period, see Anna Loomba, "'Delicious Traffick:' Alterity and Exchange on Early Modern Stages," *Shakespeare Survey. An Annual Survey of Shakespeare Studies and Production*, 52d, ed. Stanly Wells (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999). 201-214; Vitkus, *Turning Turk* 1-25; Dimmock, *New Turkes*, 1-20; McJannet, *The Sultan Speaks*, 1-15.

[14] Said, *Orientalism*, 2.

[15] Vitkus, *Turning Turk*, 8.

[16] Ibid, 8-10.

[17] Nabil Matar, *Islam in Britain 1556-1685*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 12.

new connections with the trade routes in both the Atlantic and the Mediterranean. By the late 1570s, a growing conflict with Spain also forced Elizabeth to encourage English merchants who wanted to form an alliance with the Ottomans and found an embassy in İstanbul.[18] Apart from these commercial connections, the necessary effort for a closer Anglo-Ottoman relationship came from both sides as a result of some very specific conditions. Elizabeth was excommunicated and thus further alienated from "the common corps of Christendom" in 1570.[19] The Ottomans started a tiresome and expensive program of reconstructing the fleet that they had lost at Lepanto. In the meantime, they were preparing for a hard campaign against Persia in the east. Therefore, they both needed allies and supplies from the west.[20] After the succession of Murad III in 1574, according to Ottoman law all treaties and agreements with other states had to be renewed. The French were asking for the right of consulage over most of the European shipping to Ottoman lands; however, the Ottomans were hesitant to grant these privileges as they always chose to play one party against the other during the Reformation conflicts.[21] Instead of supporting "the highly papist" France they deliberately chose to ally with the English.[22] These "totally new political circumstances," as İnalcık puts it, ended in a new set of power balances.[23] Despite criticizing the French harshly for their alliance with the Ottomans, Elizabeth, under these new circumstances, had to reconsider her situation in this power game. When the Ottoman economic interest was coupled with their strategy of international politics, direct Anglo-Ottoman relations started. The English side took action by sending William Harborne to Istanbul in 1578.[24]

This secret decision to establish a trade alliance with the Ottomans was almost immediately learned by the European powers and the idea of the common "corps" of

---

[18] Vitkus, "Adventuring Heroes," 77.

[19] For the ideas on the influence of the ideal Christian unity in the Early Modern period see, Franklin L. Baumer. "England the Turk, and the Common Corps of Christendom," *The American Historical Review* 50, No. 1 (1944): 26-48.

[20] Dimmock, *New Turkes*, 85.

[21] Halil İnalcık. *From Empire to Republic: Essays on Ottoman and Turkish Social History* (İstanbul: Isis Press, 1995), 117.

[22] Burton, "Anglo-Ottoman Relations and the Image of the Turk in *Tamburlaine*," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 30, No. 1 (2000): 131 (hereafter: Burton, "Anglo-Ottoman Relations"); Halil İnalcık. *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 360-5.

[23] Ibid., 365.

[24] Burton, "Anglo-Ottoman Relations:" 132.

Christendom pushed England into a corner. There had always been Spanish attacks on Elizabeth for her alliance with the Ottomans, but at the end of the sixteenth century the impact of these attacks became more and more important in both the internal and external responses to Elizabeth's rule. Worse for Elizabeth, however, were internal attacks on her reign. These ongoing accusations and rejections within the country were by no means heard only in court circles, but also in the public discussions of the age. Apparently, Elizabeth needed a more nuanced diplomatic discourse than the simple Eastern/Muslim-Western/Catholic division to defend an Anglo-Ottoman linkage. An analysis of the correspondence of Murad III and Elizabeth indicates that these two parties made a great effort to highlight doctrinal identity and diminish the importance of religious differences in their approach to each other.[25] It is certain that under these circumstances the English public heard a more nuanced diplomatic rhetoric on the Turks, on the "papists," and on the very essence of Englishness and this nuanced rhetoric ended in a break with stereotypical representations in some cases.

