

Dealing With Tyranny: Fulke Greville's *Mustapha* in the Context of His Other Writings and of His View on Anglo-Ottoman Relations

Seda Erkoç*

Fulke Greville'in Mustapha'sını Yazarın Diğer Politik Yazıları ve İngiliz-Osmanlı İlişkileri Üzerine Görüşleri Işığında Yeniden Okumak

Öz ■ Fulke Greville'in Kanuni Sultan Süleyman'ın oğlu Şehzade Mustafa'nın ölümünü anlatan tiyatro oyunu *Mustapha*, erken modern dönemde “doğulu öteki”nin edebi metinlerdeki temsili üzerine çalışmaların çeşitlenmesiyle araştırmacıların ilgi alanına tekrar girdi. Metni sadece kralın mutlak gücünü eleştiren bir politik tartışma olarak kabul eden ve metnin Osmanlı bağlamını tamamen yadsıyan ilk çalışmaların aksine, yeni analizler metindeki iyi ve kötü Osmanlı karakterleri işaret ederek Greville'in olumlu bir Osmanlı tasviri ürettiğinin altını çizdiler. Greville'in Osmanlıları nasıl temsil ettiğinin önemini vurgulamakta haklı olduklarını kabul etmekle birlikte, bu makale son dönemdeki çalışmaları iki açıdan eleştirmektedir: Öncelikle *Mustapha*'nın, yazarın kullandığı anlatı kaynaklarıyla karşılaştırmalı olarak incelenmesi Greville'in erken modern dönem İngiltere'sinde yazılmış diğer tiyatro oyunlarında var olduğu iddia edilen olumlu söylemi tekrar üretmediğini göstermektedir. İkinci olarak *Mustapha*'yı yazarın diğer politik metinleriyle birlikte değerlendiren bu makale Greville'in Osmanlı dünyasına karşı olumsuz tutumunun, bir siyaset kuramcısı olarak Osmanlı devlet sistemini algılayışıyla yakından ilişkili olduğunu öne sürer.

Anahtar kelimeler: Fulke Greville, İngiliz tiyatro oyunlarında Osmanlı imgesi, erken modern dönem Osmanlı-İngiliz ilişkileri, Şehzade Mustafa

Much has been said on *Mustapha*, Fulke Greville's tragedy that dramatizes the execution of the son of Suleyman the Magnificent at the command of his father. Most early studies stripped Greville's work of his Ottoman context and focused on

* Bilkent Üniversitesi.

his discussion of the absolutist tendencies of his time, tyranny, service and obedience to tyrants and Christian philosophies of just rule.¹ *Mustapha* has received renewed attention lately, in connection with the recent research in the field of early modern representations of the Eastern other.² These studies, in contrast to the first group, have underlined the Ottoman context of the play and focused on Greville's differentiated representation of the Ottoman or Muslim other. Jonathan Burton, stepping beyond Said's binarism, argued that early modern English drama was "more multiple, fluctuating, and susceptible to Eastern influence than has been previously recognized".³ The discourse of some English playwrights was influenced, according to Burton, not only by genuine Arabic and Ottoman voices, but also by Elizabeth I's keen interest in establishing a closer relationship with the Ottomans.⁴ The representation of the Ottomans and Muslims in certain early modern English texts, therefore, was not necessarily polarized or negative. Accepting the "Christ-like", heroic character of Mustapha⁵ as an indication of "Muslims portrayed in a positive light", Burton argued that Greville's *Mustapha* was one of those works which "makes it impossible to conclude that English drama produced only stock figures of Islamic depravity".⁶ Linda McJanneth, comparing Greville's representation of the Ottomans to that of his historical sources, concluded that Greville's work represents "a remarkable cultural even-handedness", in contrast to

1 Jonathan Dollimore, *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Dramas of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* (Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1989); David Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance* (London: Routledge and Paul, 1984); Joan Rees, *Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke, 1554 – 1628: A Critical Biography* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971); Ronald A Rebholz, *The Life of Fulke Greville, First Lord Brooke* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971); G. A. Wilkes, (ed.), *The Complete Poems and Plays of Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke (1554-1628), in Two Volumes* (G. A. Lewiston, Queenston, Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2008); Amanda Rigali, "The Plays of Fulke Greville in Context," unpubl. Ph.D. thesis, (King's College, London, 2000).

2 Jonathan Burton, *Traffic and Turning Islam and English Drama 1579-1624* (Cranbury: Rosemont Publishing, 2005); Linda McJannet, *The Sultan Speaks. Dialogue in English Plays and Histories about the Ottoman Turks* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006); Katrin Röder, "Intercultural 'Traffique' in Fulke Greville's *Mustapha*," *Literature Compass*, XI, 8 (2014), pp. 560–572.

3 Burton, *Traffic and Turning*, p. 15.

4 Ibid., p. 52.

5 In referring to Ottoman historical figures the Romanized version of their names will be used: Suleyman, Selim, Hurrem, Mustafa, Rustem, Ahmed; in referring to the characters in the narrative accounts and plays the names given by Greville will be used: Mustapha (Mustafa), Soliman (Suleyman), Rosten (Rustem), Rossa (Hurrem), Achmat (Ahmed).

6 Ibid., p. 194.

“English historians, whose commentary increasingly criticized the Turks”.⁷ Katrin Röder granted the tone of the sources a role, but stated that the “nuanced portrayal” of Muslims in Greville’s work “not only is derived from his sources” but is also a result of Greville’s “creative appropriation” of his sources and current representations of Muslims.⁸

While accepting the validity of these later works in attesting to the real importance of the Ottoman context to *Mustapha*, the present article challenges them in two aspects. Firstly, I argue that an analysis of *Mustapha* in comparison to the sources that were available to the author indicates that neither Greville nor his English narrative sources produce a nuanced rhetoric such as has been argued to exist in early modern English plays. The following analysis of *Mustapha* indicates that Greville followed his English historical sources closely in employing some long-recurring negative commonplaces about the Ottomans and in reproducing the hostile rhetoric on the Ottomans as the perpetual threat to Christendom.

Secondly, considering Greville’s own explanations for his heavy revisions of the tragedies *Alaham* and *Mustapha*, I argue that an analysis of Greville’s representation of the Ottomans in *Mustapha* would be incomplete without taking *A Treatise of Monarchy* [hereafter *Monarchy*] and *Life of Sir Philip Sydney* [hereafter *Life of Sydney*] into account. *Monarchy*, composed of poems that were originally written for the choruses of tragedies, discusses political issues at length and thus presents us with a more accurate picture of what Greville thought about the Ottoman Empire. *Life of Sydney* was written as a dedication for *Monarchy* and for the last versions of the tragedies and reveals Greville’s evaluation of Elizabethan foreign policy. Taken together, *Mustapha*, *Monarchy* and *Life of Sydney* indicate both Greville’s genuine interest in the current state of the Ottoman Empire as well as its history and his thoughts on the contacts and relations between England and the Ottoman Empire at that time.⁹ The negative representation of the Ottoman Empire in *Mustapha* is closely connected to Greville’s overall evaluation, as a political theorist, of the Ottoman state.

