



# The Courageous Ottoman in Goffe's *Amurath I* (1619)

Fahd Mohammed Taleb Al-Olaqi

Department of English & Translation, Faculty of Science & Arts – Khulais

University of Jeddah, Jeddah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

E-mail: falolaqi@uj.edu.sa

Doi: 10.7575/aiac.all.v.7n.6p.168

Received: 14/09/2016

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.7n.6p.168>

Accepted: 10/11/2016

## Abstract

Thomas Goffe favorably represents the image of Sultan Murad I. The presence of the Turkish Sultan serves to highlight the political and cultural significance. The play depicts the disappearance of the cultural, ethnic, and religious boundaries between the Turks and the English. In the tragedy, the Ottoman Amurath loves his wife, Eumorphe. However, his Machiavellian tutor Lala Schahin persuades Amurath to murder her and depart to martial invasions. The legend Eumorphe is a symbol of Ottoman despotism in Europe. The play points on Amurath's mortal stand and his atrocities towards Christians which is punished by the Serbian assignation. The show accomplishes with the first Battle of Kosovo, in which Amurath is successful but is slain by the Serbian protagonist Cobelitz. According to the Ottoman tradition, his elder son Bajazet gets to the top but then he is enforced to slay his younger brother to avoid his rivalry for the authority.

**Keywords:** Goffe, Turk, Ottoman, Murad I/Amurath I, Eumorphe, Mahomet, Cobelitz.

## 1. Introduction

The sultanic image of the Great Turk on Elizabethan stage is exotic. The presentation of "the Turk" in Elizabethan art and in the Western imagination is complex and does not lend itself to orderly reductions (Harper, 2011:7). The Ottoman Sultans primarily symbolized the Orient in the English Renaissance against the superiority of the Occident. Vitkus agrees with Maclean when he writes, "English authors writing before 1600 express imperial envy, ambition, desire, and fantasy" (Vitkus, 1997:3). Elizabethan travelers describe Constantinople as "the most beautiful city of the world", the "imperial" place with its triangular shape, the magnificence of the monuments and ruins (Gainsford, 1618:262; Sandys, 1610: 570). In the early sixteenth century, The Turkish geographic territory strongly expanded the Ottoman worldview and played a fundamental role in determining the Turks' ideological and strategic objectives as they strived with their imperial competitors from the West (Casale, 2010:8). However, Thomas Goffe's *Amurath I* (1619) portrays the Ottoman Sultans as good politicians with a high range of consultants like Agas and military commanders, which indicates the decision-makers influence on the Ottoman Sultan to take decisions. Even among the most enthusiastic rivals of the Ottoman royal house, a mutual understanding occurs to a certain extent. The impact of the Turkish politicians is great on the imperial policy. Therefore, the transmission of people, philosophies, technologies, and merchandises, martial coalitions and viable contracts, is globally the most standard of that time to the Ottoman Sultan.

The Ottoman material has considerable inspiration on English Drama. There is a classic collection of the great Ottoman Sultans as a sign of the Elizabethan interest in the Orient (Al-Olaqi, 2013:37). The dramatists entirely admired the military adventures of the Ottoman sultans. The Turks are generally represented as valiant, proud-spirited, and cruel. There is almost a universal admiration for their valor (Wann, 1915:440). For instance, some great Elizabethan plays take the titles of Ottoman names and are established in Constantinople, such as Kyd's *Soliman and Perseda* (1588), George Peele's *Turkish Mahomet* (1595), Robert Greene's *Selimus* (1594), Lodowick Carlell's *Osmond the Great Turk* (1637), Thomas Mason's *The Turk* (1610), Fulke Greville's *Mustapha* (1606), and *Alaham* (written c. 1600) and Thomas Goffe's *Amurath the First* (1619) and *Bajazet* (1618). These plays and their "Turkish" properties draw on a range of understanding in this field, but most significantly, they establish an important modern move in theatre themes. In dealing with Turkish chronological shows, many academics believe to be antiquated to a prominence on how businesses worked, in which scholars have drawn attention to the significance of distinguishing that early modern theatre was a collective enterprise. One of the numerous magnitudes of the fascination was that in the last years of the sixteenth century and the early years of the seventeenth century, a considerable amount of the auditorium production became extremely influenced by the progress of Anglo-Ottoman association. The consequence was a compound artistic, ethical, and commercial phenomenon (Matar (1998); Vitkus (2000, 2003). Clearly, the interest in the Turks was stronger than in any other Oriental race (Wann, 1915:439). There is no doubt about the popularity of the "Oriental matter," especially the Ottoman Turk, during the early modern period in England. The appearance of forty-seven plays dealing with the Oriental issues between the years 1579 and 1642 testifies to this. Louis Wann divides the High Renaissance into four major groups, wherein the second group, covering from 1586 to 1611, is evidently the greatest momentous one since 32 displays out of 47 were inscribed in this time (Wann, 1915:424-426). The charm with the Ottoman Empire made

straight the substantial Elizabethan dramatists such as Marlowe, Greene, Peele, Dekker and Shakespeare to inscribe shows coping with the Ottomans and their domination. Wann states that:

With the plays of the period distributed thus widely among the important playwrights of the time, we are justified in the assertion that the production of oriental plays was not due to the fancy of any one author or group of authors, but that the interest of the Elizabethans was so considerable as to induce a majority of the main playwrights to write at least one play dealing with oriental matter (Wann, 1915:427).