Most of the recent studies that focus on letters, state documents, and political treatises seem to assume that the discourse seen in these texts was repeated by playwrights of the age. Although there may be some individual cases that would prove this assumption with their more nuanced representations of the Turk, is it possible to generalize such statements to the point of concluding that the image of the self and the Other changed in a few decades as a result of new socio-political situation? Is it possible to argue that the rhetoric that is created through political treatises or historical accounts of events has a direct influence on the images that are seen in individual fictional productions of the age? It seems that the modern scholars who have pointed out the change in rhetoric in the official letters and documents have rushed towards enthusiastic conclusions on the representation of the Other in general. What they miss in this rush is the works written by those in opposition, who reacted against this change of allies and close relations with the Ottomans. The texts that this study deals with indicate that the state alliances based on economic interests were not welcomed by all parties in the country. Therefore, these texts carried strong stereotypical representations. Considering these problems indicates the necessity for a focus on individual cases rather than replacing old assumptions with new ones.

[25] For a detailed analysis of the correspondence see Burton, "Anglo-Ottoman Relations:" 134-138.

Seda Erkoç

Suleyman and Mustafa on Early Modern English Stage

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

Solymannidae, an anonymous Cambridge play which applies Senecan methods to an Eastern topic, was written in 1581 and probably never performed.[26] The dramatic construction follows the European sources closely, with some alterations and an additional sub-plot which is again an execution story from the Ottoman court. Probably for the sake of keeping the unities, some changes were made in the story through the introduction of messengers and ambassadors coming into the palace rather than the characters leaving for campaigns and meetings. Therefore the setting is Suleiman's palace in Istanbul, and Mustapha is summoned to the palace, and executed there.

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

> I am the unhappy ghost of Selim ... I see that the gods, avengers of a father, will not allow a crime to go long unpunished. Victorious, I destroyed my father Bayazid and my two brothers so I alone might possess the throne and abolish all the laws, as if they were hanging over my head. Blood atones for blood, unjust murder demands the crime be requited by fresh killing.[27]

[26] Chew, *The Crescent and the Rose; Islam and Britain during the Renaissance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937), 437 (hereafter: Chew, *The Crescent and the Rose*).

[27] *Infelix umbra Selimi, qui quondam potens...*
Patris ultores video deos

The ghost of Selim is the first character on the stage.[28] Although he is a part of the Senecan style, the way he expresses the practice of fratricide is meaningful. Selim says that he killed his father and brother, so that he *alone* might possess the throne and "abolish all laws." At a very early stage of the play, with a reference to Selim and his cruelties, the author emphasizes the repetitious conflicts within the Ottoman dynastic family. The practice of fratricide, which is completely omitted from the Ottoman accounts of the event and barely emphasized in the European sources of the Suleyman-Mustafa story, is used as the opening point in *Solymannidae*. Later, the writer emphasizes this idea with references to another Mustapha, a vizier of Bayazid, who had alienated Suleiman's father, Selim, against his grandfather, Bayazid. Besides, Selim's explanation that he has murdered his father and brothers to rule alone and to "abolish all laws" unites cruelty with a desire for absolute power, which were two ideas circulating in Europe about Ottoman dynastic politics.[29]

In the first act, the ambassador of "Tartary" comes to Suleiman to inform him that they "have discovered nobody who is equal of Mustapha" to marry the daughter of "the mighty master of Tartary."[30] This marriage issue is also mentioned in Moffan, the main source for *Solymannidae*. In the play, however, there is a change in the way Suleiman is informed about the marriage. Suleiman is not informed of this arrangement through the parties that are against Mustapha in a deliberately provocative way, but he is directly informed by the ambassador, who asks "if such an offer is to [his] liking."[31] By removing the basis for Suleiman's

---

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

[28] In referring to the characters in the plays the names given by the particular writer will be used: in *Solymannidae:* Mustapha (Mustafa), Suleiman (Suleyman), Roxanes, (Rüstem), Rhodes, (Hurrem), Achmat (Ahmed) and in Greville's *Mustapha,* Mustapha (Mustafa), Soliman (Suleyman), Rosten (Rüstem), Rossa (Hurrem), Achmat (Ahmed).