7 McJanneth, *The Sultan Speaks*, p. 153.

8 Röder, “Intercultural ‘Traffique’,” p. 560.

9 Brett Roscoe also points out the gap between Greville’s closet dramas and his poetic treatises as a problem in the present literature; see Brett Roscoe, “On Reading Renaissance Closet Drama: A Reconsideration of the Chorus in Fulke Greville’s *Alaham* and *Mustapha*,” *Studies in Philology*, CX, 4 (2013), pp. 762-788.

Greville's *Mustapha* was written in the social, political and literary context of the Elizabethan age and it was intended for the specific audience of the courtiers that were grouped around the Earl of Essex.¹⁰ The early version of *Mustapha* reflected Greville's concern to advise Essex that it is better for a courtier to support a tyrannical Queen than to cause even more disorder by rebellion. The death of Essex in 1601 had, however, a huge impact on Greville. The Jacobean world in which Greville revised *Mustapha* intensified his feeling of disappointment, as the absolutist tendencies of the new monarch emphasised to him the futility of the hope that bad rulers would in time be replaced with good ones. This desperate atmosphere, together with the change in the intended audience from Essex circle to a broader group, forced Greville to change the focus of the discussion in *Mustapha* from that of a courtier's obedience to a tyrant to the question of a son's obedience to his father.¹¹ Opposition from a son seemed relatively more valid as he had the legitimate authority to rule, which the courtier lacked. The revised version discusses the issue of obedience through reflecting the opinions of various characters and does not point to a specific "right" action, indicating the profound effect of the events of 1590s on Greville's ideas. The later versions of *Mustapha* do not point to a specific course of action but rather leave the readers with numerous possibilities.

It is certain that the Elizabethan and Jacobean social and political atmospheres had their own particular paradigms and the shift in these paradigms, as well as the specific events that took place at the turn of the century, influenced Greville's ideas on the issues of tyranny, absolutism and obedience to a tyrant. *Mustapha*, as a hybrid work that was first produced in the Elizabethan world and then revised in the Jacobean, is a rich source for a discussion of the political views of the author. This article, however, cannot aim to explain all the factors that might have had an influence on the formation of Greville's political views, or to contextualize them within a broader circle of works. Accepting the relevance of the political discussions of the age around the issues of tyranny, absolutism or decline on Greville's ideas, this article restricts itself to revealing some specific aspects of his representation of the Ottomans rather than focussing on their relevance to the political issues of Greville's age.

10 Rigali, "The Plays of Fulke Greville," p. 8.

11 Ibid., pp. 124-5.

Fulke Greville's *Mustapha* depicts the events at Suleyman's palace right before his decision to execute his son Mustafa.¹² In 1553 Şehzade Mustafa, the eldest son of Suleyman the Magnificent and the heir apparent to the throne, was strangled at the command of his father. This story was recorded by contemporary chroniclers and in numerous Ottoman poems of mourning marking Mustafa's death.¹³ Only two years later, in 1555, Nicolas de Moffan's Latin text entitled *Soltani Solymanni Turcorum Imperatoris horrendum facinus, scelerato in proprium filium* appeared in Europe and set off the repercussions of the story written for the European audience.¹⁴ When Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq's well-known letters were published in 1581, the story of Mustafa, which had been circulating in Europe in Latin and the vernacular for a while, attracted even more attention.¹⁵ Moffan's account was translated into English twice, firstly as an attachment to Georgijevic's *The offspring*

12 It is known that there were three distinct versions of Greville's plays. However, it is difficult to date these versions very precisely. The first version of *Mustapha* was composed in the mid-1590s, most probably between 1594 and 1596, but this first version was not published until 1609. The result of the first revision of the plays, carried out in the period 1599-1604, were versions with lengthy choruses containing much political discussion, but these versions are not extant. The final revision came between 1607 and 1610. Here, Greville shortened the choruses of the second versions and these final versions were published in 1633. *Monarchy*, therefore, was most likely composed during the first revision of the plays (1599-1604), though *Monarchy* itself was subsequently expanded and revised. The final version of *Monarchy* was published in 1670. The final work of Greville considered here is *Life of Sidney*, which was most probably composed in the latter half of 1610 and was published in 1652. For the details, see Rebholz, *The Life of Fulke Greville*, Appendix I. G. A. Wilkes, however, dates the earliest versions of the text to 1587, see Wilkes, *The Complete Poems and Plays of Fulke Greville*, vol. I, pp. 182-183.

13 Nişancı Mehmed Paşa, *Hadisât*, ed. Enver Yaşarbaş (İstanbul: Kit-san Matbaacılık, 1983); Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede, *Sabaifü'l-Abbâr fî Vekâyi-ül-a'sâr*, trans. İsmail Erünsal (İstanbul: Tercüman, n.d.); Hasan Beyzâde Ahmed Paşa, *Hasan Beyzâde Tarihi*, ed. Şevki Nezih Aykut (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basım Evi, 2004); İbrahim Peçevî, *Peçevî Tarihi*, ed. Murat Uraz (İstanbul: Neşriyat Yurdu, 1968); Solakzâde Mehmed Hemdemî Çelebi, *Solakzâde Tarihi*, ed. Vahid Çabuk (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1989). For mourning poems, see Mehmet Çavuşoğlu, "Şehzâde Mustafa Mersiyeleri," *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi*, XII (1982), pp. 641-686.

14 Nicholas de Moffan, *Soltani Solymanni, Turcarum Imperatoris, horrendum facinus, scelerato in proprium filium, natu maximum, Solianum Mustapham, parricidio, anno domini 1553 patratum* (Basileae [Basel]: I. Oporini, 1555). The first German translation of Moffan's pamphlet came out in the same year as the original, 1555. Another German translation, two French translations, and a Spanish translation appeared the following year, 1556.

15 Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq, *Itinera Constantinopolitanvm et Amasianvm ab Augerio Gisleenio Busbequij ...,* (Antverpiae [Antwerp]: Ch. Plantin, 1581).

of the *House of Ottomanno* (1569)¹⁶ and secondly in William Painter's *The Palace of Pleasure* (1575)¹⁷. There was also an anonymous Cambridge play, *Solymannidae Tragoedia* (1581) based on the events.¹⁸ These works, from Moffan onwards, were all potential sources for Greville's original version of *Mustapha*. Richard Knolles's narration of the story of Mustafa in his *General History of the Turkes* (1603) may have been available to Greville for the revisions of *Mustapha*.¹⁹

Mustapha, Treatise of Monarchy and Life of Sydney

Fulke Greville was educated at Cambridge and he served the English crown for more than forty years.²⁰ Having been one of Queen Elizabeth's favourites, he also worked in various positions for the state during James I's and Charles I's reigns. By the time Greville composed the first version of *Mustapha* (1594-6) he had already experienced the results of factional struggles at the court of Elizabeth. Greville and the Sidney family were associated with the militantly anti-Spanish faction, who lost power to the more cautious Cecils in the final decades of the sixteenth century. The new leader of the militant faction after the deaths of Leicester and Walsingham, Robert Devereaux, the earl of Essex, continued to support the more aggressive policies against Spanish imperialism that were opposed by the

16 Hugh Goughe, *The Offspring of the House of Ottomano, and officers to the greate Turke. Whereunto is added Bartholomaeus Georgieviz Epitome of the Customs, Rytes, ceremonies and Religion of the Turkes, with the miserable affliction of those Christians whiche live under their captivitie and bondage. In the ende also is adjoined the manner how Mustafa, eldest sonne of Soltan Soliman, twelfth Emperour of the Turkes was murdered by his father in the yere of our Lorde 1553, all Englished by Hugh Goughe* (London: T. Marshe, 1569/1570).