Elizabethan writings were under the impact of the new history of the rise of the Ottoman Empire. Linda McJanet states that the English translated or written histories of the Turks between 1542 and 1600, endorse that European Christians were charmed by the Ottoman greatness and their customs (McJanet, 2006:60). The Turks are generally represented as valiant, proud-spirited, and cruel. There is almost a universal admiration for their valor (Wann, 1915:440). They also appreciated the Ottomans for unity, martial excellence, strict justice, and qualities, which they occasionally felt were missing in their own cultures (Wann, 1915:460). Thomas Goffe ascribes Amurath and the other Turks within their Islamic religious and ethnic broadmindedness. Goffe's interests in the Ottoman Orientalism would undergo a dramatic shift upon producing an English adaptation of a Turkish tragedy that not only gained the approval of the people as a whole, but aroused an excited enthusiasm such as no other productions of the English theatre had quite equaled. Thomas Goffe's *Amurath the First* (1619) formed types of revenge tragedy with separate bases and development. These are the Grevillian tragedy in which the protagonist is a hero who is a revenger of blood and the Marlovian tragedy in which the protagonist is a villain, who may or may not be a revenger in a play in which revenge takes an active part in resolving the catastrophe. Goffe has emphasized on the Turkish moral and sexual illegitimacy. His play treats Amurath with caustic irony, rhetorical additions, and larger-than-life portrayals, which has more complicate reactions to the main dramatic persons. Amurath murders his wife to prove his constant promise to his Turks to launch a deadly campaign of terror on the Christians. In fact, his wife's love threatens his inspiration towards Europe. As a punishment, the invincible Amurath is too easily defeated. Therefore, the bravery depiction for Amurath as he cold-bloodedly pursues the Christian Serbians, and then, is pleased when he meets his end by the dying Serbian leader. Or it is possible to depict the bloody tyrant Bajazet while simultaneously shocking the audience by his slaughter to his brother.

## 2. Goffe's Amurath, the First

Goffe admirably speaks of the image of Sultan Murad I (1362- 1389) and the Ottomans' military and political success, but when he came to power, he executed all of his brothers, which started a practice where each successive sultan similarly executed all of his brothers, the other competitors for the throne. This practice persisted for 200 years (Imber, 2002: 97-8). Murad I was historically wise, valiant and of high courage. He attached many European territories to his Empire (Inalcik, 2006:156-164). The Sultan was a noble and absolute ruler with a politically effective power. Thomas Goffe's *Amurath the First* (1619) represents the disposition of the Ottoman Sultan Murad I. The image of Sultan Murad I also appears in George Peele's *The Battle of Alcazar* (1588-89), and in Robert Greene's *Alphonsus* (1599). Through Goffe's play, Amurath is honored numerous times, with qualities or titles such as 'mightie', the 'Emperor of the East', the 'Emperor of the World' and 'God of earthly kings'. In fact, during the Middle Ages, Islamic conquests had stood at the entrance of Europe. The Ottoman Empire has surfaced as an amalgam of many cultures and traditions (Goffman, 2004:8). The Ottoman Empire's legitimacy, however, is rooted in Islam. By the Ottoman conquest of most Arab lands in 1516-17, the Ottoman State exhibits itself as the protector of Islam (Goffman, 2004:73).

In presenting Amurath's invasions as concurrently distressing and enviable, Goffe reproduces the contradiction of English attitudes toward the Ottomans as defined by many recent scholars, including Emily Bartels, Richmond Barbour, and Linda McJanet. For instance, Bartels notes that 'while the demonization of Oriental rulers provided a highly charged impetus for England's own attempts to dominate the East, their valorization provided a model for admiration and imitation, shaming or schooling the English into supremacy, or providing an excuse for defeat' (Bartels, 1992:5). McJanet observes that the individual qualities for which early modern European historians admired the Ottomans'

itself. The theme of Murad's assassination by a Serb after the battle of Kosovo offers a material for the climax of the last act of Goffe's episodic play (O'Malley, 1979).

Goffe seems a Turk-lover. Emrah Safa Gurkan finds that the diplomatic relationship between Turkey and Europe was not a constant enmity and encounter. The Ottomans have employed Christians comprehensively and encouraged European businessmen to trade in the Levant. For instance, there are numerous alliances between the Ottomans and the Christian states. This cooperation has blurred the cultural boundaries and enabled the flow of people, ideas, technologies and goods from one civilization to another (Gurkan, 2010:1). Knolles similarly proves the motives for the overall denunciation of Christendom and Europe's allure with the Ottoman Turks. Likewise, in the general introduction, he sums up the causes for the 'Ottoman' victory. Knolles remarks that the Christian fighters were 'untrained' serving rather for "shew and filling up of number" than for consumption and "in no respect could be compared with the Turk Janissaries" (Knolles, 1610:"Introduction"). Further than this, the Christian Europeans have battled amid themselves in place of the Turks. Though, there are also potentials on the part of the Turks that have donated to their achievement:

First, in them is to be noted an ardent and infinite desire of soveraignty [sovereignty], where with they have long since promised unto themselves the monarchie [monarchy] of the whole world[...]Then, such a rare unities [unity] and agreement amongst them, as well as in the manner of their religion(if it be so to bee[be] called) as in matter concerning their state [...] joyne [join] unto this their courage, conceived by the wonderfull successe [wonderful success] of their perpetuall fortune; their notable vigilancie, in taking the advantage of every occasion for the enlarging of their Monarchie; their frugalitie and temperatenesse in their diet and other manner of living; their carefull observing of their ancient Military Discipline, their cheerfull and almost incredible obedience unto their Princes and Sultans; such, as in that point no Nation in the world was to be worthily compared unto them[...] whereunto may be added the two strongest finewes of every well governed Commonwealth; Reward propounded to the good, and punishment threatened unto the offender (Knolles, 1610:"Introduction").