[29] Vitkus, "Early Modern Orientalism," 213.

[30] ... *Ut regis prolem stirpem cum regis thoro*
Aequali sortiet, haud quemquam similem tuo
Invenit Mustaphae. ...

[31] *Conditio si talis placet..*

suspicions of his son, but still indicating that he is quite suspicious through his long conversation with the Turk that accompanies the ambassador's, inquiry about Mustapha's reaction to this situation and right after that asking his son to be summoned, "to see the virtue of his family," Suleiman himself is depicted as the first source of the suspicion, rather than the others.[32] His utterance that Mustapha "possesses a province full of warlike men" and "on all sides he has blood-thirsty flocks of men" not only reminds the reader of the fearsome, terrible army of the Turk but also indicates that Suleiman is afraid of his son, whom he has not seen for four years.[33] His next sentence, "perhaps under his generalship I am destined to conquer the Christians and subdue them to my yoke" points out the target of the fearsome army, the Christians.[34] Right after this comes the first chorus: "Mustapha, who in his pride hopes for a wedding that will be deadly for this realm, is preparing his own downfall. Taken in by his father's deceit, he will succumb."[35]Again in contrast to the European sources, the anonymous author depicts Mustapha, at the end of the first act, as a man of pride who wants to accept an offer that which will be *deadly* for his realm. He is not a strong knightly figure as depicted in the Ottoman and European sources, but a young man full of pride who is surrounded by "blood-thirsty flocks of men."

The second act introduces other characters: Rhodes, Roxanes and Selim, the son of Suleiman. The reader is informed about the plans of Rhodes after the description of the conflict between Suleiman and Mustapha. Nothing much is different in the English plays' depiction of Rhodes and Roxanes. Very much as in the European accounts, in *Solymannidae* Roxanes is a woman of high ambition who believes that "one must gain power by doing right and wrong."[36] The superiority of Mustapha over Selim, and thus the impossibility of an open victory over him, is told, and other means of getting him out of the way, such as assassination and poisoning, are

---

[32] *Volo videre stirpis virtutem meae*
Et ingens Ottomanni faelicis genus.

[33] *Provinciam bellicis tenet plenam viris,*
Habet cruentos undique populorum greges.

[34] *Forsan Christigenas illo domiturus duce*
Iugo captivis opprimam victor meo.

[35] *Qui nuptias regno graves*
Superbus optat, exitum sibi parat,
Mustapha paterno captus occumbet dolo.

[36] *Regna per fas et nefas*
Paranda.

discussed one by one. In a deviation from the source, Selim, the nominee for the throne after Mustapha, is included in the play, depicted as a passive son under the direct authority of his mother.

The next deviation from the sources is the introduction of Hybrachimus, İbrahim Paşa (1493-1536), a previous vizier of Suleyman. İbrahim, a pasha of *devşirme* origin, was one of the best advisors and viziers of Suleyman, whom he had known since his childhood. Later, in 1536, he was suddenly executed at the command of Suleyman, without a clear accusation.[37] In the play, the story of İbrahim, who was executed seventeen years before Mustafa, and whose story is mentioned with little emphasis in Moffan's introduction to his text, is combined with the Suleyman-Mustafa story. In the play, he is the second victim of Suleiman's rage and suspicion and Rhodes and Roxanes' intrigue. He is depicted as an experienced statesman and a virtuous, loyal, and educated advisor. He is the one who suggests that Suleiman decide calmly, after hearing his son's defense. But through his "honest piety" that overcomes the "credulous fears" of his friend, he becomes the target for Rhodes' and Roxanes' intrigue. Rhodes gives Roxanes a "little notebook" where he has written down everything "ever since powerful Hybrachimus began to lord it in the palace to the detriment of our prince's wealth and the condition of his empire" and asks her to give it to Suleiman.[38]

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

Suleiman is in another conflict now and another issue is attached to the Suleiman- Hybrachimus story. Suleiman, who wants to execute Hybrachimus,

---

[37] M. Tayyib Gökbilgin, "İbrahim Paşa," *İslam Ansilopedisi* [Encyclopedia of Islam] (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1965), 915.