17 William Painter, *The Second Tome of the Palace of Pleasure, contayning more of goodlye Histories, Tragical matters, and other Morall argumentes, very requisite for delight and profyte.* (London: T. Marshe, 1567).

18 *Solymannidae Tragoedia* (1581), British Museum. MS. Lansdowne 723, 4^o, fols. 43-63.

19 Richard Knolles, *The Generall Historie of the Turkes, from The first beginning of that Nation to the rising of the Othoman Familie with all the notable expeditions of the Christian against them. Together with the Lives and Conquests of the Othoman Kings and Emperours. Faithfully collected out of the best Histories, both auntient and modern, and digested into one continual Historie Until this present Yeare 1603* (London: A. Islip, 1603). Greville might have used Knolles' history either for this first revision, or for the final one, which was most probably done between 1607 and 1610. For a discussion of the European accounts of Mustafa's death and their influence on the English plays, see Seda Erkoç, "Repercussions of a Murder: the Death of Sehzade Mustafa on Early Modern English Stage," unpubl. MA thesis, (Central European University, 2008).

20 Rebholz, *The Life of Fulke Greville*, p. 4.

Cecils. Towards the mid-1590s, the more Greville's association with Essex became visible, the more detached he felt from the political core.²¹

In *Life of Sydney* Greville explains the process of his revisions of the tragedies. The tragedies were revised twice. The first revision filled the plays with lengthy political discussions in the choruses to elaborate on the issue of the vices of ambitious rulers. The issues that the choruses discuss, as Greville clearly states, were “not borne out of the present matter acted”, yet these were inserted to give “a perspective into vice”, and to show “the unprosperities of it”. This would make the tragedies “more acceptable to every good Readers ends”. For the second revision, however, Greville found these choruses “beyond proportion” and thus left most of them out.²²

The first version of *Mustapha* was composed at a time when the succession to Elizabeth was still an open question and when Greville was feeling more and more uncertain about his future at the court of Elizabeth. All the issues he addressed in this first version certainly had resonances in the political atmosphere of his age, as well as in his personal experience at court. According to Rebholz, the emphasis in the first version was more on “the psychology of the individual person's moral choice.”²³ The later versions of *Mustapha* certainly take the story far beyond the subject of a personal struggle at court, in order to deal with “the largest subjects”.²⁴ Greville's discussion of the history of Ottoman-Christian conflicts and the differences between the Ottomans and Christians, his evaluation of the present situation of the Ottoman Empire and the results of the traffic between the Ottomans and Christians are included in these versions. It is certain that Mustafa's story not only gave Greville a great opportunity to discuss, in a foreign setting, a variety of topics in relation to contemporary England, but also made it possible for him to develop ideas on issues such as the absolute rule of a king, whether obedience to a tyrant was required, and the fate of tyrannical rule.²⁵ After the revisions of the

21 Ibid., pp. 90-105.

22 Fulke Greville, *Life of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. Nowell Smith (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907), p. 150.

23 Rebholz, *The Life of Fulke Greville*, p. 104.

24 Greville, *Life of Sidney*, p. 150.

25 For a detailed discussion of the possible political reasons for Greville's revision of the tragedies see Rigali, “The Plays of Fulke Greville,” pp. 99-100 and 125-133. According to Rigali's convincing discussion of the early and the revised texts of *Mustapha*, one of the main reasons for the revision was the shift of the intended audience. In contrast to Rebholz who presents *Mustapha*

tragedies, the discarded pieces of *Mustapha* and *Alaham* were combined to form, substantially, *Monarchy*. Greville's discussion of the Ottoman Empire in that treatise should therefore be taken into account while discussing his representation of the Ottomans in *Mustapha*, as these texts were initially intimately connected.

Mustapha was a closet drama.²⁶ As Greville would later express in *Life of Sydney*, the tragedies *Alaham* and *Mustapha* were not composed as plays for the stage but as dramatic *exempla*, and he made what he wanted these plays to exemplify quite clear in his own words. Greville's main aim in writing these two tragedies was not, as the ancient tragedies did, "to exemplify the disastrous miseries of mans lives". This sort of focus on the miseries of men, according to Greville, implied that "Order, Lawes, Doctrine, and Authority" are useless for protecting "innocency from the exorbitant wickedneffe of power" and therefore suggested an unjustified protest against "Divine Providence".²⁷ Nor did Greville share the aim of what he saw as modern playwrights in representing how God revenged himself on every particular sin. *Mustapha* and *Alaham* were rather written "to trace out the high waies of ambitious Governours, and to shew in the practice, that the more audacity, advantage, and good successe such Sovereignties have, the more they hasten to their owne desolation and ruine".²⁸ Not following either the ancients or the moderns, Greville, in his tragedies, focused on the power of the individual. Order, laws or doctrines *were* useful means in saving men from miseries and it was not necessarily God's plan to destroy the order men had founded. What caused "desolation and ruin" was men's own ambitions and mistakes, which Greville's tragedies were composed to exemplify.

as a private and introspective work, Rigali points that the early version of the play was written for the readership at Essex House, to advise the courtiers there who were actually showing signs of disobedience to the monarch as early as 1595. The later version of the play, however, was aimed at an anonymous group of public readers and was reflecting the concerns of the author on absolutist tendencies of the new monarch.

26 The main difference between "closet" and "public" dramas was that the former had a specific group of readers and was intended to be circulated privately. Public dramas on the other hand had a wider, less specified audience. Having clearly defined "private" readers, closet dramatists could form their work in a way to suit the needs of the intended readers. Private circulation of the material also let the authors discuss politically sensitive material in their works. For a discussion of the two main sub-genres of sixteenth-century drama that influenced Greville in terms of both form and content, see Rigali, pp. 63-89.

27 Greville, *Life of Sidney*, p. 221.

28 *Ibid.*, p. 221.

Whatever Greville represented in his tragedies was therefore necessarily over-all a negative example, tragedies as they were. Negative depiction by Greville of some of his characters was only natural, and it was also natural for him to make use of stereotypical negative descriptions of Turks for this purpose. In *Mustapha*, Solyman, Rossa and Rosten are characterised as greedy, violent and vicious as the story necessitates this.²⁹ Equally, for reasons of the drama itself, other characters would be portrayed less negatively and therefore also less stereotypically. Mustapha, Achmat and Camena are those who discuss the fateful decision of Solyman from political, religious or moral perspectives. They could hardly do this as stereotypical Turks. The virtues or the vices of the characters, the Christ-like representation of Mustapha or the monstrous character of Rossa, are irrelevant in this respect, and only take us back to binaries of self and other. The focus of this article, therefore, is on Greville's perception of the Ottoman Empire and its affairs with Christians separate from his representation of particular characters in the play. Besides, as the ideas in *Monarchy* are less influenced by the conventions of the genre or the necessities of the main storyline, the general evaluation of the representation of the Ottoman Empire in this text, together with *Mustapha*, gives us a more reliable picture of Greville's ideas.