The play may invert the construction of the political associations of the Elizabethan government with the imperial power of the Ottoman Turks. In history, Queen Elizabeth I (1558-1603) and James I (1603-1625) had established progressively and reasonably respectable profitable and administrative associations with the Ottoman State. Hence, she acknowledged the profits of alliance with the Turks, both to challenge the power of Catholic Spain in the Mediterranean Sea and to improve access to the Levant business. In the late 1570s, the English Queen corresponded with Murad III, filling out that she, like the Great Turk, was an antagonist of 'all kind of idolatries' (Skilliter, 1977:69). Formal ambassadorial relationships were proven in 1581, comprising an English representative in Istanbul, trading privileges, and legal protection for English merchants in Turkish territories. The communication between Sultan Murad III and Queen Elizabeth I was counted in the two descriptions of Richard Hakluyt's *Principal Voyages and Navigations of the English Nation*. The accounts point to a perception of the Ottoman Turk, who is well-maintained as a esteemed equal rather than an inferior "other" (Burton, 2000:130-131). R.W. Southern has found that the growing wealth of Europe and the sluggish failure of the great Turkish Empire made a growth of more materialistic attitude on the world and particularly on Elizabethans (Southern, 1978:13). Elizabethan England upgraded ties and reciprocal assistance in martial institution. As a result, some Englishmen converted to Islam and many English soldiers fought side by side with the Turkish armies against European countries. The English ambassador William Harborne also attended with the Turkish Sultan Amurath (Murad) III (1574-1595) on a military operation (Matar, 1998:226; Chew, 1965:157). The Turkish Sultan Amurath III was an anathema to Englishmen, as his name became a byword for tyranny. Shakespeare's prejudice is linked to his outlook against the Ottoman Domain. Prince Harry looks down on the Turks and their ruler. Prince Harry says:

...you mix your sadness with some fear,  
This is the English, not the Turkish courts;  
Not Amurath an Amurath succeeds,  
But Harry Harry. (2 *Henry IV*. 5.2.46-49)

The image of Sultan Murad appears also in Greene's *Alphonsus*. Greene's Amurath fundamentally represents Islam who is also humiliated and defeated by the Christian hero Alphonsus. Goffe seems singularly fascinated by the Ottoman figure Amurath I and his son Bajazet II. Goffe has certainly drawn assessments to the courageous and outrageous protagonists of his plays. The tyrant Sultans are given a privilege with his depiction to themselves as courageous, which are difficult for the spectators to catch any established viewpoint from which to make up a judgment of the great protagonists. The bloody raging Bajazet II is dreadfully trying to hold onto his power by plotting his own sons.

Many critics consider Goffe's interest in the Turkish history as a fascination in the devils. Fredson Bowers notes that 'Goffe appears to be fascinated with the reputed evil of the Turks and their insatiable greed' (Bowers, 1987:157). Goffe's *The Courageous Turk or Amurath I* has institutes some disapproving criticism. It has been termed "all but unendurable" because of its "outrageous rant and bombast" by Felix Shelling in *Elizabethan Drama* (1908) and also called a "repulsive bombast" by Adolphus Ward in *A History of English Dramatic Literature to the Death of Queen Anne* (1875). Nonetheless, *The Courageous Turk's* spectators in the seventeenth-century enjoyed the play because of the

attractiveness of the Great Sultan Amurath, the elegant staging, the theme of Turkish account, and Goffe's idea about the weakness of kings and the eventual reward given to Christians who battled against earth's pagans (Bowers, 1987:115-122). On the other hand, the evil deeds of Amurath are exciting to the story, especially when it seeks the sultan's Greek wife Eumorphe.

### 3. The Killing of Eumorphe

The legend of Sultan Mohamet killing his virtuous wife, the Christian Greek Hiren, is pathetic in English Drama. George Peele's tragedy of love *Turkish Mahomet and Hiren the Fair Greek* (1594) has evoked the same theme in Goffe *Amurath I* (1619), Kyd's *Soliman* (1599), Shakespeare's *Othello* (1603), Lodowick Cadell's *Osmond* (1637), and also Gilbert Swinhoe's *The Unhappy Fair Irene* (1658), Charles Goring's *Irene, or the Fair creek* (1708), and Samuel Johnson's *Irene* (1749). Thomas Goffe seems fascinated by the episode to include it as a sub-plot in *Amurath I*. The Turkish critic, Sila Senlen remarks that 'Goffe has united bits and pieces from the biography of two Ottoman sultans, the conquest of Constantinople 'Mohamet' and his descendant 'Amurath' alongside supplementary scenes such as masques, the consumption of Senecan features such the Aga, Lala Schahin being hidden as the ghost of Amurath's father and the fiends that act on the Battle of Kosovo and inventions (Senlen, 2010:49-63). In the introductory scenes of the show, Amurath is opposed by the aggression of the Ottoman courtiers as his fascination in the European wife is presented to have made him idle in war (Khan, 2011:167). Goffe's legend misused the love of Amurath to his wife in a negative way as the Christian Greek woman has conquered Ottoman Sultan which was common in the history of the Turkish Sultans such as Soliman and Mehmet II (Slotkin, 2009: 225). The European wives of the two Sultans lived happy in the company of the Sultans (Knolles, 1610: 350). Like Goffe's *The Courageous Turk*, other characters related to the Oriental World murder their darling wives, which happens in Lodowick Cadell's *Osmond the Great Turk*, and also in the extensively notorious, *Othello*.

Goffe displays the Sultan Amurath indulging in a violent sexual lust. The author emphasizes that the Turks' sexual activity is not only conventional but also inborn in the very nature of their sexual norms. Amurath might just be setting the example for the rest of the Turkish rulers to emulate him. The sexual orientation of the ruler was as unchallengeable as the ruler himself (Matar, 1999:118). The notion of the violent Muslim had been carried over from the Middle Ages to Europe of the Renaissance and the Reformation in the form of the cruel and barbaric Turk (Schwoebel, 1967:166). Goffe proclaims that among the Turks there was a niche carved by the Ottoman sultans themselves for unnatural sex by keeping a high number of concubines in their palaces. This impure and unnatural sex is associated with murder and both would lead the Turks to everlasting damnation, and thus, death seals the fate of the sinful Turk. The lustful Sultan establishes the model of the abnormal sexuality of the Turks in the Renaissance imagination.