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

remembers the oath he took when he was young, saying "I swear by the gods that Hybrachimus' life will be safe as long as I live."[39] At this point Roxanes, through reference to previous deeds of the Ottoman emperors, the ways they killed their brothers and fathers for absolute power over their realm, tries to persuade Suleiman to kill him, as she thinks that "in a kingdom, whatever is greater than royal power drags everything to its ruin."[40] But still, Suleiman is indecisive and upon the advice of another pasha, Ajax, that he "can preserve the empire and his faith at the same time," wants to see the "venerable Mufti."[41]

This final part related to the Suleiman-Hybrachimus story is again a diversion from the main storyline of the death of Mustafa that is seen in the Ottoman and European sources. Suleiman, trying to find a way out, asks the mufti if it is "permissible" to break an oath. The first answer to this is a direct no, as "the rulers of high heaven demand sure faithfulness regarding an oath."[42] After a little inquiry, the mufti, who asks who took the oath, when it was taken, and the exact words, makes his suggestion:

> Good. Having taken that oath, you are only able to kill Hybrachimus in the middle of the night... When all things are still as they are overcome by sleep and slumber possesses you as you lie abed, you may allow Hybrachimus to be dispatched to Orcus. But don't command this. Point out the steel with which you want his throat to be cut, and leave the rest to your trusty slaves.[43]

[39] "*Obstat consilio sacra*
Conceptum voce votum quo testes deos
Olim iuravi Hybrachimo vitam fore
Me vivo incolumem."

[40] "*Quicquid in regno magis*
Valet quam regnum cuncta in exitium trahit."

[41] "*Servare regnum servata fide potes, …*"

[42] "*Summi rectores poli*
In iuramento solidatam exposcunt fidem."

[43] *Bene est. Iuratus illo Hibrachimum modo*
Potes necare, … . Cum omnia silent
Humente pressa somno, teque intima quies
Tenet iacentem lecto, Hybrachimum sine
In Orcum mitti. Nec tamen fieri iube.
Demonstra ferrum, quo velis iugulum peti,
Caetera relinque servis quos fidos habes."

Here, it is apparent that the answer of mufti is quite tricky. The "cunning" answer of the religious man is also criticized by the chorus with these words, "Cunning men always conceal the deceits of kings and the base strivings of their crimes."[44] At first sight, this episode resembles Knolles' inclusion of a religious figure in the intrigue story as a man under the control of Rhodes. Here again is a tricky mufti who willingly uses word play to open the way to the emperor's wicked desire. This is certainly a repetition of the long-lasting stereotype of the tricky and oath-breaking Turk.[45]

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

> Fearful Suleiman himself, not daring to harm his pasha's sacred body, gave a sword and ordered it be plunged in his throat, for the man's red blood to be let. ... First he [the murderer] pulled away the pillow set under Hybrachimus' head, and suddenly used the sword to strike his exposed neck. ... [46]

After that, in answer to Mustapha's question about the burial place of Hybrachimus, the messenger replies: "Your irate father denied him burial. He bade the body be stripped bare and in its foul condition be dragged to the great seashore, for a great stone to be tied to his tender feet, and for him to be thrown in the ocean."[47] With this finale to the Suleiman-Hybrachimus story, the point of making this diversion from the main Suleyman-Mustafa story becomes clearer. Through this story, the

---

[44] "*Principum fraudes, scelerumque turpes*
Homines conatus semper versuti tegunt."

[45] Vitkus, "Early Modern Orientalism", 209.

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

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

most frequent *topos* of the Turk is emphasized and Suleiman's cruelty is shown, even torturing the dead body of his ex-friend.

