



## International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies

ISSN(e): 2306-0646/ISSN(p): 2306-9910

URL: www.aessweb.com



### MASON'S INFIDEL: MULLEASSES THE TURK (1606)



Fahd Mohammed Taleb Saeed Al-Olaqi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of English & Translation, Faculty of Science & Arts – Khulais, University of Jeddah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

#### ABSTRACT

*This article examines the sixteenth century Elizabethan perception of the racial dimension of the Turk in Mason and its influence on an individual's character within the context of the play. John Mason's negative image of the Turks is associated with lust, violence, and treachery. The traditional European portrayal of Turks has been biased and largely hostile. Mason propagandized his play *The Turke* (1606) against the Turks. He attacks Turkish morals and sexual illegitimacy. Therefore, the Turk *Mulleasses* has been shown to be lustful and brutal. His image is a unique portrayal of a damned Turkish noble in the Britons' eyes. Mason represents a stereotyped Turk to understand the Turkish Other. His *Mulleasses* establishes the model of the Turkish sexuality, ambition and treachery in the Renaissance imagination. The play provides the distressed multitudes with entertainment and national polarization against the Muslim Turks and Catholic Venetians. The lascivious Venetian Catholic lady Timoclea possesses a bodily lust for life, sensation, and experience. She and her husband Borgias resemble *Mulleasses* in sexuality and treachery.*

© 2016 AESS Publications. All Rights Reserved.

**Keywords:** Turk, *Mulleasses*, Infidel, Borgias, Lust, Turkish sexuality, Ambition and treachery.

Received: 21 December 2016/ Revised: 18 January 2017/ Accepted: 24 January 2017/ Published: 30 January 2017

#### Contribution/ Originality

This study contributes to the existing image of the Turks in Elizabethan Drama. This research article analyses John Mason's image of the Turks according to the European tradition. This study is one of very few studies which have investigated Mason's understanding of the Turkish Other in the Renaissance Period.

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

John Mason's *An Excellent Tragedy of Mulleasses the Turke, and Borgias Governour of Florence*, simply known as *The Turke* (1606/pub.1610), draws on the Elizabethan public interest in Turk plays and it is an attempt to explore monotony among people of diverse cultures. The Renaissance England viewed the Ottoman Turks as a potent threat to its religion and nation. The major accounts of the Ottoman Sultans are predominantly inaccurate as they are established in accordance with the European agenda of defending Western Europe. Stocks of lies on personal affairs are made to tarnish the positive characteristics of the Ottoman Sultans to keep the European hatred and hostility towards the Turks and their religion. Byzantine nations have collectively embraced Islam and gave up Christianity in

1453. These false accounts are derived from the descriptions present in foreign sources, which were passed on to Richard Knolles' *Historie of the Turkes* (1603) and formed the English attitude towards the entire Turkish nation.

The early conflict between Europeans and Turks was cultural and religious in nature. For Europeans, they were shown to fight the Turks in the spirit of the medieval holy warriors who had conquered that land (Matar, 1999). The image of the lustful Muslim Saracen is also prevalent throughout the Middle Ages. The matter of the Senecan tragedies was sensational and laden with lust and blood, or with terror and revenge (Sphelling, 1908). Moreover, many anti-Islamic images forge in the late Medieval and Renaissance periods. Matar states that the foremost Medieval and Renaissance enemy is identified as the Muslim, and the foremost hero is the "ancestral" fighter against the "infidels" (Matar, 1999). In Elizabethan England, the theatre took up the cudgel against the Muslims and appealed to a populace that felt threatened by, and confused at, the appearance of the Muslim Other in their metropolis, in their harbours, and across their Mediterranean and Atlantic trading routes" (Matar, 1999). Muslim artisans, skilled workers, and small merchants were available in the Renaissance London (Yungblut, 1996). In the Muslim world, the Muslims were strong in faith and mighty in military and they had extensively induced European cultures, and dictated their own terms of commercial and industrial exchange. Thus, Englishmen had possessed no strong military and they had to learn to produce what the Turks would buy (Matar, 1999). The Turks were at the axis of European fantasies about the Near East, and the renovation of Christian historical narratives into the secular narratives of the illumination and modernity.

The Turks had entered into the most open and extensive relationships with their European counterparts. They widely became the fashion of the early modern stage. For instance, as a sign of fascination with the Orient, many great Elizabethan plays carry the titles of Turkish names and are set in Constantinople, such as Thomas Kyd's *Soliman and Perseda* (1588), George Peele's *Turkish Mahomet* (1595), Robert Greene's *Selimus* (1594), Thomas Goffe's *Bayazeth the Second* (1618) and *The Courageous Turk* (1619), Thomas Mason's *The Turk* (1610), Fulke Greville's *Mustapha* (1606) and *Alaham* (1600), and Lodowick Carlell's *Osmond the Great Turk* (1637) (Al-Olaqi, 2013). These Turks are depicted in an entirely derogatory and unfriendly fashion. The historical Ottoman images describe the Turks as cruel, barbaric and lustful. The value of depicting the history of bad Turks is to establish the secular European Self, and its eventual renovation places merely in the comprehensive destruction of the Turkish identity.

Like Mason, many other famous Elizabethan and Restoration dramatists have prejudicially depicted the negative image of the Turks, Moors, and other Muslims in England, though the real image is positive. Some models of Ottoman themes, plots, and characters are familiar to Renaissance English writers and playwrights to refer to Europe's own account of war and politics. Matar remarks that there were many British diplomats, adventurers and businessmen in Turkey as well as 'thousands of Turks and Moors visited and traded in English and Welsh ports'; and hundreds were captives in England; and scores of Turkish ambassadors and emissaries arrived to London (Matar, 1999). Furthermore, Matar finds out that 'the Moors and Turks were earlier "everywhere,"—not just in the literary imagination of English dramatists and poets, but in the streets, the sea towns, the royal residences, the courts, and the jails of Elizabethan, Jacobean and Caroline England and Wales' (Matar, 1999). Many Mediterranean Muslims learned about the English after falling prey to piracy (MacLean and Matar, 2010) in the same manner that many Britons learned about Muslims after being seized into captivity. Matar observes that such Muslim 'visitors provided the English populace with the only real portrait of how Muslims—wealthy Muslims, that is—lived, worshipped, and conducted themselves. Although they numbered far fewer than refugees and prisoners, it was this elite group that provided Londoners with their most authentic image of Muslims' (Matar, 1999). Elizabethan Britons and Muslims also learned about each other's religion, customs, laws, and society, and about differences in the role of women, as well as about similarities in desire, greed, and curiosity (MacLean and Matar, 2010).