Greville, his sources and the representation of the Ottomans in *Mustapha*

Greville's *Mustapha*, following Moffan and the English narrative sources, represents the Ottoman Empire as a serious threat to Christendom. Greville discusses both the history and the present condition of the religio-military confrontations of the two parties and thus reproduces the hostile rhetoric about the Turk as the perpetual threat to Christendom.³⁰ The speakers of Chorus Secundus, Mohametan Priests, start with the origins of Christian-Muslim conflict and present a history of Ottoman expansion by "pulling others' [churches] downe". "Europe" according to chorus, stood against Muslim's prophet, The Ottomans, however, were successful:

29 For a discussion of the representation of certain characters in *Mustapha*, see, Galina I. Yermolenko, "Roxolana in Europe," in *Roxolana in European Literature, History and Culture*, ed. Galina I. Yermolenko (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), pp. 23-55.

30 For a detailed discussion of rhetoric of the Turkish threat in English prose historiography see Stephan Schmuck, "Politics of Anxiety: The imago turci in early modern English prose, c. 1550 – 1620," unpubl. Ph.D. thesis, (University of Wales, Aberystwyth, 2007) pp. 26-37.

FULKE GREVILLE'S MUSTAPHA IN THE CONTEXT OF HIS OTHER WRITINGS AND OF HIS VIEW ON ANGLO-OTTOMAN RELATIONS

We undertooke with unitie of minde,
And what their wittes dispute, our swords did binde.

So that ere her crosse sectes could danger see,
Their Thrones, Schooles, Miters, Idolles were resign'd
To us, newe Trophies of our Monarchie:
Thus are the Muses still by Mars refin'de:
And thus our Church, by pullinge others downe,
I feare o'rebuilt itselfe, perchance the Crowne.³¹

Greville's representation of the history of Christian-Muslim conflicts does not differ much from his sources. Moffan and Painter refer to the long lasting conflicts between Christians and Ottomans as the main reason for their narration of the story of the death of Mustapha, and Knolles, at the dedication of his lengthy volume of Turkish history, mentions the present Ottoman threat as an explanation of the importance of the subject matter of his work.³² The only difference in *Mustapha* is the affirmation of this threat through the words of Ottoman/Muslim characters. Greville's narration of the history of the conflicts between the parties through the chorus of "Mahometan priests", presents a different perspective, but by revealing the boastful comments of the Ottomans about their deeds, it only serves to confirm the enmity and the threat they pose for Christianity.

The Mahometan Priests also comment on the current situation, mentioning that since then

[Muslims] still spoyle that Christian sect,
Which by diuision fatall to their kinde,
Friends, duties, enemies, and right, neglect³³

The final lines that contrast the previously mentioned Muslim "unity of mind" with the "division" that is "fatal" for Christians is a recurring idea in Greville's

31 Fulke Greville, *Mustapha in The Works in Verse and Prose Complete of the Right Honorable Fulke Greville*, ed. Alexander B. Grosart (1870), pp. 344-5.

32 Knolles, "Dedication" in *Historie*, p. [1].

33 Greville, *Mustapha*, p. 346.

English sources. Knolles, in *General History of the Turks*, frequently turns to this idea and urges his readers to see themselves as “Christians” so that a unity against the Ottoman threat might be secured. In his dedication to James I, Knolles explains that “the Christian commonwealth” has never been under such a great danger before and “the Christian princes sitting at the helme of their estates” could beat “these natural and capitall enemies” only with their “united forces”, the unity of which is the “greatest terror” of these “barbarous enemies”. Referring to James’s own work on Lepanto, Knolles describes the naval battle as “the greatest and the most glorious victory that ever was by any the Christian confederate princes obtained” against the Ottomans.³⁴ Painter, at the very beginning of his version of the filicide story, states that he translated the story “to renew the ancient detestation, which we have, and our progenitors had, against that horrible termagant and persecutor of Christians”,³⁵ and as a concluding remark he repeats the idea that the “continuall discorde” among Christians would give the Ottomans “the occasion to invade the rest of Europe”.³⁶

Greville’s comments on the Muslim-Christian conflict in *Monarchy* also restate this idea. Pointing to the “fatal discord” of Christians as opposed to the “unity” of the Ottomans as a “disadvantage”³⁷ and stating that “this mighty tyranny” could only be defeated at sea, Greville describes Lepanto as an example that “prows the Christian’s might / Able by sea to shake the Turkish power”.³⁸ Greville’s proposed solution to the existing problem is unity against the common enemy. The “privateness”, as he explains in *Monarchy*, “forgets Time’s glory” and therefore the “selfless” Christian princes should unite against the Ottomans, not to extend their own empires, nor to “purchase fame, or any noble end”:

But selfly to root out our enemies,
Deface fair monuments, spoil civil places,
Dispeople realms of men, and Earth of trees,
Spoiling, to varnish Tyrnannie’s disgraces,

34 Knolles, “Dedication” in *Historie*, p. [ii].

35 Thomas Painter, “A Horrible and Cruell Murder of Soltan Solyman,” in *The Second Tome of the Palace of Pleasure*, ed. Joseph Haslewood (1813), p. 663.

36 *Ibid.*, p. 683.

37 Fulke Greville, *A Treatise of Monarchy in The Works in Verse and Prose Complete of the Right Honorable Fulke Greville*, ed. Alexander B. Grosart (1870), p. 204.

38 *Ibid.*, p. 148.

FULKE GREVILLE'S MUSTAPHA IN THE CONTEXT OF HIS OTHER WRITINGS AND OF HIS VIEW ON ANGLO-OTTOMAN RELATIONS

And bring the World to those days back again,
Where Pow'r did over beasts, not people raign.³⁹

Greville's references to the commonplace of the Turkish threat, his presentation of the history of the conflict, his identification of the reasons for Christian failure and his proposed "solution" to the problem could not have been further from the differentiated, "nuanced" rhetoric that has been noticed in some early modern English plays. As Burton carefully observes, Queen Elizabeth's aim was to downplay the differences between Islam and Christianity in the hope of a future Anglo-Ottoman alliance against the Catholic side. This rhetoric, Burton assumed, was re-produced generally by the playwrights.⁴⁰ Greville, however, emphasizes doctrinal differences between the two religions in re-telling the history of the conflict:

Europe in chiefe our prophets then withstood,
With her three-mitred god of flesh and blood.⁴¹

Representing two of the main doctrinal differences between Islam and Christianity, Greville, as well as his English sources, was trying to renew hatred and unity against the natural enemy, the Turks. The speakers of Chorus Sacerdotum re-assert this point:

[Christians] wrangle with themselues, and by dispute
As if, in thrones, blood were Religion's art;
We in subduing Christians conquer both,
And to lose use of either part are loth.⁴²

Condemning the "disputes" among Christians Greville in line with his sources emphasize the Ottoman State as the common enemy of all Christians.

