

REPRESENTATIONS OF THE ‘OTHERS’: IMAGE OF MUSLIM TURKS ON THE RESTORATION STAGE*

B. Ayça ÜLKER ERKAN
Celal Bayar University

Abstract

The Muslim world is considered as the “other” by the Europeans throughout centuries. The territorial expansion of the Ottomans and the route control of the world trade worried England. Thousands of Turks and Moors traveled to England during the early seventeenth century. The English were acquainted with Turkish literature, culture, history, and religion through travel books. In the western perspective, this interaction with an Islamic country like the Ottomans brought mostly a negative image. The recognition of the Ottomans and Islam consisted of a mixture of fear, bewilderment, and uneasiness. Fear of the “revolt of Islam” haunted the mind of Europe, which made grounds for constituting a racialized subjectivity. It certainly created the image of an enemy who was “cruel”, “barbaric”, “devastating” and a “threat for Christianity”. Racialization of Muslim Turks and their negative image as “devastating” Turks can clearly be observed in British literature, especially on the Restoration stage.

Key Words: Image of Muslim Turks, Restoration drama, the other/s, racialization.

B. Ayça ÜLKER ERKAN

* Presented as a paper on April 4, 2008 at Michigan State University, Muslim Studies Conference 3-5 April 2008 Michigan, U.S.A

‘ÖTEKİLER’İN TEMSİLLERİ: RESTORASYON SAHNESİNDE MÜSLÜMAN TÜRK İMAJI

B. Ayça ÜLKER ERKAN
Celal Bayar Üniversitesi

Özet

Müslüman dünyası yüzyıllar boyunca Avrupa’lılar tarafından “öteki” olarak görülmüştür. Osmanlıların bölgesel olarak genişlemesi ve dünya ticaret rotasını kontrol etmeleri İngiltere’yi endişelendirmiştir. Binlerce Türk ve Mağribi on yedinci yüzyılın başında İngiltere’ye seyahat etmişlerdir. İngilizler, Türk edebiyatı, kültürü, tarihi, ve dini ile seyahat kitapları vasıtası ile tanışmışlardır. Batılı bakış açısına göre Osmanlı İmparatorluğu gibi, çoğunluğu Müslüman olan bir ülke ile olan bu etkileşim çoğunlukta negatif bir imaj getirmiştir. Osmanlıların ve İslamın tanınması korku, şaşırma, ve tedirginlikle karışık bir durum ortaya çıkarttı. “İslamın başkaldırma” korkusu, ırkçı ve nesnel oluşumuna zemin hazırlayan Avrupa zihniyetinin yakasını bırakmadı. Böyle bir durum şüphesiz “zalim”, “barbar”, “tahrip edici” ve “Hristiyanlığa tehdit” olan bir düşman imajı oluşturdu. Müslüman Türklerin ırkçı bir bakış açısıyla ele alınması ve onların “tahrip edici” negatif imajları, açık bir şekilde İngiliz edebiyatında özellikle Restorasyon tiyatrosunda gözlemlenebilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Müslüman Türk imajı, Restorasyon Draması, Ötekiler, Irkçılık.

1. INTRODUCTION

The religion of Islam, and the Ottomans were great problems for Christian Europe from the time they first appeared. Looking at Islam with a mixture of fear, bewilderment and uneasiness, European Christians saw Muslims as the enemy and rival of Christianity. The most commonly held belief, as Hourani declared, was that “Islam is a false religion, Allah is not God, Muhammad was not a prophet; Islam was invented by men whose motives and character were to be deplored, and propagated by the sword” (Hourani 10). Luther also thought that the Muslim Turks were a divine punishment from God for the sins committed by Christendom. He adapted his scheme after the first siege of Vienna by Süleyman the Magnificent in 1529 and invited German princes to fight the Muslim Turks (Soykut 101). Significantly, the relationship between Muslims and European Christians was not simply the idea of holy war, of crusade and “jihad”¹, there was also trade across the Mediterranean where the ships from the European ports began to appear in the Mediterranean.