Travel literature continued to dominate the Western discourse about the infidel Turks. Naji Oueijan remarks that the Elizabethan travel books helped to popularize the false image of Islam and the Orient (Oueijan, 1996). Normal Daniel holds that this 'tradition inherited from the Medieval West' (Daniel, 1966). The West has inherited much of the traditional hatred of Islam as the enemy of Christendom (Said, 1978). Kabbani remarks that the Western dramatists believe that the entire 'East was a place of lascivious sensuality' (Kabbani, 1986). The images of the Turkish Other as *God's Scourge*, *Antichrist*, *Pagan*, *Heretic*, *Chivalrous*, and/or *Lustful* – were extended to the new foe, some more frequently than others (Tolan, 2002). Mason's play exemplifies, categorizes, contextualizes, and evaluates the accounts about the Turks which are likely cultural and historical. While the other Elizabethan dramatists' images of Turks are religious, Mason's image of the Turk is secularized and initially associated with other infidel Europeans. John Mason's *Tragedy of Mulleasses the Turke*, is a Machiavellian image of the Turks. Mason's Turk enters into an extensive political and social engagement with the Europeans. The author establishes a mosaic of imaginings or romance, plotting, cruelty, lust and exoticism. Mason's Machiavellian Mulleasses is a treacherous Turk. The play is full of negative images of the Muslim Turks. The play takes up the themes or ambitions, the pursuit for authority, brutal sensualism, sexual obstinacy, and so forth which were established in a number of portraits and episodes taken from a fantasy world. The play has a prominence on the Turk's interest in sexuality such as eunuchs and concubines.

Mason's play reveals the complex position of the Turk in English imagination. The play illustrates the persistent bigotry of Elizabethan England and the austere connotations of the institutionalized prejudice. The tragedy transcends particular Turkish culture of lust and treachery. It explores the ways in which racial characters are treated by Elizabethans in London, and how these entities beheld themselves within the multifaceted social framework that these numerous interactions and self-images reveal in the play. In addition to the plays' text, Mason establishes these actual characters to challenge the despotic conducts of Elizabethan society. Elizabethan Britons began to demonize, polarize, and alterize the Turks. They established in their popular and widely read works the stereotype of the Muslim in plays and poems (Matar, 1999). The "Turk" was represented as cruel and tyrannical, deviant, and deceiving; the "Moor" was sexually overdriven and emotionally uncontrollable, vengeful, and religiously superstitious (Matar, 1999). Given the repeated superimpositions of Turkish models of bad sultans, it is not astonishing that the same typecasting of the Turks as sexually unclean people appeared in the Renaissance period. The Turks are depicted as a folk who disobeys God, nature, and English law, and thus they deserve punishment.

The Elizabethans considered the Orient as the domain of 'war, conquest, fratricide, lust and treachery' (Wann, 1915). Although Turkish customs as well as religion were understood as distinct from those of the Christian West, the Ottoman Turks cast a significantly longer shadow on London stage due to the evolving geopolitical and economic associations between Turkey and the West (Kalmar and Derek, 2005). In the Renaissance, for example, the Turkish lands became a focus of curiosity for Europeans with respect to the inhabitants' exotic costumes, beliefs, and manners. Some other accounts of the Turks' wickedness, malice and violence, excited the Western public. Playwrights such as Marlowe, Kyd and Shakespeare introduce historical Turkish figures in their works, by using the Western references of the Turkish history as source material (El-Deen, 1984). Elizabethan dramatists present an inclusive account of the personalities and lives of the Turkish sultans who ruled during the later periods of the sixteenth century. The depiction is at variance with the conventional Renaissance notion of the Grand Turk as a formidable, cruel tyrant and a brutal murderer. Moreover, Matar remarks that the English writers had already constructed the sexual and military identity of the non-Christian/Indian Other (Matar, 1999). Therefore, the Ottoman Sultan's sexual lust becomes a typical example of this kind of Oriental treachery.

Mason presents an extreme prejudice against the Turks in the portrayal of Mulleasses. Turkishness was a complex social tradition in the Elizabethan England. The play examines the Elizabethan attitudes toward the image of the

Turkish Muslim Other and their culture. Mason's Mulleases is a Moorish name of King of Fez which includes in the image a typical sort of the Moorish character that is libidinous and sexually aggressive. The past contact between Britons and the Moors and Turks helped the literary imagination of English dramatists and poets, in representing their concern about their own culture. However, the West embraces the image of the terrible Turk, the infidel whose intent was to destroy the Christian world and who did not bother to distinguish between the Christian sects (Goffman, 2002). Al-Olaqi remarks that the image of the Turk is depicted as the gloomy devil and the stereotypical cruel 'Moor' or 'Turk' – violence, mercilessness, faithlessness, lawlessness, despair, jealousy, frustrated lust (Al-Olaqi, 2016). Mason's work exploited the general taste of the Elizabethan public for the Turkish sexual lust and treachery on stage, but there is also a solid commendation of violence in the Turkish culture, best exemplified by Mulleases, who seeks to intervene in the Christian lifestyle. The play presents a series of episodes involving intrigues and treacheries involving the Turkish Mulleases and his sponsor the Italian Borgias.

## 2. THE TURKISH INFIDEL MULLEASES

The personality of Mulleases himself may have been based on the figure of the historical king of Tunis, who had been forced to leave his country and to take refuge in Sicily and Naples in 1543. Mulleases or Muleases (i. e. Mevlay Hasan) had won disrepute for his brutality and conspiracies. Once slaying his brothers, he had been enforced to abandon kingship and finally exiled to Italy (Knolles 1603, pp. 642-749). Since Mulleases's origin is not a Turk, it is superficial that Mason has used his historical source liberally with a view to establish a villain that would conform to the prevalent views about the Turks. However, the play represents a totally different method to the Turkish theme and is led by Senecan intrigues, horror and bloodshed. In the case of the Turkish Machiavellian, John Mason, as many other Renaissance English playwrights composing plays about the Turks, used the first English chronicle on the Ottoman Turks - Richard Knolles' *Historie of the Turkes* (1603). The polarization of the Turkish infidels is shown to be exclusively political and religious. The Muslims are categorized as "infidels" "heathens" and enemies of Christ (Hubbard, 1972). Matar remarks that Renaissance literature shows Muslims with "no family structure, no natural sexuality, and therefore no place in the civilized world" (Matar, 1999). Mulleases has arrived to Florence, in exchange for Borgias' son, to learn the "tongues,/The fashions and the arts of Christendome" (II.i. 81-2) and claims to have got Borgias's confidence through his "sly" and "affable intrusion": "He thinks my thoughts are Osiars to be wrought" (II.i.85). Yet there is no any identifiable episode from the real history of the city. The political allegory in *The Turke* treats the Turkish infidel Mulleases as an object of polarization and destruction. Mulleases is politically a Turkish agent of the Christian Borgias in the Ottoman court. His presence in Italy is to support Borgias to gain power over his fellows and to give the Ottomans a place in Venice which is historically invaded by Turkey before Venetians turned allies to the Ottomans (Isom-Verhaaren, 2011). Mason's anti-Turkish story depicts the Turk through Western eyes full with hatred. The theme is tinged with a stirred, excited, and rising up sexuality. But for the most part it is a debauched sexuality the author attributes to the Muslim Mulleases since he is depicted deep in dalliance with a Christian Venetian lady.