Another point in which Greville follows his sources closely is the reproduction of the "new barbarians" commonplace. Knolles refers to the Ottomans as a

39 Ibid., p. 182.

40 For a discussion, see Jonathan Burton, "Anglo-Ottoman Relations and the Image of the Turk in Tamburlaine," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, XXX, 1 (2000), pp. 125-156.

41 Greville, *Mustapha*, p. 344.

42 Ibid., p. 350.

“barbarous” nation more than once in his introduction and laments the loss of lands that belonged to many ancient kingdoms to them. Evaluating Ottoman histories as “rude notes” written according to “their barbarous manner” rather than “just histories”, Knolles finds them especially useless because of the “strange and barbarous names” given to the cities, towns, rivers and even to men in these sources.⁴³ Greville also repeats this idea in *Monarchy*, where he states that a king’s providence should “adorn Nature’s producements, by the pow’r of Art”. Together with works such as “rebuilding monuments, or towns”, “draining dry of fenns” or “fitting out brooks, and mears for navigation”, there exists a second “more refined” policy that a true monarch should employ.⁴⁴

The founding is of these sweet nurseries,
 Where knowledge and obedience multiply
 The fame and sinews of great monarchies;
 As schools, which finely do between the sence
 And Nature’s large forms, frame intelligence.⁴⁵

These schools, according to Greville, were to “protect the coming ages from that barbarism, which first breeds ignorance, and after schism”. Giving Ancient Rome as a successful example Greville laments the loss of those achievements:

Whence again Rome in all her colonies,
 Even while her eagles march’t, had yet a care,
 To plant the muses in the soldiers’ eyes;
 Such means to move or qualifie they are;
 Where, in the Turks excess of tyranny,
 These dainty Nymphs excel’d for ever be.⁴⁶

Although most of these passages were taken out of *Mustapha* during the revisions, in the final version, the chorus still mentions how, after the Ottoman expansion, the “thrones, schooles, miters, idols” of Europe’s “lett’red Greece” were

43 Knolles, “To the reader” in *Historie*, p. [4].

44 Greville, *Monarchy*, p. 169

45 Ibid., p. 170.

46 Ibid., p. 171.

given up to the Turks.⁴⁷ These passages do not only exemplify how the editing process, as the author explains, left some ideas rather incomplete in the play and thus complicated the representation in the text, but they also help us see that Greville actually employed some prominent stereotypes of the Ottomans in his representation. A close reading of Greville's *Mustapha*, in comparison to the English sources available to him, fails to indicate a prominent difference in the playwright's approach to the Ottomans. Greville, therefore, does not seem to produce a differentiated rhetoric on the Ottomans but rather follows the negative tone of the English histories.

The representation of the Ottoman State

Greville follows his sources in representing the Ottoman state as one that is degenerating, one that has been corrupted and turned into tyranny.⁴⁸ Nicholas de Moffan's slave account, the earliest historical narrative of the death of Mustafa that appeared in Europe, and one of Greville's possible sources, looks into the details of the Ottoman political structure, admiring the way the offices are gained not for wealth or nobility, but for talent and success. Explaining recent corruption in the system and stating that in the past time the best offices were given to the best captains and soldiers, Moffan, very much like an insider, establishes the original superiority of the system, while criticizing the present worsening.⁴⁹ His comments on the degeneration of the Ottoman state structure were repeated by Painter almost word for word: "the manner in the disposition of the same office is now degenerated, for where in time paste the same were bestowed upon the best captain and soldiers, in these days, are through favour and money, thoroughly corrupted".⁵⁰

Knolles as well, at the very end of his history refers to the weakening of the Empire. According to Knolles the Ottomans now are "by their owne persons

47 Greville, *Mustapha*, p. 345.

48 For a discussion of the concept of tyranny in the Elizabethan age, see Armstrong, "The Elizabethan Conception of the Tyrant," *The Review of English Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 87 (Jul., 1946), pp. 161-181.

49 Nicholas de Moffan, *Le meurtre execrable et inhumain commis par Soltan Solyman, grand Seigneur des Turcs, en la personne de son fils aisné Soltan Mustaphe*. trans. I.V. (Paris: J. Caveiller, 1556). [.. pour le jourd'huy est si bien corrompu & amorty par argent & faveur, qu'ils exposent tout en vente au plus offrant...] see, <http://www.sjsu.edu/faculty/danielle.trudeau/Constant/meurtre.html> (accessed June 5, 2015).

50 Painter, *Palace of Pleasure*, p. 666.

farre degenerating from their warlike progenitors, their souldiers generally giving themselves to unwanted pleasures, their ancient discipline of warre neglected, their superstition not with so much zeale as of old regarded, and rebellions in divers parts of his Empire of late strangely raised, and mightily supported".⁵¹ These, Knolles concludes, are the signs of a declining state. Considering Knolles's comments on the strength and discipline of Ottoman soldiers and their "cheerful and almost incredible obedience" to their Sultan while discussing the reasons for the success of the Ottomans, the passage above becomes more revealing.⁵² Knolles, like Moffan, acknowledges the strengths of the Ottoman state in the past, in discussing its worsening condition.

The only work in which Greville openly comments on the current situation of the Ottoman Empire is *Life of Sydney*. In the eighth chapter of this work, Greville touches upon the general evaluations of Sydney on the condition of European countries and reflects on the situation of the Ottoman state as follows:

The Grand Signior asleep in his Saraglia as having turned the ambition of that growing Monarchy into idle lust; corrupted his Martiall discipline; prophaned his Alcoran in making war against his own Church, and not in person, but by his Bashas; consequently by all apparance, declining into his people by such, but more precipitate degrees, as his active Ancestors had climbed above them.⁵³

A similar overall evaluation of the current situation of Ottoman Empire, in comparison with earlier times, resonates in the words of Chorus Secundus:

Great the Seraglia was, I must confess,
Yet so, as kindle did, not quench our spirits:
Our pleasures neuer made our natures lesse;
Venus was ioynd with Mars, to stirrevp merits.⁵⁴

Greville's evaluation of the current state of the Ottoman system in both *Life of Sydney* and *Mustapha* therefore indicates degeneration. Moreover the texts suggest some causes.

51 Knolles, *Historie*, p. 1167.

52 Knolles, "To the reader" in *Historie*, p. [3].

53 Greville, *Life of Sydney*, p. 86.

54 Greville, *Mustapha*, p. 346.

The reasons for the decline

Greville's explanation of this degeneration, both in *Mustapha* and *Monarchy*, is twofold. To start with, Greville presents the deterioration of the Ottoman state system as a result of the personal vices of the rulers, specifically of Suleyman. Achmat, listing the changes that had occurred in the Ottoman state system, blames Solyman for the current situation of the empire:

States trespasse not: tyrants they be that swarue,
And bring upon all Empires, age or death.

...

This monarchie first rose by industrie;
Honor held vp by vniuersall fame,

...

Worth was not proud: authoritie was wise;
And did not on her owne then tyrannize.
Now own'd by humour of this dotard king

...

His will, his end; and Power's right euerywhere:
Now, what can this, but dissolution, beare?⁵⁵

The main cause of this deterioration, as uttered by Achmat, is the long reign of Solyman through which he "stained" people with "ill managing". These comments reveal that Greville does not blame an organic problem in the Ottoman state system. Once a monarchy, Ottoman state system was not genuinely problematic; it is rather the pride and the vices of the rulers that spoiled it and turned it into a tyranny.