Edward Said’s *Orientalism* (1979), which centered on the existence of a coherent Western discourse on the Orient, contributed to new perspectives to frame the colonial and postcolonial discourse. In other words, it engages the West’s relations with the Islamic world.

‘The Eastern Question’ aroused by the Ottoman Empire is mostly related to the problems presented by their weakness and withdrawal. For most Europeans, Ottomans were regarded as “the source of danger and invasion from the first Persian vanguard to the last Ottoman rear guard . . . (Lewis, *The Question* 252).

As Edward Said points out, between the 16th and 17th centuries either the Arabs or Islam or both dominated the Mediterranean (“Arabs, Islam” 105). Then, the Ottoman Empire appeared more prominent causing the so-called Eastern Question. Moreover, Western Christianity had never been able “either to accommodate Islam or to subdue it completely. There is an unbroken tradition in European thought of profound hostility, even

¹ In Arabic, Jihad means to “strive” or “struggle”. It appears frequently in the Qur’an and common usage as the idiomatic expression ‘striving’ in the way of Allah meaning the legal, compulsory, communal effort to expand the territories ruled by Muslims at the expense of territories ruled by non-Muslims.

hatred, toward Islam as an outlandish competitor . . .” (Said, “Arabs, Islam” 1105).

The Orient and Orientals were always in the position of “outsiders” and were considered to be the weak partners for the West. This displacement made Orientals as aliens, backward, the “others”, and as standing in the peripheral world of Western hegemony. Moreover, there was a tendency of Western colonial and imperialist dominion over the Islamic world. As Said emphasized Westerners saw the Orient as a location requiring Western attention, reconstruction, and even redemption (“Arabs, Islam” 112). The technological development, progress, and success of the West failed them to comprehend the spirit of the Orient especially in its moral power. Still, it did not prevent Western interest in the Orient. There was an inclination to contest assumptions of European politico-cultural superiority over the East. Thus, “The Eastern Question” basically arose from “the efforts to prevent the Ottomans from enforcing their authority” (Nash 13).

Louis Montrose draws attention to the new historicism by analyzing “otherness” and “inclusiveness”. Montrose emphasizes the otherness by exclusiveness; “experiences of exclusiveness or otherness may, of course, provoke a compensatory embrace of the dominant culture, a desire for acceptance and assimilation . . . provoke attitudes of resistance or contestation” (393). In the light of this perspective, the Western hegemony “embraces” the Orient for assimilation, still the Orient, namely the Ottoman Empire is an unknown exotic world, which subverts or transgresses the hegemonic Western ideology.

2. THE EASTERN QUESTION: THE DEVASTATING TURKISH IMAGE

Perhaps one should take a brief look at Turkish history and Islam in order to comprehend how the Turkish image is established according to the Western point of view and how Westerners appreciated Orientalism. The image of the Turk that emerged in 1088 at the time of the Byzantine Emperor Alexius Comnenus was certainly a negative one: “the image of an enemy”, who was “cruel”, “barbaric”, “devastating”, as somebody who was considered a ‘threat for Christianity’ (Kuran –Burçoğlu 188). First of all, the enmity of Muslim Turks flourished from the very beginning of the first Crusade². As Kuran –Burçoğlu states, the letter that

² The First Crusade was a military expedition from 1096 to 1099 by [Western Christianity](#) to regain the [Holy Lands](#) taken in the Muslim conquest of the [Levant](#), resulting in the

the Byzantine Emperor Comnenus had written played an important role in starting the first Crusade (188).