The fantasies of the Oriental male with Oriental Occidental are sightseen in their manners. European allusions in classical literature and philosophy refer to the Turks who have conquered the land of the Greeks, and absorbed the learning of the Greeks, they have fallen under the spell of Greek unnatural lust (Matar 1999:120). The play depicts the Ottoman admiration of the European beauty which is represented in Amurath's fascination with Eumorphe, a Non-Muslim beautiful concubine, who triumphs over Amurath's heart and mind: "A Supposed Victory by Amurath \Obtain'd in Greece, where many captives taken,\One among the rest, IRENE ["Eumorphe" in play], conquers him" (1-3). Eumorphe is originally a Christian captive but she appears as a converted Muslim since there is no reference to its Christianity. Moreover, despite the Islamic nature of the Ottoman State, the government had ruled over at least as many Christians as Muslims, and had contended with chiefly Catholic foes (Goffman, 2004:99). However, the encounter between Christian and Muslim powers draws the Oriental despotism which was beyond the political matter of repressive administration as stranded in deep-reaching anxieties that go beyond legislations and even beyond the East-West association. This idea has a pedigree of many centuries since the Abrahamic way of submission to God the Creator. The early Ottoman Sultans had established their claims to legitimacy on historical backgrounds as frontier *gazis*, or fighters of the faith involved in a holy fight against the infidels of Byzantium (Boxer, 1985: 57). Amurath's love also changes his political attitudes, producing him to discard the ethical authority of kingship: Amurath says,

I might overcome more Kingdomes; have more dominion  
Enthroned my selfe an Emperor! oth' world,  
I might! I might! Amurath thou mightst! (2.3.47-9)

He asks his tutor Lala Schahin to arrange a masque depicting how the Gods once loved. In the scene, his tutor reflects his dissatisfaction concerning Amurath's engagement in love:

No more King now: poor Subject AMVRATH,  
Whom I have seen break through a Troope of Men,  
Like lightning from a Cloud:  
[...] now lies lurking in a womans arms  
Drencht in the Lethe of Ignoble lust [lust] (1.2.93-100)

The dissatisfaction by the alluring lady, who has produced Amurath to be disdained and laughed at by his subjects resolves that "[...] blood, not water must wash off this stain" (1.ii.115). In the beginning, Amurath defines war as a

violent ambition but then becomes a violent megalomaniac as he yields to that ambition. In this scene of the play, before his tutor Schahin works as an Iago figure, who unleashes Amurath's violent passions, causing in the shocking manifestation of Eumorphe's amputation and making Amurath's wicked and ruined effort to conquer the world. Vitkus argues for this analysis of the play saying "the irony is that Amurath, like Othello, has been "wrought" upon by a male follower who succeeds in turning him against the virtuous woman he loves and in bringing on his death and damnation. In both cases, dramatic irony exposes the murderer's misogynist code as damnable and deadly to himself" (Vitkus, 2003:101).

Goffe's Amurath looks to be interested in his stereotypically Turkish passions as both a lover and a warrior. As the play starts, the fiendish Amurath exaggeratedly proclaims his comprehensive rejection to the passion of lust: 'Jove Ile outbrave thee! melt thy selfe in Lust ... Ile not envie thee' (1.1.25-7). When Amurath turns to military conquest, he shows in the same way intense passion. Schahin offers Amurath the severed heads of Christians 'to adde freshe oyle unto thy hate,\And make it raise it selfe a greater flame' (3.2.13-14), and Amurath replies with pleasure as this his habit to do, 'O how it glads me thus to pash their braines,\To rend their lockes, to teare these Infidels!' (3.2.23-4). He constantly states a wish to drink the Christian blood (3.2.44 and 4.2.89). Therefore, Amurath becomes immorally lustful deviant, and violent monster.

The Aga Schahin appears as a malevolent tyrant. Lewis remarks in the age of Murad II "whatever oppression and corruption there in this country is due to scholars" (Lewis, 1987: 135). The Aga has the highest post in the Ottoman spiritual profession and the hierarchy of sultanic law which has been fundamentally regularized and systematized. The tutor Aga is munificent rather than malicious. He leads the accomplishment mainly by teaching the Sultan to kill his wife. Whatever clemency and pity Amurath suggests depend on the state loyalty as opposed to God's grace, and likewise, they also rely on his own intervention and plots. Therefore, in a disgusting bloody scene Amurath crosses off Eumorphe's skull in the attendance of the Turkish lords and yields to his prior self: "...in her Bed/Before his Councils face, strikes off her head./Then ruining former bloody broyles" (II.v.6-8). Amurath has lost every sense of his humanity in unjustly killing innocent spouse while sleeping. His ironic love smashed his modesty and mortality. With regard to Goffe's show, Eumorphe has superior qualities which grasp Amurath and his mind. In contrast, he has deceived his wife in love and he claims that he is unable to find his interest in warfare, that clues to stories and opposition amongst the dignity and military generals:

For taken with her love, he sounds retreat,  
Eternally from Warre; but after, mov'd  
With murmur of his Nobles. (2.5.4-6)

Concerning the dissatisfaction of the Turkish nobles and soldiers, Goffe depends on Knolles in reporting the Turkish criticism on Sultan Mehmed II's engagement with personal affairs and discontinuing wars in Europe (Senlen, 2010:54). Goffe estimates Knolles' words on sultan Mehmed II responses to the Turkish criticism to him: "*I understand of your great discontentment & that you all murmur & grudge, for that I, overcome with mine affections toward this so faire a paragon, cannot withdraw myself from her presence:*", requesting them what they would ensure if they were in "*possession a thing so rare and precious, so lovely and so faire*" (Knolles, 1610:353). The episode is utilized to explore the Sultan's religion. Following the battle in Thracia Amurath asks Schahin if his armed forces have 'slaine\ A thousand superstitious Christian soules' (3.2.4-5) and discusses how he will 'Make them stoope to us' (3.2.6). His dictatorship is then related unambiguously to his religion once again as he proclaims that:

.. Now I will be a *Turke*,  
And to our Prophets altars do I vow,  
That to his yoke I will all necks subdue,  
Or in their throates my bloody sword imbrew. (3.2.9-12)

The passage represents the early modern image of any Islamic prince as a tyrant who rules by will and appetite, committing foolish acts in the name of honor or Islam. Given that the expression 'Now I will be a *Turke*' is synonymous to 'turning Turk,' which indicates a Christian's transformation to Islam. For Christians, it is a turning from the morals of Christianity and its European nation. Goffe provides the Elizabethan audience with a divinely authoritative explanation of how unnatural sexuality had invented and an assurance of damnation for the Muslim Turks. It is a misleading picture of the religion of the Turks. A number of Elizabethan plays that damn Islam are pensive with main characters turning against those in their family or within their own clan, which ends up in the self-destruction. Two of the plays, *Othello* and *The Courageous Turk*, examine the feature of the phrase 'turning Turk.' Shakespeare's *Othello* refers to the phrase as a sign to cross the red-lines and killing his wife over false accounts. Vitkus remarks that 'this sort of stock character has a long history, going back to the [Islamic] Moorish villains of the romance tradition and the stage tyrants of medieval drama. Once Othello gives way to his jealous will and "tyrannous hate" (3.3.450), the audience sees him transformed into a version of the Islamic tyrant' (Vitkus, 2003:171). Historically, an uprising affair in Murad's life was the rebellion of his son-in-law Aladin, King of Caramania, and allowed him to rule in his own dominion as his vassal while he decides to resume war, although he is eventually moved by pity at one point to exercise mercy toward them

(Pasini, 2011:216). Knolles remarks that Sultan Murad forgave his son-in-law and he "was busied in most godly wars against the misbelieving Christians" (Knolles, 1610:194).

#### 4. Atrocities of Christians

The monstrous Sultan appears in a great pomp of his position. He looks a successful combatant. The imperial Ottoman treasury has established the lucid foundation of Ottoman foreign policy, rather than one administered by cultural or religious convictions. The Ottomans have had a grand imperial strategy when determining their foreign dogma. Official papers in the Ottoman archives concerning intelligence, military institution, and strategic preparation show how watchful the Ottomans are, when it comes to assessing the capabilities and logistic hindrances as well as the potential welfares of military accomplishment (Agoston, 2007: 112). As the play goes on to explore the psyche of the Sultan, the event of killing his wife points out the man who eventually prepares to win is the one who needs to "conquer first himself" (2.5.84-85). Furthermore, in the play the Turkish captain Euroneses brings six Christian maidens apprehended from European triumphs to the sultan Amurath and instructs to him kill them as the Christians that they battled:

So weary were they to indure our swords,  
That by impetuous mutiny themselves,  
Tum'd on each other; flew their Maisters;  
Childrens own hands, tore out their fathers throats.  
And each one strove who should be slaughtered first;  
Here did a brother pash out a Brothers braines. (4.2.110-115).

It is a heinous perspective of blood and corpses on the stage. The Ottoman expansion in Europe results in a large list of atrocities. The Machiavellians praise the Turks for their massacres (Bisaha, 2004:177). The consequence here in this scene is that only through these deeds of religious autocracy and extermination can Amurath strictly be a 'Turke', principally the 'Great Turke' or sultan. When the villainous Schahin grants Amurath with Christian heads he states:

So am I *Amurath* the great King of *Turkes*,  
O how it glads me thus to pash their braines,  
To rend their lockes, to teare these Infidels! (3.2.22-4)

This language of Goffe's Amurath is tight, uninterrupted and fluent. This statement of exaggerated anti-Christian violence is then once more associated openly to his situation as sultan, and Muslim as Amurath perceives that 'now I fit in Orchanes great throne/ And sacrifice due rites to Mahomet' (3.2.28-9), stating that in the pursuit of these 'rites' he will 'dung the Earth/ With Christians rotted trunckes' (3.2.30-31). These actions form part of the prosecution of the representation of what are entitled later in the tragedy the 'great Prophets Warres' (4.1.4) which will appreciate the sultan 'hewing down Christians' (4.1.5), converting young Christian boys (an interpretation of the institution of the Janissaries) and saying intimidations against Christendom in the most violent of expressions. In fact, it has nothing to do with Islam. The monstrous Amurath states that 'Mahomet (say) not but I invoke on thee now!' (5.3.4). The Ottoman wars in Europe are for power. Amurath describes his ambition to kingship. He says,

Turke, *Amurath*, slave nay something baser  
King! For all aery titles which the Gods  
Have blasted man withall to make them swell  
With puft up honour, and ambitious wind,  
This name of King holds greatest antipathy  
With manly government for if we waigh  
'Tis subjects, and not Kings beare all the sway. (2.3.1-6)