Turning back to the Mustapha story, the play basically repeats the details in Moffan's account. Achmat warns Mustapha to be careful and suggests that he flee; Mustapha rejects this, saying

> So must I hide myself in furtive flight? Am I, who recently bore arms and dauntlessly overmastered the greatest captains, to live as a wretch hunting for bolt-holes? ... Whoever strives after virtue's abiding glory manufactures no vain fears for himself.[48]

Here again, Mustapha is depicted as a young, impatient and proud character who does not listen to his more experienced advisor. To this Achmat answers by reminding him that "sweet love is all-convincing" and that "Hyman conveys great power."[49] Suleiman's being under the control of his wife is implied, but not with a strong emphasis on lust as seen in Moffan and Knolles. Moreover, Mustapha's decision to see his father is not due to obedience but because of his interpretation of his dream in which "the Prophet" told Mustapha that "before the third day has passed for [him], [he] will stand on happy feet with [the Prophet] in a better place, greater than mortal men." Here the dream is used to remind the reader of Mustapha's greedy, proud nature; in a rush he interprets the dream as an indication of his success. Suleiman's words before ordering his son's execution; "You two pashas, give Mustapha a lofty seat in the camp. A throne stands, bright with gold and picked out with glittering gems. Let this be my son's place, let him rest on that seat," also indicates the irony between Mustapha's "foolish hope" and reality.[50]

---

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

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

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

Immediately after the death of Mustapha, the chorus turns back to the original depiction of Mustapha stating:

> But he who established the sum of all things in heaven and governs the indomitable and unalterable laws of Fate, turns human ills to good ends. ... [Mustapha] was blood-thirsty, rough, cruel, threatening, savage in war, and fierce in sharp battle. He could work harm, as by his savage vow he promised he would. But the ruler of the world preserves us by His help. He arms this father against his sons, hastening the enemies of virtue to their proper punishments.[51]

This passage not only reasserts the general stereotypical depictions of the Turk, but it also repeats the moral lesson that Moffan set in his work. The death of the blood-thirsty, rough, cruel, threatening, savage Mustapha is seen as assistance from the "ruler of the world." Here again, through the dichotomy of "us" and "the enemy," the position of the other is presented.

The most striking change throughout the play is in Mustapha's character. In both of the European accounts, despite Busbecq's skepticism, Mustapha is depicted as a positive character, a brave, obedient, successful ruler and a good soldier. In Moffan, he has some divine protection over him, and he is only described as a bloodthirsty Turk at the very end of the account, where the moral lesson is stated. In *Solymannidae*, from the very beginning onwards his weak points are presented. He is accused of the most severe deficiencies in ancient heroes and good Christians, pride and over self-confidence.

This play, despite constant references to Ottoman society, makes some statements about contemporary English society as well. The themes of absolute rule, state power and religion are employed through some alterations in the main story. Especially in

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

the scene when Suleiman is in conflict about his decision on Hybrachimus' fate, the anonymous author comments on state religious affairs through Ajax's comments and suggestions. Suleiman's good and loyal counselor openly states the possibility of having "the empire and the good faith" at the same time. It is certain that this sentence coming from a Muslim meant a great deal to a contemporary English audience, who were the subjects of an excommunicated queen, especially when these words are coupled with the rest of Ajax's comments: "all men who want to adapt new laws should not cleave to that which can be touched or seen. Let them seek higher things. Often poison lurks hidden with gold, evil exists under an appearance of good."[52] It is true that in documents and political pamphlets of the Early Modern England the representation of the Turk was evolving into a more nuanced, complex rhetoric as a result of the economic and political developments. However, this does not nullify the possibility of criticisms concerning these developments and strongly stereotyped representations and repetitions of the Ottoman danger.

Compared to its main sources' much more nuanced characters, and a much more even distribution of the good and the evil, *Solymannidae* presents a more negative idea of the Turk as an ethnic type. The dominant themes, rage, absolute power over life and death, violence, not only towards the enemy but within the family unit, are generally expressed as essential parts of the characters' ethnicity. From the beginning onwards, despite the strange setting, readers are reminded of the ethnic identity of the characters through references to historical facts about the Ottomans and their contrast to the Christians. The guilt is evenly distributed among the plotters and Suleiman as seen in the European sources, but this time it is duplicated with the Hybrachimus story as well. What Suleiman indicates throughout the play, right from the very opening sentences of the ghost, is the cruelty of the Ottomans in particular and the danger of absolute power in general.