Comparing Greville's approach to Suleyman's decision to kill his son to that of his sources is quite revealing on this point. Busbecq, as an experienced diplomat, states that Suleyman indeed had reasons to be suspicious of Mustafa, who was favoured greatly by the Janissaries and in more than one instance reveals the necessity of such a decision.⁵⁶ English histories, on the other hand, explain

55 Ibid., p. 407.

56 Ogie Ghiselin de Busbecq, *The Four Epistles of A. G. Busbequius, Concerning his embassy into Turkey* ... (London: J. Taylor, 1694), pp. 47, 48, and 49.

the reasons for Suleyman's decision in a completely different way. According to Painter, Suleyman consented to "murder" his own son as he was "bewitched". As "tyranny like a lord possessed [Suleyman's] brain" in his wars against the Christians, it "shed the blood of his own begotten". Tyranny, "the regent of his life most wicked", Painter concludes, turned into "the plague of [Suleyman's] own generation".⁵⁷ Rather than this individualized explanation by Painter, Knolles presents a rather general one. According to Knolles the "devilish policy to break and infringe" the laws of "Nature" was one of the qualities that enabled the Ottomans to "spread" their Empire:

As for the kind law of nature, what can be thereunto more contrarie, than for the father most unnaturally to embrue his hands in the bloud of his owne children? ... a common matter among the Ottoman Emperors. All which most execrable and inhumane murders they cover with the pretended safetie of their state, as thereby freed from the feare of all aspiring competitors.⁵⁸

From the explanations that his sources present, Greville favours Knolles's, though without generalizing about the Ottomans. Greville's interpretation of Solyman's decision to kill his son emphasises his absolute and limitless power, as well as his transgression of the natural or eternal law, in full submission to his pride. Chorus Primus depicts the character of the Sultan as one of "disproportioned humors".⁵⁹ Solyman, in pain with suspicion declares "mercy and love" to be the two things that "undermine and limit princes thrones".⁶⁰ Informing his advisor Achmat on his decision to kill Mustafa, Solyman explains his conflict:

And shall loue be a chaine, tyed to my crowne,
 Either to helpe him vp or pull me downe?
 No, no; This father language fits not kings
 'Whose publike, vniuersall prouidence
 'Of things, not persons, alwayes must haue sense.⁶¹

57 Painter, *Palace of Pleasure*, p. 664.

58 Knolles, "To the reader" in *Historie*, p. [3].

59 Greville, *Mustapha*, p. 318.

60 Ibid., p. 325.

61 Ibid., p. 327.

Solyman perceives his dilemma as being a father and a king at the same time, “two states” that he finds mutually exclusive. However, in *Monarchy*, Greville states that a true monarch’s love for his son would be an example, not an obstacle, for his actions as a king.⁶² Solyman’s concern for the state, therefore, is neither praised nor explained as a real necessity in *Mustapha*. On the contrary, putting the blame solely on Solyman, Chorus Secundus laments, with reference to Selim I’s reign, “Had Mustapha beene borne in Selim’s time, What now is fearefull, then had beene sublime”.⁶³

Greville does not only follow Knolles’s lines in questioning the sincerity of the Sultans’ concerns for their state, but he also, through the Chorus of Cadis and Bashas, asks the questions, “Are disproportion’d humors made to please? Can parricide, euen vnto Nature treason, draw any true line from, man’s zenith, reason?”⁶⁴ Solyman’s decision, therefore, is neither justifiable, nor reasonable. The third Chorus of Time explains Solyman’s decision to kill his son only as building a “turret” against the will of God, referring to the idea of the violation of eternal law, in order to perpetuate a temporal institution. Thus Solyman ironically quickens the end of his state by his unnatural, brutal act as he sets an example to his people to change the established order.⁶⁵

The second possible reason for the deterioration of the Ottoman State system, according to both Knolles and Greville, is the over-expansion of the state. Differentiating the expansion of the state in the later period from the expansion in the foundation period of the empire, it seems that Knolles attributes different notions to each. Though violent, the initial period of expansion was still honourable in a way, as it was done through military victory. As this “commendable” and “lawful” expansion was not enough for the Ottomans, explains Knolles, they added more and more to their dominions as they broke the law of Nations:

Their leagues grounded upon the law of Nations, be they with never so strong capitulations concluded, of solemnity of oath confirmed, have with them no longer force than standeth with their owne profit, serving indeed but as snares to entangle other princes in, until they have singled out him whom they purpose

62 Greville, *Monarchy*, p. 12.

63 Greville, *Mustapha*, p. 348.

64 Ibid., p. 318.

65 Rebholz, *The Life of Fulke Greville*, p. 202.

to devour; the rest fast bound still looking on as if their own turne should never come.⁶⁶

A similar differentiation between different phases of Ottoman expansion is also seen in *Mustapha*. Achmat states that in the process of initial expansion Ottoman armies took the lead: “Great ends procur’d our armies greater name: to enemies no iniurie had blame”.⁶⁷ Chorus Secundus also refers to the success of the Ottoman army in the expansion period, contrasting it to the present situation:

Vices, I grant, our martiall course then had:
 For spoile, blood, lust, were therein left too free,
 As raising strong idea’s in the bad,
 Brane instruments of soueraignty
 ...
 Yet, to redeeme this discipline of Vice,
 We adde to the glory of our State;
 Wonne honor by them, to the preiudice
 Of strangers, conquering more than we did hate:
 ...
 Yet all we thus winne, not by force but sleight,
 Poy’sd with our martiall conquests, will lacke weight.”⁶⁸

The Chorus Primus of Bashas and Cadis also describe the second phase of expansion as “catching inferiors” with invisible spider nets.⁶⁹ In a similar tone, Chorus Secundus mentions how the Ottomans “eat the Natiue downe” with “Colonies”.⁷⁰

Over-expansion of the empire, through the ways explained above, is mentioned as one of the reasons of the deterioration of the system by Chorus Secundus.

66 Knolles, “To the reader” in *Historie*, p. [3].

67 Greville, *Mustapha*, p. 407.

68 *Ibid.*, pp. 345-6.

69 *Ibid.*, p. 319.

70 *Ibid.*, p. 314.

FULKE GREVILLE'S MUSTAPHA IN THE CONTEXT OF HIS OTHER WRITINGS AND OF HIS VIEW ON ANGLO-OTTOMAN RELATIONS

And thus our Church, by pulling others' downe,
I feare or'ebuilt itselſe, perchance the crowne.

For, till of late, our Church and prince were one,
No latitude left either to diuide:

...

Now while the crowne and priesthood ioyned thus
In equall ends, though dignities distinct,

...