This image of the Turks as sexually violent created one of the strongest forces for polarization between Englishmen and the Turks. The popular representations of Turkish sexual violence in Elizabethan drama are established within the anti-Islamic Turkish propaganda. The European accounts report Turkish ill-treatment to women in Turkey. Accordingly, the play introduces the essential Otherness of the Turks with harsh criticism of Turkish ethics. For instance, Mason's Mulleases establishes the model of the unnatural sexuality of the Turks in the Renaissance imagination. Elizabethan dramatists make the biblical explanation of the infidels apply exclusively to Turks and Moors. The audience has become accustomed to exotic Turks. Similarly, English writers interchanged discourses and prejudices as they crisscrossed between the Turks and their fascination in the Turks. Inspired by the

anti-Muslim zeal, the author depicts Mulleasses as an avenue to uncontrollable lust and unnatural desire. Lowenthal remarks that 'Turkish men were slaves to their excessive sexual desires' (Lowenthal, 2003). Mulleasses lives along with his sexual modes and determined perceptions. Mason's Mulleasses was driven by lust but above all by his ambition. Mulleasses's cunning ambition goes beyond the ethics in having love affair with of the first lady of Florence. The Christian eunuch and the Turkish Muslim lover of the Christian Duchess Timoclea are planning to offer the Turks a way into Christendom. It establishes 'a funeral in White, and bearers in white' (I.iii.1). She claims to be the good and beautiful Julia, and works against the blackness of the villain. Far along, Mulleasses asks her to calm and she cannot spoil his plans (III. iv.1-5). On the other hand, Borgias realizes the plots of Mulleasses. Thus, Borgias develops the theme as it is 'true true, clap clap ye furies\ Dance your blacke rounds, and with your yron whips' (IV.i.331-2). He seems unconcerned about his wife in showing her excessive sexual drive. The disgrace of the love affairs ends up in a sexual deviance of the lascivious Timoclea with the infidel Turk. Therefore, Borgias proclaims

But yet Timoclea liues, and may perhaps  
 Escape her false loues hate: which if she do,  
 This blacke nights horror falls like thunder on me:  
 She must not liue till day: be euer darke.  
 Stand night vpon the noonestead: and attend  
 My fates security: if euer blacknes pleasd  
 Or deedes to which men may resemble thee,  
 Turne then thy sooty horse, and with their feete,  
 Beate at the rising morne: & force the Sunne,  
 Forbeare his lustre till this black deed's done.( IV.i.374-83)

The fantasies of the Occidental female with the Oriental male are explored in their wrong doings. Mason emphasises the lechery and lust of the Occidental woman Timoclea. Mason's lascivious Timoclea, the wife of Borgias, establishes a model of submissive victim of the lustful. In fact, British woman were more attracted to Turks and Moors than Christianized Jews. Matar finds that the some cases of marriages occurred in English Renaissance history between English women and Turks and Moors (Matar, 1999). The marriage of a Christian woman to a Muslim man was seen to be theologically (and not just practically) legitimate in some circles (Matar, 1999). The link between ambition and sexual behaviour among the Turks further established for Christian playwrights their alterity from the Turks.

The conflict between Borgias and Mulleasses is undermined by the treason of the Turk in which Mason has shown the Turk as more malicious than the Venetian. By presenting a Duchess's association with an ambitious and lustful Mulleasses, he creates a familiar distinction between forceful unbridled sexual desire and love. It is a natural feature of the female sex and alliance. To the lustful and unwomanly Duchess and Mulleasses's situation as a gloomy symbolism, this portrayal is ambivalent depending on understanding of counterparts and parody. The alliance is a symbol of virtue and calm, happiness and fidelity in love. Its ambivalence lies in its juxtaposition between idealized love and the carnal lusts of the flesh but it is significant as a symbol of vice. The same episode is also seen in Webster's *The White Devil* (1612), a Moor in lustful love with the Duchess of Florence.

The play notes on encounters between eastern Christians and Muslims. Mason has portrayed Islam as a pagan religion. The use of this image makes it possible to protect the minds of Christians against apostasy and Islam. It gives Christendom self-respect in dealing with a civilization in many ways its superior (Daniel, 1962). In the early modern period, the depiction of Muslims was a means to help strengthen and secure separate Christian identities in times when many perceived them to be threatened. In the play, the Christian Borgias is as fraudulent as non-Christian Mulleasses, because he represents Italy and hence, the Roman Catholic Church. Meanwhile England broke off

publically with the Roman Catholic Church; Catholicism appears to have been as much a menace for England as the Muslim Ottomans (Senlen, 2013). The Protestant England suffers from internal contradictions of politics, society, and history. The dramatic or theatrical performance considers similarities and differences in how Muslim Turks and Catholic Venetians were symbolized in different epochs. The mostly hostile depictions of Muslims and Catholics found in medieval works on theology, historiography, and politics, were part of conflicts over the creation of a collective Christian identity, upon which a secular European identity was ultimately created.

In classical literature and philosophy, European references refer to the Turks, who conquered the land and absorbed the learning of the Greeks, and note that the Turks fell under the spell of Greek unnatural lust (Matar, 1999). Deprived of this allusion, British dramatists explore theories about the Turkish unnatural sexuality. In the case of Shakespeare's Othello, the Moor's wedding love comes to be seen as a purely spiritual relationship, although he is condemned as being lustful. Mulleasses's wife, Maria was chased by King Fernando but she was a truthful and loyal wife as the pure Othello's Desdemona. Mulleasses is completely different from Othello in jealousy. Mulleasses does not care for his dishonour. He has self-admitted unclean sexual performance along with a tragic tale of lust, ambition or revenge, but there are other cultural concerns reproduced in Mason's drama. Therefore, Mason provides the English with a divinely authoritative explanation of how unnatural sexuality had invented and an assurance of damnation for the Turks. He has dehumanized the Turks and placed them in the position of a fundamentally different Other.

The Orient as a space of infidels and pagans conformed to a traditional structure that opposed the tyranny and licentiousness of the East with the rational, civilized Europe. The West is "rational, developed, humane, superior" and the Orient is "aberrant, undeveloped, inferior of Said (1978). The "European was rational, virtuous, mature, normal" and the Oriental was "irrational, depraved childlike, 'different" (Said, 1978). The military and lustful Turk is a general representation in which it is associated the Turkish Other with sex and violence. This stereotype had been essential in medieval anti-Islamic polemics, but it would occupy a comparable and perhaps even more significant position in the European Renaissance image of the barbarian Turk. These descriptions are thus in a sense instrumental (Cirakman, 2002). In a departure from the traditional stereotypes of East and West, Mason has subverted the expectations of the English audience by placing the Turkish noble in the role of the classical villain antagonist. As the tremendously destructive view of the Ottoman Turk as the Other prevailed in the late Elizabethan era, the opposition between English civility and Oriental barbarism help to define England, which was in search of a common ground in religion and politics. However, Linda McJannet's also argues fear and desire, her identified goal is "to recognize the moments at which Western playwrights enter into dialogue with Ottoman civilization and construct more complicated images of the East" (McJannet, 2006). Sir Robert Sherley defines the Turks as modern and great leaders of the world, with universal traits that led to the vogue for the Orient in Europe (Chew, 1937). In spite of this opinion, unpleasant prejudice creeps in Sir Thomas Sherley's *Discourse of The Turks* (1617) as he mentions Turks as pagans, infidels, sodomites, liars, drunkards, proud, scornful and cruel (Chew, 1937).