Fulke Greville's *Mustapha* has much more nuanced depictions, although he relied on Moffan's account and Busbecq's letters for the Suleyman-Mustafa story. Greville was a member of the group that was formed around the countess of Pembroke, Sir Philip Sidney's sister, and he was an admirer of Seneca, as were

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

the other members of this group such as William Alexander and Sidney himself. Greville's *Mustapha* is a closet drama, in the Senecan tragedy style.[53] It is filled with long interventions of either one character or the chorus for the discussion of political views, the explanation of personal conflicts, and comments on religion. In *Mustapha*, Greville's representation of the story is much more philosophical than either of his sources and the previous play, which was written approximately fifteen years before *Mustapha*. Greville's treatment of the story takes it much further than a personal or dynastic struggle in the Ottoman court and presents it as a moral, political, and religious conflict through which issues like statecraft, the absolute rule of a tyrant and obedience to him, and the weaknesses of individuals are dealt with.[54]

The most striking difference of Greville's play from *Solymannidae* is the depiction of Soliman. From the very beginning until the end, Soliman is depicted as a three-dimensional human being rather than merely a tyrant or a weak ruler. He knows his weaknesses and, moreover, he is not a gullible ignorant man but understands the hidden agendas of the people around him. He openly calls Rosten a "crafty slave" and accuses him of being the one who is trying to come between him and his son. The most dominant side of Soliman's character is his indecisiveness. In contrast to *Solymannidae*'s Suleiman, who easily changes his mind at the suggestions of others, here, he is depicted as completely indecisive man:

Soliman: Turns fear to hope, and hope again to doubt
If thus it work in man, much more in thrones.[55]

He listens to his wife's suggestions, he weighs his own feelings, and he questions his counselors on the recent situation of Mustapha among the soldiers and as a ruler. In the end, what he can say to his wife is just a rejection of her persuasions, "You move me, yet I remove not!" The important point about the Soliman character here is that, much as in Busbecq's account, his actions are not simply explained through his own merits and characteristic weaknesses, but with reference to the general condition of human beings. Certainly Greville's play is much more involved in common great human conflicts than in the peculiar condition of the Turkish ruler.

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

[54] Ibid., 193; Peter Ure, "Fulke Greville's Dramatic Characters," *The Review of English Studies* 1, no. 4, (1950): 310.

[55] Joan Rees, *Selected Writings of Fulke Greville* (London: Athlone Press, 1973), 70 (hereafter: Rees, *Selected Writings*).

This more realistic, less stereotypical representation of the ruler helps Greville to make his theme clear.

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

Chorus: We silly Bashas help power to confound,
With our own strength exhausting our own ground
An art of tyranny; which works with men
To make them beasts and high-raised thrones their den
Where they that mischief others, may retire
Safe with their prey and lifting tyrant higher.[56]

The chorus goes on with comparisons with the "Christian courts of chancery" where although the offices are distributed by titles and land, people are afraid of disobedience, as that could lead to imprisonment. Then Bashas and Cadis offer a bitter self criticism, saying:

Chorus: ...
For as we see, when sickness deeply roots,
Meat, drink, and drugs alike do little boot;
Because all what should either nurse or cure
As mastered by diseases, grow impure:
So when excess (the malady of might)
Hath (dropsy-like) drowned all the styles of right,
Then doth obedience (else the food of power)
Help on that dropsy canker to devour.[57]

To discuss the same topic from the mouth of an officer and, closer, from a family member, Greville adds scenes of the discussion between Soliman and Achmat and between Soliman and Camena. These two characters, in their quite similar soliloquies, not only discuss the same issue of obedience to a tyrant but they also

[56] Ibid, 79.
[57] Ibid., 81.

fulfill a more practical role with their speeches aimed at persuading Soliman of Mustapha's innocence. Achmat, as in the historical accounts and the other play, is a good, experienced, witty statesman who understands the unseen parts of visible events. Achmat's dilemma is clear; should he "for [his] prince's sake, destroy succession/ Or suffer ruin to preserve succession?"[58] In the end, as expected from him, he decides that although he is "sworn to [his] king and his honor," he is "First nature's subject then [his] prince's."[59]