The expansion of the Ottoman Empire between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries from the Persian Gulf up to the Balkans into eastern and central Europe, and twice siege of the city of Vienna (1529 and 1686) worried Europeans deeply. Thousands of Turks and Moors traveled to England during the early seventeenth century. The Anglo-Ottoman economic relations started with the establishment of the Levant Company by merchants from London. Then, the English were acquainted with Turkish literature, culture, history, and religion through travel books. The most pressing threat to Europeans was the non-Western empire, the Ottomans. the Köprülü grand viziers, namely, Mehmet, Ahmet, and Hüseyin, were in major campaigns against the west from the 1650s to 1710. The territorial expansionism characteristics of the Ottomans can be observed in *Europe Moderna Speculum* (1665). Therefore, the English attitudes towards the Ottomans were inevitably affected from direct attack causing popular fear and hostility (Orr 62-63).

At the end of the nineteenth century, the Ottomans were losing their authority in Europe. Russia and Britain sent their fleet through Çanakkale (the Dardanelles) placing Turkey into direct confrontation. The Russo-Turkish War between 1877 and 1878 caused great losses and Russians almost took İstanbul. The Ottoman Empire lost territories: Bosnia Herzogevia and Serbia (Austria took charge of it), Romania declared formal independence, and Britain got the control of Cyprus. As for the most historians the corruption and the weakness of the Ottoman government was because of Western interference in its institutions. The idea behind the interference was to disarm Turkey of her own defense. This interference was not only to disarm the Ottoman Empire from her own defense, but also it aimed at excluding her from the recent developments that would hinder her from intellectual progress. Inevitably, the Ottoman Empire would be dependant and would not progress much to take her place as a super power in the world arena. This idea appears in Marmaduke Pickthall's statement, a Turkophile, novelist and traveler who became the partisan of the Young Turks reforms; "European interference in Turkish affairs was not that its modus operandi would corrupt Ottoman authenticity, but that it worked to sabotage

[recapture of Jerusalem](#). The Crusades are most commonly linked to the political and social situation in 11th-century Europe, the rise of a reform movement within the [papacy](#), and the political and religious confrontation of [Christianity](#) and Islam in Europe and the Middle East. For more information see www.Wikipedia.com/wiki/first_crusade.

Turkey's progress and reform" ³(qtd. in Nash 39).

3. THE TURKISH IMAGE ON THE RESTORATION STAGE

Western fears of Muslim Turks were inevitably reflected in the literature of the era. There were over forty plays between 1660 and 1714 in which the Levant and settings in Asia appeared on the early British stage. The earliest plays about Muslim Turks traced back to 1580, and it lasted until the eighteenth century. Among the most famous Turkish plays of the era were Christopher Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta* (1592), *Tamburlaine the Great* (1590), Mason's *The Turks*, Fulke Greville's *The Tragedy of Mustapha* (1609), Ladowick Carlell's *The Famous Tragedy of Osmand the Great Turk* (1657), John Mason's *The Turks* (1610), Nevile Payne's *The Siege of Constantinople* (1675), Elkonah Settle's *Ibrahim the Illustrious Bassa* (1677). The subjects such as Turkish history, Turkish characters, opposition between Muslim Turks and Christians mostly appeared in Restoration drama. The dominant characteristics of Muslim Turks on the Restoration stage were portrayed as sensual, cruel, and negative bodies.

The negative image of Muslim Turks not only appears on the Restoration Stage but also in Elizabethan theatre. As Kamil Aydın states, the early British Stage utilizes Turkish history as source material, which is most suitable to the theatrical taste of the time (54). For instance, in Shakespeare's tragedy *Othello* there is a reference about the Turkish naval defeat at Leponte on 7th of October 1571. On Restoration stage, in Oliver Goldsmith's *She Stoops to Conquer* (1773), the character Hardcastle reminds the audience of the battle of Belgrade in which Christians fought against the Turks (II, i, 33). The negative image of Muslim Turks portrays a conflict between Muslim Turks and Christians. In *Othello*, Muslim Turks are presented as cruel, barbaric, and sensual people. Othello is the commander-in-chief of the Christian army that will fight against Turks because there is an emerging Turkish threat. He boasts of killing a Turk for the welfare of the Senate: ". . . Where a malignant, and a turban'd Turk/ Beat a Venetian, and traduc'd the State,/ I took by th' throat the circumcised dog,/ And smote him, thus. (He stabs himself)" (V, ii 152-56). Othello points out the disorder within the Venetian culture by stating: "Are we turn'd Turks, and to ourselves do that / Which heaven hath forbid the Ottomites?" (II, iii 170-71). The idea