The Christian-Turkish conflict goes on in last three chapters of the performance which established on Knolles' share on "Amurath", essentially copes with the conquer of Adrianople and Battle of Kosovo, despite chronological occasions for instance the instituting of the janissaries structure, Bajazet's wedding to Hatam (German Ogly's daughter), Aladin's effort to arrest Murat I's region in Minor Asia and his downfall etc (Senlen, 2010:57-8). Chapter III opens with the overview of the supreme Christian champion Cobelitz, factually identified as Miles Cobelitz. In Knolles' writing, Cobelitz has been defined as a "slave" (Knolles, 1610:189) and as a Commander warrior who has knifed Amurath to death once he was marching the arena after his triumph. In the play, on the other hand, he has been assumed exciting significance. As a Christian champion, he combats counter to the Muslim Turks, the popular rival of Christians, by all means of his authority and belief. In act three he astonishes if holy wisdom senses to "arme" him with "thunder-bolt", and enhances that: "Turke, Ile oppose thee still! Heaven has decreed/That this weake hand, shall make that tyrant bleed" (3.1.33-4). In contrast, this courageous Turk who needs to redeem his concentration in warfare, is firmed to battle alongside Europeans. He requests his Aga Schahin whether they have slayed "A thousand superstitious Christians fouls"

in the City of “Orestias” [Orestia- Adrianople], (3.2. 1-3) and the warriors bring in the heads of dead Christians. This is of sequence an indication to the Battle of Adrianople. As soon as Evrenoses conveys news that “To Servia (my Lord) there are troupes of armes,/Gathered to resist Mahometans” and Chase Illibegge points out that “At Bulgaria, there they fet on fire,/The Countries as they passe, ‘twere good we haste”, they leave to “invade them” (3.2.40-1). Recognizing that the “Butcherous Turke’s at hand”, Lazarus-Despot of Servia, and Sesmenos- Governor of Bulgaria, have instant judgments about struggling, however Cobelitz makes his soldiers courageous like “those great Romans, and Heroicke Greekes” and make for themselves an “Eternall name” (3.3.15-21). Sesmenos responses saying: “Well spoke (Christian)/[...] (O) then lets to our weapons! Make him yield” (3.3. 30-1). Instead, the champion Turks take new Europeans as captives. The minute [Cairadin] Bassa claims that ‘these young slaves’ are filled of “Valor” and ‘mettall,’ the Turkish Lala Schahin affirms that he will take them in the elite Turkish forces, the ‘janizaries’ (5.3. 7-13).

In the course of the tragedy, the Janizaries are offered to the great Sultan via Cairadin Bassa to be prepared up “in all the precepts of our [their] Mahomet:” (3.5.10) throughout the ceremony arranged by Bajazet’s wedding to the German Hatam. Meanwhile the Christians are depressed. Sasmenos is distressed that “Servia, our [...] Cities are turned flames” but Lazarus comments on Christians with inferior dooms before passing their “funeral flames” and their contagious corpses carry out “second murder on the rest that live!” (5.3. 22-4). Far along, Amurath approves Bajazet and Hatam, ask for their comfort. Eurenoses comes in with six Christian maids, the descendant of six Western monarchs, with mugs of gold with ornaments in their fingers. The brave Sultan provides all with the gifts gotten by Asian nobles to Eurenoses, and the six virgins to the facility of Hatam. Lazarus says that they “scarce have roome“ upon their “bodies to receive more wounds“ to resist this Turkish violence (4.3. 31-6).

The stage course shapes like the universes appear on flames, and the comets and tremendous stars seem so. Besides, Amurath is distressed saying that he failed and Mahomet commands “the puny-Christians demi-God” to spoil his dream of triumph (5.3. 1-6). However, Cobelitz requests the world prevent violence and support his people with the resistant of superior judgments. Retelling his fellows that “Fortune and Heaven will scorne to try a man,/That hurles his weapons hence and runs away!” He quiet considers that they are tough since they are struggling for fair causes: “O what an army ‘tis to have a caufe/ Holy and just; there’s our strength indeed” (3.6.40-44). Likewise before Lazarus requests whether they will endure combat, Cobelitz shows that they should combat till their last soldier. Then the spectacle returns to the fight amongst Europeans and Turks. The Captain Cobelitz is confident and certain that God backs them from every corner of heaven (5.2. 5-8). In the end of the tragedy, Sultan Amurath, Bajazeth, and the lords enter to see the damage in the meantime the Serbian Cobelitz rises as awaked, astonished inclined on his blade, awkward or the lifeless. He walks towards Amurath resolute capture his life’s purpose saying: “I shall performe my lifes true taske” (5.4.30). Cobelitz appearing to kneele “stabs him with a pocket Dagger”. The Sultan is overwhelmed to be murdered by such a sordid creature: “And mufti I like th’unhappy Roman, dye/By a slaves hand?” (5.4.42-3). Amurath requests him if he dreads what is standard to occur to him, nevertheless Cobelitz is courageous: “Ha, ha, ha!/I thanke the (great omnipotent) that I/ Shall ere laugh out the lag end of my life!” (5.4.53-55). Cobelitz designates that although “your witty furies shall invent/For me, some never heard of punishment;/I see a guard of Saints ready to take me hence.” (5.4.1819-21) and finally passes away. He is depicted as a idealist surrendering his soul for his Christian faith, though Amurath’s penalty is a bad omen of the firm triumph of Christ. Amurath declares:

O now have I and Fortune tried it out.  
 With all her best of favours was I frown’d.  
 Stay (Soule!) a King, a Turke, commands thee stay!  
 Sure I am but an actor, and must strive  
 To personate the Tragicke ends of Kings.[...]  
 O but I fee Nemesis at hand:  
 What? Not one Earthquake? One blazing Comet  
 T’accompany my foule t’his Funerall?[...]  
 Quake Pluto, for ‘tis I come  
 A Turke, a Tyrant, and a Conquerour. (5.4. 101-113)

Often he is credited with the successes, and he and his Aga calculate a path to slaughter for the Greek lady. All of these traits and actions inevitably undercut the killing triumph at the end of the play when Bajazet kills his brother. Amurath’s final speech before his murder bespeaks not fury but quietness and retirement. His language is extremely colored, but it is not chaotic bombast:

A *Turke*, a Tyrant, and a Conquerour,  
 And with this groane, like thunder will I cleave,  
 The timerous earth, whilst thus my last I breath.

*He dyes.*

Like as one Prophet we acknowledge now

So of one King in state we must allow.