In a recent analysis of Greville's play, Burton has emphasized the saint-like representation of Camena, Mustapha's sister. According to him, the variation that Camena introduces to what Achmat has already told is to put this discussion on a Christian background.[60] She mentions the plot of the intrigue, directly pointing out the plotters, and tries to persuade her father to be "merciful," reminding one of a characteristic of an ideal Christian prince. Her constant references to virtue and her belief that pain "must be the guide" to virtue complete her saintly representation. She completes the argument that starts with Soliman himself and goes on with the chorus and Achmat, showing the right way both for the ruler and the conflicted self. Thirdly, she, as the victim of the completely black character, Rossa, highlights the evil in the latter.

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

Rossa: … My chiefest end
Is, first, to fix this world on my succession;
Next so to alter, plant, remove, create.[61]

[58] Ibid., 84.
[59] Ibid., 85.
[60] Burton, *Traffic and Turning*, 187.
[61] Rees, *Selected Writings*, 105.

This emphasis on personal ambition, removing the issue of fratricide somewhat from the general construction, makes it easier for Greville to discuss political power and the theme of absolutism in a context less strange to an English audience.

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

Soliman: If God work thus, kings must look upwards still,
And from these powers they know not choose a will
Or else believe themselves their strength, occasion,
Make wisdom conscious and the world their sky.
So have all tyrants done, so must I.[62]

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

Camena: Besides the Gods whom kings should imitate
Have placed you high to rule, not overthrow
For us, not for your selves, is your estate;
Mercy must hand in hand with power go.[63]

According to Burton, such advice to an Ottoman ruler is quite out of context as "mercy" is generally not an adjective reserved for Ottoman rulers in European literature. Therefore, Burton concludes, there should be some other explanation of Camena's advice, which is a projection of English concerns on the Ottoman setting.[64]

---

[62] Ibid., 113.
[63] Ibid., 94.
[64] Burton, *Traffic and Turning*, 109.

Another Christianized character of the play is Mustapha himself. Mustapha is the good, successful, and innocent victim of the cruelty that is inflicted on him. The only divergence from the story, on his part, is his counselor. In contrast to his representations in all other accounts, this time he is not warned against the danger to his life by a good "doctor" or a secular advisor, but by a religious figure. Instead of his wise, pious advisor who advises him to stay away from the political struggles of this world, now he is told to rebel against his father by a "tempter" priest who previously calls himself "evil's friend, hell's mediator." As in all other accounts, Mustapha rejects the option of fleeing from his father.[65] Through his dialogue with the priest, his righteousness and virtues are highlighted in contrast to the wickedness of the religious man. From the very beginning of his dialogue, he criticizes Heli, the priest with a strange name that reminds one of "hell", for his "rage" and reminds him of the "wicked colors of desire" and the importance of "obedience" against confusion. Achmat describes the way he accepts death as "in haste to be an angel," and his final words before he dies echo Christ:

Mustapha: O Father! Now forgive me.
Forgive them too, that wrought my overthrow
Let my grave never minister offences
Since my father coveted my death
Behold, with Joy I offer him my breath.[66]

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

It is apparent that all the issues that Greville forced into the Suleyman-Mustafa story reflect basic concerns of his age. The Suleyman-Mustafa story was a good choice for speculating on the struggle to overthrow tyrants, reflections on monarchy, the relations of the monarch and the individual, loyalty, honor, religion, and the relations of the governing power and the state religion, as well as the part played by a state religion in the control and even the oppression of the people. All these topics, together with a desire for order, unity and a more or

[65] Although Burton indicates a difference here, in Moffan's account Mustapha rejects fleeing from his father for the same reasons.
[66] Rees, *Selected Writings*, 130.

less certain future were basic concerns of the English people, who were on the edge of Catholic world, divided among themselves, confused with great changes in the country and with the lack of an appropriate heir to the throne, which was apparently the only strong pillar on which they could rely. Greville, in his play, through constructing a less-Muslim, less-Ottoman atmosphere, helps his readers to connect the discussions to the English context.