The stereotypes of the "lustful Turk" and the "cruel Turk" were already forming in early modern European imaginations (Jones, 1942; Wheatcroft, 1993). Such kind of power conflict created by a royal lustful lady is in Mason's *The Turke* (1609). Mason's 'lascivious strumpet' Duchess is obsessed by a bodily lust and sensation. She lusts after the noble Turk Mulleasses who enticed her to destroy Florence. In George Chapman's *Revenge of Honour* (1603), Caropia's lust matches the lustful Duchess in Mason's *The Turke* (1606), but Caropia is driven by ambition more than lust, since she has become heroic enough to take vengeance for her sexual corruption. It is believed to be a female practice among the Ottoman harem, because she can have a powerful lust if she masters the Mulleasses's affection. Timoclea thinks that her sexual exploitation is the key to her lust. The lascivious Timoclea portrays her relationship with Mulleasses as 'unworthy to be titled lovers' (II.i.56). In fact, she feels insecure about her status. She

fears her husband lord Mura disturbing her happiness. Mulleasses does not care for Timoclea's suspicion and asks her for more pleasure. Mulleasses does not want to cause any harm to Timoclea by her husband. Timoclea's relationship is adulterous and sinful yet the climactic execution scene seems to demand that the audience infer her guilt and approve his punishment. In other words, she prostitutes herself, even using a well-known procuress to broker the deal. The play proposes the troublesome relation between female and male desires at the top echelons of the Arab world. The author describes the Arab mistress as white, exotic, passionate, and sexually experienced woman. She is a favoured fair, witty, and rich ingénue woman in Arabia. Moreover, she has resisted the bonds of an arranged marriage by maintaining a demonstrably sexual relationship with her first love.

Mason humorously delineates the indulgence of Turkish men in open sexuality through a funny anecdote about catholic Venetian ladies. She swiftly encounters bizarre sexual scenes and stories associated with the lecherous and cruel figure of the Turkish Mulleases. All the sensual fantasies are recounted through Timoclea as she enslaves her body to Mulleases. As a significance of sixteenth-century literary approaches, that is to scheme crushed sexual fancies of the Turkish sultans on European women, pornography written in Europe with an Oriental setting and sexual uniqueness associated with cruelty and bloodshed. On the other hand, this unhealthy sensualism is exploited in the Turkish identity. In terms of sexuality, Mason questions the Turkish perceptions, and challenges the claims of travellers who embroidered their diaries with sensual stories. Mason provides the locus of sexual fantasy for the European woman with the Oriental persons. Mason produced sexual pleasure scenes which are denied in the Elizabethan home for its impropriety. Mason's account portrays the Italian Catholic ladies as sexual chattels with exotic beauty. Timoclea seems to gain sexual pleasure by beating her sexual desire. Mulleasses was also a sexual deviant. His voracious sexual appetite is toward white women. The lustful Turk seduces the beautiful Timoclea by the pleasure of love to carry on his political ambition:

What sweete suggestions of my future blisse  
Haue I from thee? O I am transported  
Beyond the power of reason! the present time  
Craves a more sober temper. Madam this disguise  
Must carry you vnknowne vnto my chamber  
Where we haue much to do: release your thoughts,  
Giue freedome to those faculties of nature,  
That made your sexe first dare to reach at pleasure.  
Be proud and lustfull, let ambition sway  
The power of action in you: murder and blood  
Are the two pillars of a States-mans good. (II.i. 197-107)

Timoclea draws attention to the power of female desire and sexuality. She has evoked her high sexual desire and becomes a symbol of woman's unfaithfulness. Elizabethan Englishmen strongly linked it to the Turks and Moors. The early modern period dramatists luxuriate in the degeneracy and deviance of the Turks. The prurient curiosity in what is regarded as Turkish sex acted in the medieval Christian books and would endure well into Renaissance period as it was inspired by the religious polemic against Islam. Mulleasses's reference to Mahomet is a stand-in for religious fanaticism or enthusiasm. Mason's usage of Muhammad is as a weapon against the Turkish Other's religion. He utters brutal terms against his faith. In fact, Mason denounces the theology of Islam in the speech of Mulleasses about Prophet Muhammad which could find no better image than that of Islamic sex to describe the Turks in order to confirm their divine doom. The dynamic at the play here is not wholly unlike in observing Mason's rhetorical use of comparisons between Catholics and Turks. Mason's play criticizes the abuses of Mulleasses and Borgias to their friends by comparing them to the claimed abuses of Prophet Muhammad in the Christian writings, but in doing so it

repeats the Western classical stereotypical outlook of the latter. Certainly, it would be difficult to understand Mason's decision to give his blessing to the play except it could practically also be construed as a forthright critique of Islam and its Prophet. From the Christian point of view, the Turks have deviated from God by following the teachings of a false prophet; and accordingly they have turned into deviants in their sexuality as in their beliefs. The audience and Englishwomen in particular view as the root of all evil in the Islamic theology this as it does not condemn adultery.

Mason displays the Turks indulging in unnatural sex. The author emphasizes that the Turks' adultery is not only acceptable but also inborn in the very nature of their sexual norms. Mulleasses might just be setting the example for the rest of the Turkish elite to emulate. Mason asserts 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 unclean and unnatural sex is affiliated with murder and both would lead the Turks to eternal damnation. So death seals the destiny of the sinful Turk. Like the more general notion of Mulleasses the fraud, this image had a long history in earlier English Medieval writings on the Saracens or Muslims (Tolan, 2002). Therefore, Mulleasses proves to conform to the popular notion of 'Turkish' treachery, ruthlessness and deceit. The false Christian accounts about Prophet Muhammad's alleged private perversions and desires were widespread in Europe (Prideaux, 1697). The sexual and marital practices of Prophet Muhammad and the Muslim Turks in general are briefly outlined in some of Luther's Medieval sources. John Tolan suggests that the fascination with Muslim sexuality goes back to the turn of the millennium and hagiographies of Christian martyrs by the hands of Muslims in Andalusia (Muslim Spain), but it argues that it was with the growth of Christian anti-Islamic polemics and crusader-propaganda during the 12th century, which portrayed Islam as a heresy, that it became truly widespread (Tolan, 2002). Norman Daniel also discusses extensively the medieval Christian obsession with Mohammed's many wives (the exact number varying greatly between different authors) and with sexuality in Islam in general (Daniel, 1962). These repetitive Oriental themes are of those Christian polemic claims of Muhammad's lustfulness, pedophilia, incest, homosexuality, and the invented promiscuity in the Holy Qur'an.