Crownes, by this tincture of diuine instinct,
So above Nature rais'd the lawes of Might,
As made all errors of the world our right.⁷¹

Rising the ruler's powers above Nature, "which makes kings more than men, men lees then beasts", according to Greville, is the very notion that makes the Ottoman state a "tyranny".⁷² Greville's reference to the present state of the Ottoman Empire as a negative example of the role of laws in a state also reinforces this idea:

Instance the present brutish rapsody
Of mankind under Ottoman's base line,
Where if in one man should assembled be,
Of their well-beings freely to define,
What were it but a liberal commission,
For them, to cast off bondage by sedition.⁷³

Pointing to the two main causes of its present tyrannical nature, the arrogant behavior of rulers and an excess of success, Greville actually completes his aim in writing tragedies, that is, in his own words, to set an example of how "the high waies of ambitious Governours", or the "audacity, advantage, and good successe" of states "hasten to their owne desolation and ruine".⁷⁴

71 Greville, *Mustapha*, p. 345.

72 Greville, *Monarchy*, p. 183.

73 *Ibid.*, p. 114.

74 Greville, *Life of Sydney*, p. 221.

Anglo-Ottoman Traffic

Initially emphasizing the hostility between the Ottoman Empire and Christianity, Greville also refers to the existing *traffique* between the two in *Mustapha*.

Yet by your traffike with this dreaming Nation,
 Their conquer'd Vice hath stain'd our conquering State,
 And brought thinne cobwebs into reputation
 Of tender subtilitie, ...⁷⁵

As mentioned above, Greville represents the Ottoman Empire as in decline and points to the excessive expansion of their lands, through the “art of tyranny” rather than the success of their armies, as one of the reasons for their impending doom. The lines above re-state the shift in Ottoman ways, from being a conquering state, to that of “subtility”. As Ottomans “learned civility” from Christians, they also learned “how to fall”.⁷⁶ These, according to Greville were the results of Ottoman expansion.

In the seventeenth chapter of the *Life of Sydney*, elaborating on Elizabethan foreign policy, Greville touches upon the reasons for and results of Anglo-Ottoman relations. Elizabeth, according to Greville, had a reputation of “restraining the unnatural ambition of getting other princes rights” and she was known as so “even amongst the heathen”.⁷⁷ She had always been, Greville states, “more ambitious in balancing neighbour Princes from invading one another” than in trying to “conquer upon foreign Princes possessions”.⁷⁸ Here Elizabeth is clearly described in contrast to the Spanish king, whom Greville accuses of planning to “have all the Western parts of the world”. What made his plans more “probable” was not only the “Indian” mines, from where the gold was coming for the Spanish armies, but also his ways of influencing the “chief councils” of both “Christian and Heathen princes” through “corrupting, and terrifying” them.⁷⁹ In contrast to the imperial ambitions of the Spanish, Elizabeth was rather respectful of the rights of smaller kingdoms.

75 Greville, *Mustapha*, p. 347.

76 Ibid., p. 348.

77 Greville, *Life of Sydney*, p. 212.

78 Ibid., p. 80.

79 Ibid., p. 87.

Greville points out that Elizabeth, with this reputation,

destroy'd a nest, which this aspiring Monarch began to build in the Seraglio of Constantinople; For she thinking it no wisdome to look on, and see his Spanish pistols pierce into so high a mountaine of Forces, and dispose of them at his pleasure, providently opened the stronger Monarchs eyes to discover how craftily the weaker wrought his ends at the cost of all defective, or sleepy Princes about her.⁸⁰

Elizabeth's diplomatic moves towards the Ottomans, Greville's sentences reveal, were known to be in reality a move against the Spanish, whom Greville accused of "corrupting" the councils of other states. While Ottoman Sultan was unaware of the "nest" the Spanish were forming in the palace, the English, thanks to the efforts of the Queen, woke him up to see the crafty tricks of "this aspiring [Spanish] monarch". Read in the light of Greville's comments in *Life of Sydney*, the contrast made here between the "stronger" and the "weaker" Spanish monarch is reminiscent of the words of Chorus Secundus, who complained of great states "learning civility of petty kingdoms", which in the end causes the ruin of a great state.⁸¹

Besides, this good reputation of Elizabeth among the Ottomans enables her to rival Spanish traders in the eastern Mediterranean⁸² and helps her to get Ottoman support against the Spanish:

Besides which reputation given to her name by the Grand Signior in this particular, she generally got power to keep this fearfull Standard of the halfe Moon waving in such manner over all the King of Spaines designs, as he durst move no where against his Neighbour-Chriftian-Princes, for feare of being incompassed within the horns of the heathen Crescent.⁸³

Setting Anglo-Ottoman relations in the context of the background of rivalry with Spain, Greville explains how successfully Elizabeth managed to side with the "fearfull Standard of the halfe moon" that would hopefully one day crush the Spanish. The adjectives Greville uses, even when he is directly talking about Anglo-Ottoman relations, does not reveal anything positive about the Ottoman

80 Ibid., p. 212.

81 Greville, *Mustapha*, p. 348.

82 Greville, *Life of Sydney*, pp. 212-13.

83 Ibid., p. 213.

state. The only important characteristic of this state, according to Greville's evaluation, is its brutal power, which the English might need against their capital enemy, the Spanish. Harshly critical of Spanish imperialism, Greville's words on the dangerous position of the Venetians in the previous chapters, help us understand how he positions these states in general: "The Venetians again, foreseeing with their Aristocraticall jealousie, that their Estate had onely two pregnant dangers hanging over it; the one Eastward from the grand Signior, who easily moves not his encompassing half Moon; the other Westward from this Solyman of Spain whose unsatiabable ambition, they knew."⁸⁴ Calling the Spanish king "Solyman" not only indicates Greville's hatred of Spain, but also reveals the resemblance he sees between these two states as enemies of Christendom as a result of their ambitions.

Conclusion

As the discussion above indicates, Greville's representation of the Ottomans in *Mustapha* does not reproduce a nuanced discourse that emerged as a result of ongoing Anglo-Ottoman relations. Greville's approach to the history of the religio-military confrontations between Christians and Muslims, as well as his references to the commonplaces of the Turk as a perpetual threat to Christendom and as the Turk as the new barbarian not only indicate that he follows the hostile rhetoric of the English histories closely, but also reveals his concerns for the future of the relations between two parties.

The lengthy political discussions of the Choruses both in the last version of *Mustapha* and in *Monarchy* indicate Greville's genuine interest in the Ottoman State, its history and its relations with Europe. Greville's representation of the Ottoman State in *Mustapha*, as a state that is made into a tyranny, either by the vices of the contemporary rulers or by excessive expansion, might possibly result from his aim of following the histories then available to him, especially Knolles's *The General History of the Turks* as well as his aim of discussing "larger issues" through his tragedies. The rapid and excessive growth of the Ottoman dominions, as well as the vices of the recent Sultans, are made the main causes of the degeneration of the Ottoman system that presaged its decline and fall.

Finally, taking into consideration Greville's comments on the issue in *Monarchy* and *Life of Sydney* when discussing the representation of the Ottoman-Christian

⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 102.

traffic in *Mustapha*, it becomes apparent that Greville discusses Anglo-Ottoman relations within the broader frame of Anglo-Spanish rivalry. His comments on Spanish attempts to manipulate other states and Elizabeth's pragmatic move towards the Ottomans to change the balance of power within these relations confirms his hatred, not only of the Spanish and their imperial ambitions, but also of the Ottomans and their vicious ways against the Christians.