You know the *Turkish Lawes*, Prince be not nice

To purchase Kingdomes, whatsoever the price. (5.4. 145-52)

The assassination succeeds but fails to generate any variation in the ethical order of the Ottoman imperialism as the Turk is substituted by his son, Bajazet. The Turks overthrow the Christians in battlefield, and Cobelitz is apparently executed. Amurath dies and Bajazet is the ruler. However, in the drama, Amurath's heir, Bajazet signs the permanency of the Ottoman sovereignty with all its cruelty. The Aga Schahin and others retell Bajazet that 'the Turkish Lawes' need Jacup's death (5.4.143). The other imperial prince, Jacup, is murdered to avert any conflict in the Turkish factions. Like his Grandfather Selim, Bajazet decides to murder his brother (Belgasem, 2013:151). Meanwhile Turkish Sultans principally exemplified Islam for tragedians and the spectators, British Renaissance catastrophes about the Ottoman rulers were primarily Christian productions paralleling 'non-ideal' Turkish rulers with 'ideal' European celebrities. In this deference, Goffe's *Amurath the First* comprehends an excessive concentration of theological suggestions, somewhere Amurath purposes for instance an anti-type in contrast to his European equivalents, Eumorphe and Cobelitz. When confronted with Eumorphe, a Saint-like Christian, he is controlled some time, then again admits defeat to his nature and exterminates her, which gets on his catastrophic conclusion. In contrast, being destroyed by Cobelitz then the combat proves the functioning of God's heavenly decision. The retribution in anticipation of Amurath, at the close of the play, is a presentiment of the decisive triumph of Christian Europeans over the Muslim Turks.

### 5. Conclusion

Elizabethans are profoundly interested in news about Turkish wars. As another Christian nation, they are engrossed in expelling the Turks out of Christendom. Therefore, Elizabethan dramatists exploit and demoralize Ottoman issues. While some of the sultans' expressions undoubtedly scandalize Christian audience, others denote them in a promising straight virtuous light. These represented Ottoman Turks are of popular criticism and literary counterparts in Western historical writings of that period, which have a fearful internal convention. As an example, Goffe's Amurath has marred the reputation of the great Ottoman sultan for his courage, though he is no less a shedder of Christian blood in Serbia. The sultan's unnatural cruelty is received with admiration for his magnitude. Although Amurath's bombast prior to the battle is matched by his success on the field, in his assassinated death, he receives respect as well as sympathy. Goffe's enhances a tragic feeling for Amurath's death rather than anti-Ottoman stereotype. It can be considered as a universal subject of statesmanship and politics and as a result it develops the moral focus to contain British Christians along with the Turkish counterparts.

The image of the Turks as sexually violent created one of the strongest forces for polarization between Englishmen and the Turks. the Ottoman Amurath has committed such heinous sins. The prurient curiosity in what is observed as Turkish sexuality has represented in the Christian accounts and would stand well into Renaissance period as it is inspired by the spiritual polemic against Islam. Amurath's reference to himself as turning Turk or Muslim is a stand-in for fanaticism. In fact, Goffe's condemns the religion of Islam in the speech of Amurath about Prophet Muhammad, which could find no better image than that of Islamic sexual role to define the Turks in order to approve their heavenly destiny. Matar remarks that 'a cognitive keyword that proved that Muslims had no family structure, no "natural" sexuality, and therefore no place in the civilized world' (Matar, 1999:126). From the Christian standpoint the Turks have departed from God by ensuing the teachings of a false prophet, they have become deviants in their sexuality as in Islam. Amurath and his lack of moral principle were affiliated with a clear and present danger to Christendom.

The ethical ambiguity of this show is unique that it could also be assumed in the perspective of Jacobean political affairs. Apprehended in this light, Goffe's play is an reinforcement to James I to alter his diplomacy into an enthusiastic association in European issues by admiring Ottoman tactics of war and reign. As a gentleman charmed, Amurath is a prompt to the Jacobean audiences of the improper impact of lust and pleasure-seeking in the imperial clan. The Ottoman world is a concrete demonstration of political attributes of the Turkish monarchy that are genuinely a source of wonder to Western observers, whose home states are still far short of the technical capabilities that would enable them to develop absolutist rule during the seventeenth century (Anderson, 1974:407). The Ottoman succession does not allow decentralizing the authority among heirs to avoid any spawning of political fragmentation. As a history play, Goffe evaluates the historical matters that fascinated him in Ottomanness with an outstanding cultural evenhandedness. As a result, the Ottoman impact on European diplomacy created the political birth of the West (Valensi, 1993:55-60). The Europeans' perception of the Ottoman threat established the identity of the West (Najemy, 2009:127). An Elizabethan criticism of the Ottoman Machiavellism donated to the emergence of the notion of Oriental despotism.

The Elizabethan Oriental material discovers the Machiavellian prototype of tyranny in Oriental despotism, in the Ottoman dominion ruled by sultans and princes. The appearance of Europeans and Turks in the Ottoman high courtyard, is a portrait of the superior Ottoman and inferior Europeans. It displays how the East views the West. The performative nature of Ottoman personality has exciting associations for the Elizabethan spectators, who can understand characters struggling to imitate to a supreme that may seem nasty or bizarre to them. The monologue achieves an obvious application to the loyal merits between Britons and Turks: 'All heer wish Turkes destruction our hope stands/ That to their ruine you'le all set your hands' (Epilogue.19-20). On the other hand, to the extent that the universalizing desires of the show itself recurrently distort the peculiarity between the Elizabethan self and the Turkish other, *Amurath* may propose the chance and created nature of England's own evolving sense of domestic identity, along with the actually



atrocious costs of enforcing traditionalism to that identity. Therefore, Cobelitz shares combatant ethics with the Turks, and the Turkish armed forces perform at times to represent them better than Cobelitz's own public. Notwithstanding Amurath's barbarity, his dominant situation in the play and his affection for the desirable Eumorphe simplify viewers' sympathy with him. In opposition, Elizabethan audience compassions provoked by Cobelitz's marvelous faithfulness and devastation of the Ottoman emperor are weakened by his situation in the plot as the antagonist and by the way of his assassination of Amurath, which he succeeds over betrayal and achieves fairly indecent triumphing and mockery.