The image of the new barbarian was a combination of classical and Christian effects that show "the Turk as the bloodthirsty foe of Christ and Plato" (Schwoebel, 1967). In terms of its context, it is in fact frequently challenging to differentiate this image from the Protestant Reformers' later descriptions of Turks as cruel and lustful, which Mason observes as part of the exploration of the Muslim Turks and Islam. Mason fell back upon the traditional patterns of interfaith hostility. His play is a distorted portrait of the culture and religion of the Turks. Mason portrayed Islam as a pagan religion. The description of the pagan Saracens initially worked well as a propaganda instrument for such purposes, but it proved to be a two-edged sword in the long run. In order to make this image constant, it requires a rather safe distance from, or at least turning a blind eye to the real Muslims who do not worship idols, and who indeed do not view Muhammad as a God. Idolatry is particularly and strictly prohibited in the Holy Qur'an and Hadith, the Tradition. Jones remarks that "these prohibitions were, as a rule, in the Middle Ages, obeyed, although various sects weakened their effect by the modifications they introduced" (Jones, 1942).

Burton also observes that 'Christian women, instead, are endangered almost entirely in terms of the body' and that 'The lustful Muslims, both male and female, who pursue them, show no interest in their conversion' (Burton, 2005). Burton similarly argues that there are also women in the Turk plays who succumb to the lure of Muslim men, as with Timoclea in John Mason's *The Turke* (1606). Burton notes that these women usually get tangled in a condition where 'She willingly betrays her Christian ethics for a Muslim lover who typically spurns or manipulates her' (Burton, 2005). In constructing these 'lustful Turks' the image of Prophet Muhammad as concupiscent established in the polemic biographies is always in the background; indeed, in a scene of Mason's play, Julia has the subsequent substitution with Mulleasses (p. 118):

Jul: Heathen prophane.



Mul: Be gentle Madam.

Julia: If thou beest gentle and leave me *Mahomet* (V.iii.39-40)

At this point Julia is evidently seen to associate the lascivious nature of Mulleasses with that of a Muslim or as Prophet Muhammad and this, in concert with the theme of Muslim conquest and violence, which is also profoundly obliged to Prophet Muhammad of the polemic accounts. It is the representation of womanhood as representatives of Christian confrontation to the dual Islamic intimidations of sexuality and violence which are dominant in the construction of the interactions between Muslim men and Christian women in the Turkish plays. These plays place Christian females in a symbolic relationship to their native country and religion. As Nabil Matar states, this attribution of such sexual practice to the Muslim 'other' also produced an explanation for conquest which could be perceived as 'divinely sanctioned because of the moral and sexual deviance of the Other' (Matar, 1999).

The Turk takes centre-stage as the dominant Other because they were very successful professionals (Matar, 1999). Yet, given the disordered sense of the Turks as 'race', and of the category of 'Turk' as a fluid identity (bearing in mind the perception of them as racially assorted through the foundation of a convert population), the deceiving nature of Turkish characters on Elizabethan stage must ascend from religious, rather than racial identity. The treachery of the Turkish Mulleasses and his religious identity is a perfect combination in John Mason. In the speeches of Mulleasses's Machiavellian quest of his own advancement and the matter of his Islamic faith is also drawn in the tragedy between his wicked nature of Mulleasses's belief and the infidelity of would-be traitor Borgias.

### 3. MANET BORGIAS

The Italian matter provides the background to Mason's play. It is the dramatization of a fictitious story on a minor historical framework. The Venetians were the first government to establish permanent diplomatic relationships with the Ottoman Empire. Both sides signed numerous treaties and exchanged several ambassadors. Venetian states were now open to Turks. In other words, sophisticated diplomatic services serve as the interface between the Ottoman and Venetian states. The resulting societal overlap inevitably created myriad Venetian cultural chameleons (Goffman, 2002). The inter-faith relationships are repeatedly threatened with religio-moral corruption, ostensibly culminating in conversion. Mason's Christian-Muslim interaction is striking because the barbaric military and historical Sultan is replaced by the lecher and treacherous Turk. In this discourse about Turks and Italians, Mason produces a representation that did not belong to the actual encounter with Muslims. 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. In other terms, Bayle classifies 'Mahomet' in images of the impostor, the 'lustful,' the 'cunning,' and 'the false teacher' (Bayle, 1984). It is also possible to trace the notion of the 'violent' Muslim that emerges from Mason's Turkish Mulleasses.

Mulleasses is presented in a highly negative and murderous Turk. He employs women to serve his own purposes. For instance, Julia is one of Mulleasses's victims. Borgias is the protector of his niece Julia, the young Duchess of Florence, whom he plans to wed in order to gain the Duchy. When Borgias has prepared his wife Timoclea's death, he tried to murder his opponents, the Dukes of Ferrara and Venice, and establish a dispensation from the pope. He then plots to use 'forty thousand Ianisaries/To be my guard, gainst forraigne outrages' (I.iii.70-1), provided by 'the Great Turke' through the conciliation of Mulleasses to make himself King of Italy, in return for permitting the Ottoman Sultan to 'land his force on this side Christendome' (I.iii.73). Mulleasses, in the meantime, is having an illicit sexual affair with Borgias' wife, while he has been offered the hand of his daughter Amada, and ultimately makes a plan to marry Julia himself even though she rejects him, affirming that 'Our loves like our religions are at wars' (V.i.42). In plotting his evil deeds, Mulleasses made some religious petitions. In a monologue at the opening of the first scene of Act Two, Mulleasses marks a petition to 'Mahomet' to aid him in his cause. Mulleasses calls on

'Mahomet' as the 'Eternall substitute to the first that mov'd/And gave the Chaos forme. \Thou at whose nod/ Whole Nations stoopt' (II.i.1-3). Mulleasses then states that these nations: 'hold thee still a God/Whose holy-customd-ceremonies rites,/ Live unprophan'd in our posterity' (II.i.3-5). In going on to call on Prophet Muhammad as 'God of *Mecha*, mighty *Mahomet*' (II.i. 7) Mulleasses' language shows the sort of misunderstanding about the position of Prophet Muhammad which is part of the legacy of the Medieval classics and romances. Those writings frequently portrayed Prophet Muhammad (as 'Mahon', 'Mahun' or 'Mahound') as a god or idol (Daniel, 1984). This aspect similarly echoes in *The Turke*, when Julia declares that there is no love or peace between Christians and Muslims since they belong to different religions:

Julia:

If thou beest gentle leaue me *Mahomet*  
 Our loues like our religions are at warres  
 And I disclaime all peace. (V.iii. 40-3).