Dealing With Tyranny: Fulke Greville's Mustapha in the Context of His Other Writings and of His View on Anglo-Ottoman Relations

Abstract ■ *Mustapha*, the tragedy by Fulke Greville depicting the execution of the eldest son of Suleyman the Magnificent, has received increasing attention in recent research on representations of the Eastern "other." Unlike earlier works treating *Mustapha* as an anti-absolutist work with an only incidental Ottoman context, recent studies have underlined Greville's seemingly balanced depiction of the Ottomans, showing both good and bad Ottoman characters. Accepting and elaborating on the actual importance of the Ottoman context in *Mustapha*, the present article challenges these recent studies. First, it compares *Mustapha* to the literary and narrative sources available to Greville and concludes that Greville does not produce a more nuanced rhetoric such as has been argued to exist in other early modern English plays. Second, taking Greville's two other narrative works into account, it argues that his representation of the Ottoman Empire in *Mustapha* is closely connected to his overall evaluation of it as a political theorist.

Keywords: Fulke Greville, representation of the Ottoman Empire in English plays, early modern Anglo-Ottoman relations, Şehzade Mustafa

Bibliography

- Burton, Jonathan: "Anglo-Ottoman Relations and the Image of the Turk in Tamburlaine," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, XXX, 1 (2000), pp. 125-156.
- Burton, Jonathan: *Traffic and Turning Islam and English Drama 1579-1624*, Cranbury: Rosemont Publishing 2005.
- Busbecq, Ogier Ghiselin de: *Itinera Constantinopolitanvm et Amasianvm ab Augerio Gisle-nio Busbecquij ...*, Antverpiae [Antwerp]: Ch. Plantin 1581.

- Busbecq, Ogier Ghiselin de: *The Four Epistles of A. G. Busbequius, Concerning his embassy into Turkey ...*, London: J. Taylor 1694.
- Çavuşoğlu, Mehmet: "Şehzâde Mustafa Mersiyeleri," *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi*, XII (1982), pp. 641-686.
- Dollimore, Jonathan: *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Dramas of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*, Brighton: The Harvester Press 1989.
- Goughe, Hugh: *The Offspring of the House of Ottomano, and officers to the greate Turke. Whereunto is added Bartholomaeus Georgieviz Epitome of the Customs, Rytes, ceremonies and Religion of the Turkes, with the miserable affliction of those Christians whiche live under their captivitie and bondage. In the ende also is adjoined the manner how Mustafa, eldest sonne of Soltan Soliman, twelfth Empeureur of the Turkes was murdered by his father in the yere of our Lorde 1553, all Englished by Hugh Goughe*, London: T. Marshe 1569/1570.
- Greville, Fulke: *A Treatise of Monarchy in The Works in Verse and Prose Complete of the Right Honorable Fulke Greville*, ed. Alexander B. Grosart, 1870, pp. 5-235.
- Greville, Fulke: *Life of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. Nowell Smith, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1907.
- Greville, Fulke: *Mustapha in The Works in Verse and Prose Complete of the Right Honorable Fulke Greville*, ed. Alexander B. Grosart, 1870, pp. 295-417.
- Hasan Beyzâde Ahmed Paşa: *Hasan Beyzâde Tarihi*, ed. Şevki Nezihi Aykut, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basım Evi 2004.
- İbrahim Peçevi: *Peçevi Tarihi*, ed. Murat Uraz, İstanbul: Neşriyat Yurdu 1968.
- Knolles, Richard: *The Generall Historie of the Turkes, from The first beginning of that Nation to the rising of the Othoman Familie with all the notable expeditions of the Christian against them. Together with the Lives and Conquests of the Othoman Kings and Emperours. Faithfully collected out of the best Histories, both auntient and modern, and digested into one continual Historie Until this present Yeare 1603*, London: A. Islip 1603.
- McJannet, Linda: *The Sultan Speaks. Dialogue in English Plays and Histories about the Ottoman Turks*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan 2006.
- Moffan, Nicholas de: *Le meurtre execrable et inhumain commis par Soltan Solyman, grand Seigneur des Turcs, en la personne de son fils aîné Soltan Mustaphe*. trans. I.V. Paris: J. Caveiller 1556). [.. pour le jourd'huy est si bien corrompu & amorty par argent & faveur,qu'ils exposent tout en vente au plus offrant...],
- <http://www.sjsu.edu/faculty/danielle.trudeau/Constant/meurtre.html> (accessed June 5, 2015).
- Moffan, Nicholas de: *Soltani Solymani, Turcarum Imperatoris, horrendum facinus, scelerato in proprium filium, natu maximum, Soltanum Mustapham, parricidio, anno domini 1553 patratum*, Basileae [Basel]: I. Oporini 1555.

FULKE GREVILLE'S MUSTAPHA IN THE CONTEXT OF HIS OTHER WRITINGS AND OF HIS VIEW ON ANGLO-OTTOMAN RELATIONS

- Müneccimbaşı Ahmed Dede: *Sahâifü'l-Ahbâr fi Vekâyi-ül-a'sâr*, trans. İsmail Erünsal, İstanbul: Tercüman [n.d.].
- Nişancı Mehmed Paşa: *Hadisât*, ed. Enver Yaşarbaş, İstanbul: Kit-san Matbaacılık 1983.
- Norbrook, David: *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*, London: Routledge and Paul 1984.
- Painter, Thomas: "A Horrible and Cruell Murder of Soltan Solyman," Joseph Haslewood (ed.), *The Second Tome of the Palace of Pleasure*, 1813, pp. 663-683.
- Painter, William: *The Second Tome of the Palace of Pleasure, contayning more of goodlye Histories, Tragical matters, and other Morall argumentes, very requisite for delight and profyite*, London: T. Marshe 1567.
- Rebholz, Ronald A.: *The Life of Fulke Greville, First Lord Brooke*, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1971.
- Rees, Joan: *Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke, 1554 – 1628: A Critical Biography*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul 1971.
- Rigali, Amanda: "The Plays of Fulke Greville in Context," unpubl. Ph.D. thesis, King's Colledge, London, 2000.
- Röder, Katrin: "Intercultural 'Traffique' in Fulke Greville's *Mustapha*," *Literature Compass*, XI, 8 (2014), pp. 560–572.
- Roscoe, Brett: "On Reading Renaissance Closet Drama: A Reconsideration of the Chorus in Fulke Greville's *Alaham* and *Mustapha*," *Studies in Philology*, CX, 4 (2013), pp. 762-788.
- Schmuck, Stephan: "Politics of Anxiety: The imago turci in early modern English prose, c. 1550 – 1620," unpubl. Ph.D. thesis, University of Wales, Aberystwyth, 2007.
- Solakzâde Mehmed Hemdemî Çelebi: *Solakzâde Tarihi*, ed. Vahid Çabuk, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları 1989.
- Wilkes, G. A. (Ed.): *The Complete Poems and Plays of Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke (1554-1628)*, in *Two Volumes*, G. A. Lewiston, Queenston, Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press 2008.
- Yermolenko, Galina I.: "Roxolana in Europe," Galina I. Yermolenko (ed.), *Roxolana in European Literature, History and Culture*, Farnham: Ashgate 2010, pp. 23-55.