## References

- Al-Olaqi, F. (2013). The Oriental Other Soliman the Magnificent in Kyd's Soliman and Perseda. *TRAMES*, 2013, 17(66/61), 2, pp.177–201. DOI: 10.3176/tr.2013.1.02.
- Agoston, G. (2005). 'Behind the Turkish War Machine: Gunpowder Technology and War Industry in the Ottoman Empire, 1450–1700,' in: Brett D. Steele et al. (eds.): *The Heirs of Archimedes: Science and the Art of War through the Age of Enlightenment*, Cambridge et al. 2005, pp. 102–133.
- Anderson, Perry (1974). *Lineages of the Absolutist State*. London, N.L.B.
- Belgasem, F. (2013). 'Representations of Ottoman Sultans in Elizabethan Times,' Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/7384/>
- Bartels, E.C. (1992) 'The Double Vision of the East: Imperialist Self-Construction in Marlowe's *Tamburlaine, Part One*', *Renaissance Drama* 23 (1992).
- Bowers, F. ed. (1987). *Dictionary of Literary Biography, Volume 58: Jacobean and Caroline Dramatists*. University of Virginia. Gale.
- Boxer, Ch. (1985). Anglo-Portuguese Rivalry in the Persian Gulf, 1615–1635, in Boxer, *Portuguese Conquest and Commerce in Southern Asia 1500–1750*. London, Variorum.
- Bisaha, N. (2004). *Creating East and West: Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Burton, J. (2000). Anglo-Ottoman Relations and the Image of the Turk in *Tamburlaine*. *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 30(1), 130-131.
- Burton, J. (2005). *Traffic and Turning: Islam and English Drama, 1579-1624*, (Cranbury, NJ: Rosemont Publishing.
- Casale, G. (2010). *The Ottoman age of Exploration*. Oxford, University Press.
- Chew, S. C. (1965). *The Crescent and the Rose*. New York, Oxford.
- Gainsford, Th. (1618). *The Glory of England*. London, Edward Griffin
- Gurkan, E.S. (2010). 'Christian Allies of the Ottoman Empire, in European History Online (EGO),' the Institute of European History (IEG), Mainz 2010-12-03. URL: <http://www.ieg-ego.eu/gurkane-2010-en>.
- Goffman, Daniel. (2004). *The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge, UP.
- Harper, J. G. (2011). *The Turk and Islam in the Western Eye, 1450-1750*. Ashgate Publishing, Limited
- Inalcık, H. (2006). "Murad I", *DİA*, İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 2006.156-164.
- Imber, C. (2002). *The Ottoman Empire, 1300-1650: The Structure of Power*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Khan, F.W. (2011). 'Mirrors of Governance: 'The Mighty Turkish Diadem and English Drama (*Selimus*. Sc.xxvi.2340)' *Journal of European Studies*, 26(2), 139-169.
- Knolles, R. (1610). *The Generall Historie of the Turkes* (London, 1610, first published 1603).
- Lewis, B. (ed. and trans.), (1987). *Islam from the Prophet Muhammad to the capture of Constantinople*, Vol. I: *Politics and War*. Oxford, UP.
- Najemy, J. M. (2009). *MACHIAVELLI BETWEEN EAST AND WEST From Florence to the Mediterranean and Beyond*. Essays in Honour of Anthony Molho, edited by Diogo Ramada Curto, Eric R Dursteler, Julius Kirshner and Francesca Trivellato. Firenze, pp. 127-145.
- Matar, N. (1998). *Islam in Britain, 1558-1685*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matar, N. (1999). *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- McJannet, L. (2006). *The Sultan Speaks: Dialogue in English Plays and Histories about the Ottoman Turks*. New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
- O'Malley, Susan Gushee. ed. (1979). *Thomas Goffe, The Courageous Turk*. New York, Garland.
- Pasini, J. (2011). "Kin with Kin and Kind with Kind Confound": Pity, Justice, and Family Killing in Early Modern Dramas Depicting Islam. Unpublished PhD. Thesis. Rice University, Houston, Texas.
- Sandys, G. (1610) *A Relation of a Journey*. London, Barrett.

Schwoebel, Robert. (1967). *The Shadow of the Crescent: Renaissance Image of the Turks 1453-1517*. Nieuwkoop: B. de Graaf.

Senlen, S. (2010). "A[u]gmenter of Their Kingdome": Goffe's *The Courageous Turke*, or, *Amurath the First as a Christian Tragedy* based on Knolles' *The Generall Historie of the Turkes*, (OTAM, 28 /Güz 2010) pp. 49-63.

Skilliter, S. A. (1977). *William Harborne and the Trade with Turkey, 1578-1582: A Documentary Study of the First Anglo-Ottoman Relations*. London, Oxford University Press.

Slotkin, J.E. (2008). Now will I be a Turke!: Performing Ottoman Identity in Thomas Goffe's *The Courageous Turk*. *Early Theatre*, 12(2), 222-35.

Southern, R.W. (1978). *The Western Views of Islam in the Medieval Ages*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press.

Valensi, L. (1993). *The Birth of the Despot: Venice and the Sublime Porte*, trans. A. Denner, Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press.

Vitkus, Daniel J., (1997). Turning Turk in *Othello*: The Conversion and Damnation of the Moor. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 48(2), 145-76.

Vitkus, Daniel J. (2000). *Introduction. Three Turk Plays from Early Modern England*. New York, Columbia UP.

Vitkus, Daniel J. (2003). *Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630*. New York, Palgrave Macmillan.

Wann, Louis. (1915). The Oriental in Elizabethan Drama. *Modern Philology*, 12(7), 423-447.