The conflict between Christianity and Islam is between honest Christians and infidel Turks. The sufferings of Christians under the Ottoman rule were effective recruiting tools for Elizabethan dramatists to react. Thus, Mason sought to remind them that the true enemy of England and the rest of Christendom were the Turks. Therefore a holy war against the Turk is lawful, both by the laws of nature and nation. While holy war was seen as a Muslim-Christian confrontation by the majority of English writers, other writers saw it as a Protestant-Catholic conflict (Matar, 1999). A literary war was too being waged against Islam and Prophet Muhammad and all Muslims on London stage in place of a religious war on a battlefield. Subsequently, Mulleasses's words to entail the conception of Prophet Muhammad as both God and Prophet, could paradoxically subjugate the same space, as he prostrates himself and calls on Prophet Muhammad as 'Great Prophet' (II.i.9). It is the next section of Mulleasses's speech which is most interesting, considering the depictions of Muhammad in the polemic accounts as an unethical deceiver who employs religion for his own conclusions. Mulleasses calls on 'Mahomet' to 'let thy influence be free' (II.i.9) and asks that he 'mew not up my soule/ In the pent roome of conscience' (II.i.10-11), but as an alternative he prays:

Make me not morall *Mahomet*, coopt up

And fettered in the fooles philosophy,  
 That points out actions unto honesty. (II.i.12-14)

In this passage, Mulleasses entreats Muhammad to 'Give my plots fortune' (II.i.15). Muhammad seems as a deity, or at least that of mediator, the result of whose 'influence' is to abolish all ethics and leave the way perfect for ambition and deception. In this sense the 'Mahomet' who is enticed at this point by Mulleasses appears to function as sacred version of the character of Muhammad establishes in the Christian polemic accounts, with the capability, through his 'influence', to instruct his believers in the same talents of treachery and political plotting as was revealed in Medieval and Elizabethan Christian biographies of the Prophet's life. At the end, when apprised of a anxiety among the people ensuing an eclipse, Mulleasses calls on 'Mahomet' to 'Make that ecllipse etemall' (II.i.40) and chairs the 'god' within a hellish and racialized cosmology, appealing to the 'mistie-footed Jades of night' (II.i.41) to:

Draw your darke mistrese with her sable vayle,  
 Like a black Negro in an Ebone chaire,  
 Athwart the worlds eie: from your foggy breaths  
 Hurl an Egiptian grossenes through the ayre,  
 That none may see my plots. (II.i.42-46)

In this supplication, Mulleasses places the 'god' Mahomet at the climax of a divine classification which helps the deceptions and 'plots' of its ambitious enthusiasts. This petition to 'Mahomet' as a god of immorality, deception and ambition is comparable in *The Turk* with the godless words of the Christian Borgias. Borgias opposes the religious

teachings and devotion to Christianity in his search of his personal political ambitions. Borgias' deserting of his Christian personality is remarked on by his daughter Amada initial in the play, when he bids Mulleasses her hand in marriage. Having remarked that she would rather perish than 'live to see those tapers bum/ That lead me to his bed' (I.ii.79-80) she goes on to inquire 'where's sanctity?' and perceives that:

Religion is the fool's bridle, wome by policy:

As horse weare trappers to seeme faire in shew

And make the worldes eyes dote on what we seem. (I.ii.81-83)

Amada refuses her father's pledge to this inter-faith wedding with the 'infidel' Mulleasses, but Borgias is selfish and works in the comforts of his political desires. He has a solid contract with the 'Great Turk' of Turkey to make him King of Italy. Borgias calls his purpose to give the Ottoman Sultan 'command upon the streights/ And land his force on this side Christendome' (I.iii.73-74) he drives onto vow, paradoxically assumed his purpose to deceive Christianity, by his 'faith to God/ And loyalty I owe unto the stares' (I.iii.75-76) that:

Should there depend all Europe and the states

Christened thereon: Ide sink them all,

To gaine those ends I have proposd my aimes.(I.iii.77-79)

The representation of Borgias' denial of religion in the name of ambition, and of his traitorous coalition with the 'Great Turk' with the intention of securing his objective of progressive authority places him, beside Mulleasses and his petition to 'Mahomet' as a deity of deception, immorality, treachery and political machination, within a scale wherein deception, atheism, Islam and political ambition intersect, overlap and parallel each other in this play. In fact, Borgias attempts to obtain the Dukedom and the Italian throne through Mulleasses's means: fortune, ability and foreign arms. To this extent, he deliberately misleads the Duke of Ferrara and Duke of Venice "entrench't against the gates of Florence/To gaine your [Julia's] love" (I.i.103-1054), that she has expired and is "[s]inging with Angels in the quire of heaven," (I.i.251). Borgias requests them to make peace and show up in her "funerall supper" (I.i.321) with the aim of poisoning them. But to begin with, he must dispose of his wife Timoclea and to offer a kind of explanation, he orders a Eunuch to spread stories that she is sick and likely to die. Though the Eunuch cannot apprehend Borgias' particular determination, he is conscious of the association between power, violence and politics: "He kils by law that kils men for a state" (I.ii.123). On the Eunuch's leaving, Borgias displays his accurate goal through a soliloquy. He will accuse Mulleasses for the death of his spouse, his partner in malice, in order to espouse his niece Julia and come to become the Duke of Florence. The Cardinal of Anjou has besought the Pope for "dispensation with our bloods alliance:" whereas the "great Turke" (the Sultan) has undertook Borgias a forty thousand janissary to defend and make him King of Italy in interchange for the control of Gibraltar (I.iii.46-64), linking the Mediterranean Sea and the Atlantic Sea and accordingly offering a safe passage into Christian World. All this will be done through violence: "I can commaund their liues: and then maintaine/My actions with the sword" (I.iii.67-8). Therefore, in order to accomplish command, Borgias is prepared to work against his Christian colleagues by deploying the Turkish armies in Italy:

And I will do it: on my faith to God

And loyalty I owe vnto the starres,

Should there depend all Europe and the states

Christened thereon: Ide sinke them all,

To gaine those ends I haue proposd my aimes.

Religion (thou that ridst the backes of Slaues

Into weakemindes insinuating feare

And superstitious cowardnesse) thou robst

Man of his chiefblisse by bewitching reason. (I.iii.76-84)

Borgias formerly goes on to show the image of faith as a restriction to his ambition and to some degree to block religion in the terms of political progression in which religion makes politicians slaves and weak-minded by insinuating fear in their hearts; and he describes religion as a superstitious coward who does not allow to take reason and think of solutions (I.iii.80-83). Mason figures Borgias as harmless as Mulleasses. Borgias works as a chameleon. He has played altered roles such as the 'devoted uncle' and 'the lover' as a serpent molding off its skin:

Twice like a Serpent haue I cast my skin,  
Once when with mourning sighs I wept for Iulia,  
And made the two Dukes weepe for Iulia,  
That coat is cast: now like an Amorist  
I come in louing tearmes to court my Iulia,  
And seeme a louer: but of all shapes  
This fits me worst: whose constellation  
Stampt in my rugged brow the signes of death,  
Enuy and ruine: strong Antipathyes  
Gainst loue and pleasure: yet must my tongue  
With passionate oaths and protestations,  
With sighes, smooth glances, and officious tearmes,  
Spread artificiall mists before the eies  
Of credulous simplicity: he that will be high,  
Must be a Parasite, to fawne and lye. (II.ii. 6-20)