Still, the plot turns around the Ottoman court, in a Muslim state. Therefore some comments on Ottoman ways were indispensable. Not surprisingly, when Greville is talking directly about the Muslims and the Turk through the choruses, he is quite critical. The second chorus of "Mahomedan priests" comments how Muslims destroyed antiquities with their swords, how they destroyed all the temples to found theirs, how the seraglio was filled with pleasures, and how they spread their empire with their vices.[67] It is certain that Greville not only makes use of the long-lasting stereotypes like the cruel and lustful Turk, but he also applies Renaissance ideas of the Turk as the "new barbarian" to his representation.[68]

The chorus of "Mahomedan priests," through a comparison of Christian and Muslim societies and states, gives a detailed list of the peculiarities of these two cultures. The puppet-prophet stereotype and the prejudices about the lustful, beastly Turk are all represented through the speeches of the five choruses, "the chorus of Bashas and Cadis," "the chorus of Mahomedan priests," "the chorus of Tartarorum," and "the chorus of converts to Mahomedanism," which are actually the choruses of the Turkish/Muslim Others.[69] A constantly debated topic of the age, whether Christians tended to convert to Islam more than Muslims did to Christianity, is also given. Moreover, a criticism on relations with the Muslims is also conveyed, in reverse, from the mouth of the Muslim priests, after they set out the differences between two cultures:

Yet by our traffic with this dreaming nation,
Their conquered vice hath stained our conquering state,
And brought thin cobwebs into reputation,
Of tender subtlety; whose step mother Fate,

[67] Rees, 96.

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

[69] For stereotypical representations of the prophet in medieval and Early Modern texts, see Victor Tolan, *Saracens* (Colombia: Colombia University Press, 2002) and Chew, *The Crescent and the Rose.*

So inlays courage with ill-shadowing fear,
As makes it much more hard to than bear.[70]

It is clear that a harsh criticism of relations with the Muslim state is implied at this point. This means that some English men perceived the confrontation with the Mediterranean plurality, tolerance, and multicultural identities and the reality of the attraction of this new influence as a problem for their own identity. Not only the trafficking with the Turk, but also the adoption of Turkish manners of dressing, hair style and even beards were recorded and attacked by contemporary authors.[71]

Conclusion

When compared to its main sources' much more nuanced characters and much more even distribution of good and the evil, both *Solymannidae* and *Mustapha* present a more negative idea of the Turk as an ethnic type. Therefore it is clear that, at least in the anonymous author's work and in Greville's, there was nothing on the stage that was genuinely Turkish/Muslim and positive. The prejudice-based, stereotypical figures were deliberately highlighted by the anonymous author to reinforce his concern on the point that "the greatest things are in collapse." In Greville's case, the representations were certainly much more nuanced, but still they were not there as "real others" but as mere tools for the author to make his point, probably with the hope of getting through strict censorship. When it comes to representing his points on the Other, Greville could not go beyond depicting the stereotypes. Some other cases might help to prove "mistaken notions of an English culture unwilling to accept positive representations of non-Christian peoples," but apparently *Mustapha* is a wrong choice for this.[72]

From a close reading of the two English plays, the anonymous Cambridge play *Solymannidae* and Fulke Greville's *The Tragedy of Mustapha,* with specific attention to their sources, this article concludes that the representation of the Ottomans on the sixteenth-century English stage was not always influenced by the transforming diplomatic rhetoric on the Turk that emerged as a result of Anglo-Ottoman proximity. An analysis of these two different constructions of the Suleyman-

[70] Rees, 98.
[71] Artemel, "Red Herring:" 193.
[72] Burton, *Traffic and Turning*, 194.

Mustafa story on the English stage, seen in Western sources, challenges an over-generalization of the influence of the changing sixteenth-century rhetoric on the Turk on literary productions of the age. Accepting the importance and validity of the completely new strategies of representing the Other that appeared as a result of alliances with the Turks, this analysis shows that there was at least one more result of Anglo-Ottoman relations. A stricter and clear-cut rhetoric on the differences between the Turk and the English, blended with long-lasting stereotypical images, emerged in this period as result of the same social conditions. These representations offered strong criticism of the influence of Mediterranean ways on English society.