Borgias does not care for the Mulleasses' love affairs, but he is strong-minded to sacrifice his own female relatives in order to establish his power over Italy. His evil deeds make his look like a villain Christian Turk. Like Mulleasses, Borgias also becomes a ravening beast. His dangerous cruelty towards his own blood, has made him an ill name. The two Machiavellians plot to murder the Dukes without making any suspicion. The drug that they shall give them at a feast will put them to sleep for practically a month before leading to their death (II.iv.37-46). Mulleasses points out that crime committed for power and state must be done with great attention:

That were too violent: things done for state,  
Must carry forme, and with an outward glosse,  
Varnish and couer what would else seeme grosse,  
Should they be murdered in their beds, or die, (II.iv.44-7)

The Italian and the Turkish Machiavellians upsurge alongside. Borgias becomes abusive as a Turk. The dubious relation between Turkish Mulleasses and the Catholic Borgias is firmly established in relations between European and Ottoman cultures. Borgias wanted to befriend the Turks, but he projected weakness and despair. Mason emphasizes the similarity of Turkish and Italian vices. Borgias intends on debauchery and his wickedness is similar like Muslims and Turks. He is stereotyped as a pagan or heretic. Mason portrays the force and the roles of various cultural and political images in the ever-changing discourse about the Turks. Mason's intellectual and emotional reference to the Catholic believers is passive but less hostile than the infidel Turk. The morality or sinfulness of Borgias was not important in itself, except as a rhetorical tool by which to shame sinful Christians, and Mason's many comparisons between Italian Catholics and Turks were meant as insult and critique of the former. However, this is what Borgias 'seems' to consider:

My fortunes on thy councill noble Turke.  
We'le clime together: my daughter sheddy will

Shall stoope vnto thy pleasure: as for Iulias loue  
She must or yield or dye: he that is wise,  
Will tread on any that may make him rise. (III.iv 64-8)

On the other hand, the ungentle monster Timoclea follows Mulleasses's orders and masks herself as the ghost of Julia, so that she can convince the Duke of Venice to slaughter her 'murderer' Borgias. But shortly Mulleasses, wearied of Timoclea, tricks her into stabbing her own daughter Amada through an outrageous jealousy rage by purposely permitting her to realize that he 'loves' Amada. Mulleasses declares her "worse than a Cammell in her time of lust" (IV.i.117). After furtively observing the manslaughter, the treacherous Mulleasses comes into the chambers telling:

What, do you Christians sacrifice with flesh?  
Or like the *Laodiceans* unto Pallas, offer  
The blood of virgins? O inhumane deed,  
Ungentle monster [Timoclea], beauteous Amada! (IV. i. 112-115)

Then again, Borgias murders the Duke of Ferrara masked as the Eunuch (IV.i.137), and then strangles his wife for killing Amada (V.i.106). With everybody out of the means, both the Italian and the Turk are free to follow Julia for political advantage. In this detail, Borgias plots to murder Mulleasses, allege him for the murders, and at that moment proclaim that Julia is alive appealing to have been misled by Mulleasses:

First for thy death the lustfull Turke must dye,  
My rituall in the loue of Iulia  
Him Ile accuse for murdering thee. The Dukes  
Because his claime may alienate my hopes  
Him in my accusation I will ioyne  
As ioynt coagent in the Turke deuises.  
As for that rumour of faire Iulias death,  
I'le first proclaime her life: and on Mulleasses  
(Who now detaines her) will transfer the falsehood. (V.i. 138-6)

In the meantime, with Amada out of the way, Mulleasses entices Julia by proposing her "pleasure on the neighbouring plaines [a foreigner]" (V.iii. 22) and associating her uncle's love with his own: "thy Vncles love cold as the white head of the Apennine/Feeles not my fire: ambition of rule/Turnes al the heate is left in him to incest" (V.iii.16-8). Julia, in return, appeals consideration to the clash between Christianity and Islam to prove the impossibility of her marriage: "If thou beest gentle leave me Mohamet/ Our loves like our religions are at warres" (V.iii.4-5). Following her denunciation, he intimidates her with physical violence and rape (V. iii. 69-71), an allusion to the assumed violence and lust of the Turk. Wicked activities of the two Machiavellians remain up to, at last, Mulleasses and Borgias murder one another, and the Duke of Venice weds Julia. Borgias' latest words are: "False Turke thy fate be but as cruell as is Borgias hate" (V.iii.125). Borgia is immorally deviant and deceiving.

The depiction of aliens in Elizabethan drama was mainly fashioned by the prospects of contact and the knowledge in representing them through their discourse with Europeans and through their imminent threat to the Western civilization. Both of Mason's Machiavellian villains have been created founded on general ideas about their nations held by the Elizabethan England. The Muslim Turk Mulleasses is, as the dominant agents of Islam, evil, murderous, violent, and infidel, and the Christian Italian Borgias is, as the agent of Catholicism, double-faced, deception, treachery, and violence. Historically the Britons were shown to fight the Turks in the spirit of the medieval holy warriors to defeat them.

Such literary characters reveal the prejudice that Elizabethan British manipulated towards them, which made possible to show remarkable bloody scenes of revenge effective on theatre, while untruthful depictions of the Turks presented dramatists an opportunity to describe Englishness and Christianity, and explain the advantage of English culture, philosophy, faith and administration. In this situation, the Italian Borgias represents the Roman Catholic Church, and he is immoral like the Muslim Mulleases, while the author Mason is Protestant. The notions reproduced in such dramas as *The Turke* similarly display the extent to which Catholicism became a menace to the Anglican Church of England.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

Mason's Turkish Mulleases is typically part of the social stock of knowledge in Elizabethan England. Mason usually invoked the vices of Turks only to endorse Christianity. The infidel in Mason's play is an examination of the image of the Turkish infidel Other. The author depends on the biblical narratives in establishing a pattern of relationship between Catholicism and the Turkish Empire concentrated on a close understanding between the chosen Catholic-Christian seed and the cursed Muslim seed. The play fundamentally dehumanized the image of the Turks which had become so entrenched by the Elizabethan period. Mason wants to retell the Elizabethan audience that the true foe of the Protestant England and the entire Christian Europe is the Turk. In understanding the history of the Elizabethan and Jacobean governments' method in encountering any intimidation to the crown, the Turks did not do anything that could have surprised the audience of these plays, compared to excessive brutalities used against the public during the Tudor regimes in the past. The Turkish Empire has waged wars against European states. The strength and fury of the Turks creates the Elizabethan panic ebbed and payable to Turkish news. Thus, England embraces an exclusive European identity which is likely to emphasize the essential differences between a Europe that ultimately rests on Christian values and a mostly Muslim Turkey. Since the Turks belonged to a culture that was "radically foreign", they were not described in their own terms. While Mason's methods have attached the Turks to violence, his play dehumanizes the Turks as pagans. The dehumanization of Muslim Turks is a trend to substitute an attitude of fear, anxiety, and awe. The terror of the Turks, if not the Turks themselves, had crossed the ocean. Mason has replaced a so-called set of universal political and humanistic vices of the Turks in a distinct front to fight Islamic culture. Wheatcroft remarks that "the fear of the Islamic threat remained a strong connection between the past into the present" (Wheatcroft, 2003).

The image of Turkish promiscuity and lechery is used to emphasize a political issue in terms of sexual pleasure. For Mason, the sexual deviance among the Turks was unavoidable. Therefore, just as the villain or the enemy must be characterised in contrast to the hero, Turks figure as brutal, barbaric and sexually frustrated which is a certain reference to the Turkish Mulleases who is, as well as being ugly, vulgar and violent. The creation and effect of the comprehensive mood of horror in tragedies of blood, and horror's connection to sexuality and inter-racial relationships centers on transgressions of class as a type of social horror which in turn has involved ties with sexual and racial concerns. The omnipresent use of words like lustful, lecher and debauchery failed and degraded to describe the situation of sex and treachery in Turkey indicates the common sentiment that Turkish morality is already far from Europe's.

Mason partially judges the Turks in exploring the Turkish culture based on the Elizabethan experiences in the Orient. It analyses of the strengths and weaknesses of the Ottoman enemy. The negative images of the Turks associate Turkey with violence and oppression. The traditional portrayal of Turkish men has been biased and based on European judgements. There is no room for people like the Turks in England or the whole Europe. Mason understands the Turks in earlier analyses of medieval Christian anti-Islamic polemics. The author apprehends that it is a cultural or even religious threat since the warning follows immediately after an account of the rise of Islamic

expansion in Europe. The Islamization of Europe suggests how the old threat of Ottoman military invasion has been recontextualized in Mason. Mason's play is the most obvious example of the portrayal of Turkey in England.

The play shows an abundant background material about the Turks as a future cultural challenge to the Elizabethans. Accordingly, Elizabethan dramatists propagandized their literary works against the Turks. They were deeply involved in literary wars. Ignorance legitimated prejudice, and prejudice turned into exclusion, derision, and hostility. The image of Turks is distorted by linking them with violence and corruption. There is no innocent invention of the Turks taking place in Renaissance literature. Elizabethan enmity to the Turks is a stock image in England. It is a cultural and literary war of the Cross against the Crescent. The writer must have believed that this was the best way to deal with the Turkish Other. His play enacts cultural encounters between Christians and Muslims. It stands in contrast to other false accounts on Islamic theology, sensuality and sexuality. The author failed to understand the Turkish Other. Mulleases and his lack of moral principle were affiliated with a clear and present danger to Christendom. Mason's Mulleases represented a despotic Oriental Other who was well-defined by his lack of enlightenment and who belonged to the past; nowhere does Mason suggest that these differences will sometimes be overcome. The theme of unnatural sex and violent passion is the spirit of the denunciation the Turkish Other. The protagonist in Mason's play is the Turkish Muslim Other. Mason's portrayal of Turks has attempted to display that he remains enslaved of images of Islam and of Muslims that had been established by early Medieval Christians.

Funding: This study received no specific financial support.

Competing Interests: The author declares that there are no conflicts of interests regarding the publication of this paper.

## REFERENCES

- Al-Olaqi, F.M.T., 2013. The oriental other: Soliman the magnificent in Kyd's Soliman and Perseda. *TRAMES*, 1: 35–54. [View at Google Scholar](#) | [View at Publisher](#)
- Al-Olaqi, F.M.T., 2016. The barbarous moor in Peele's Alcazar (1594). *World Journal of English Language*, 6(2): 24-34. [View at Google Scholar](#) | [View at Publisher](#)
- Bayle, P., 1984. *The dictionary historical and critical of Mr. Peter Bayle*. New York/London: Garland Publishing, Inc, 4: 29.
- Burton, J., 2005. *Traffic and turning: Islam and english drama, 1579-1624*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.
- Chew, S.C., 1937. *The crescent and the rose: Islam and england during the renaissance*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cirakman, A., 2002. From the "terror of the world" to the "sick man of Europe": European images of ottoman empire and society from the sixteenth century to the Nineteenth, Ed., Frank J Coppa, *studies in modern European history*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 43.
- Daniel, N., 1962. *Islam and the West: The making of an image*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Daniel, N., 1966. *Islam, Europe and empire*. Edinburgh: University Press.
- Daniel, N., 1984. *Heroes and saracens*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- El-Deen, A.A., 1984. *A critical edition of Thomas Goffe's The raging Tyrke, or, Baiazet the second (1631)*. Unpub. Diss. West Virginia: West Virginia Univ.
- Goffman, D., 2002. *The Ottoman empire and early modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hubbard, W., 1972. *A general history of New England from the discovery to MDCLXXX*. New York: Arno Press.
- Isom-Verhaaren, C., 2011. *Allies with the infidel: The Ottoman and French Alliance in the sixteenth century*. London: I. B. Tauris and Co.
- Jones, M.C., 1942. The conventional Saracen of the songs of geste. *Speculum*, 17(2): 201-225. [View at Google Scholar](#) | [View at Publisher](#)
- Kabbani, R., 1986. *Europe's myths of orient: Devise and rule*. London: Macmillan.

- Kalmar, I.D. and P.J. Derek, 2005. Orientalism and the jews. Waltham: Brandeis University Press.
- Lowenthal, C., 2003. Performing identities on the restoration stage. Illinois: Southern Illinois UP.
- MacLean, G. and N. Matar, 2010. Britain and the islamic world, 1558–1713. Oxford: University Press.
- Matar, N., 1999. Turks, moors, and englishmen in the age of discovery. New York: Columbia University Press.
- McJannet, L., 2006. The Sultan speaks: Dialogue in english plays and histories about Ottoman Turks. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Oueijan, N.B., 1996. The progress of an image: The East in english literature. New York: Peter Lang.
- Prideaux, H., 1697. The true nature of imposture fully displayed in the life of mahomet. London: William Rogers.
- Said, E., 1978. Orientalism. London: Penguin Books.
- Schwoebel, R., 1967. The shadow of the crescent: The renaissance image of the Turks, 1453-1517. Nieuwkoop: B.De Graaf.
- Senlen, S., 2013. A state-villaine must be like the winde,/that flies unseene yet lifts an ocean: Machiavellian Italian and Turk in Mason's the Turke. Ankara Universitesi Dil ve Tarih-Cografya Fakultesi Dergisi, 53(1): 27-40.
- Sphelling, F.E., 1908. Elizabethan drama 1558-1642. Boston Houghton: Mifflin & Co.
- Tolan, J.V., 2002. Saracens: Islam in the medieval European imagination. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wann, L., 1915. The oriental in Elizabethan drama. Modern Philology, 12(7): 423-447. [View at Google Scholar](#) | [View at Publisher](#)
- Wheatcroft, A., 1993. The Ottomans. London: Penguin.
- Wheatcroft, A., 2003. Infidels: A history of the conflict between Christendom and islam. New York: Random House.
- Yungblut, L.H., 1996. Strangers settled here amongst us. London and New York: Routledge.

*Views and opinions expressed in this article are the views and opinions of the author(s), International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability etc. caused in relation to/arising out of the use of the content.*