³ The Ottoman Empire and its position are discussed according to the Westerner point of view. For more information see L.S. Stravrianos (1966) *The Ottoman Empire: Was it the Sick Man of the Europe?* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

of “turning Turk” recurrently appears on the British stage. According to Burton, “turning Turk” means to turn from Christian virtue and become “a faithless enemy to Christian Europe” (16-17). The negative connotation of the phrase emphasizes the fact that the Islamic world was most frequently associated with corruption, violence, and treachery. The play is full of negative image of the Muslim Turks.⁴

I will attempt to analyse some of the Restoration plays in which the Turkish characters played significant roles. I will briefly analyse the plays, namely Orrery’s *Mustapha*, Manley’s *The Royal Mischief*, Farquhar’s *The Beaux’ Strategem* where the Ottomans appeared on the British stage establishing a negative image.

3.1. Orrery’s Mustapha

Orrery’s *Mustapha, Son of Solymon the Magnificent*, (1665) featured only Turkish characters with exception of the Queen of Hungary Roxolana and her lords. The plot revolved around Roxolana, mother to Mustapha and Zanger and wife of Solymon, and her efforts to secure the death of Mustapha, the imperial heir and Solymon’s elder son, so that her own son Zanger would not be murdered when Mustapha ascended the throne. The plot concerns both an English belief and the Ottoman Emperor’s traditional belief that Turkish political custom demanded that the eldest son when he had the crown must murder all of his brothers against the possibility of division within the state. This law of inheritance is declared as in the following: “These fatal maxims made our Sultans

⁴ There are several studies indicating the negative image of Muslim Turks in *Othello*. For instance Günseli Sönmez, İşçi (1999) “Othello’da Türklere Yönelik Söylenenler ve Söylenmeyenler” *Tarih ve Toplum Dergisi* Vol 31 May, pp. 49-58, Nabil Matar (2005) *Britain and Barbary: 1589-1689*, Miami: University Press of Florida, N. Matar (1999) *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery*, New York: Columbia University Press, Karen Newman (1987) “‘And Wash the Ethiop White’: Femininity and the Monstrous in *Othello*”, *Shakespeare Reproduced: The Text in History and Ideology*, eds. Jean E. Howard and Marion F. O’Connor, New York: Methuen, F. R. Leavis (1952) “Diabolic Intellect and the Noble Hero”, in *The Common Pursuit*, London: Chatto & Windus, Ayça Ülker Erkan, “Valiant Othello versus Cynical Iago: New Historicist and Psychoanalytic Approach to Shakespeare’s tragedy *Othello*”, *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, The Journal of International Social Research*. 3. 12 (Summer 2010): 441-448.

still / As soon as they were Crown'd, their Brothers kill" (I,ii, 207-208).
Roxolana lamented this custom:

Oh cruel Empire! That does thus ordain
Of Royal Race the youngest to be slain,
That so the eldest may securely reign;
Making the'Imperial Mother ever mourn
For all her Infants in Succession born. (25-26)

The other main action was concerned with Mustapha's and Zanger's rivalry in love for the Christian Queen of Buda, whose city had been taken. Roxolana was strong enough to cross her powerful husband in protecting another royal woman and her infant son after the death of the Hungarian king on the battlefield from the retaliating desire of the sultan. Roxolana was strong-willed, smart and able to manipulate political systems to her advantage. As Orr emphasizes the dreadful contest between the Turkish law and maternal nature formed the last scene where Roxolana confessed. In fact, Roxolana's scheme about Mustapha's death appeared as "her maternal care rebels against the cruel law of empire" (74-75). That "maternal nature" was set against the cruel Turkish system throughout the play:

ROXOLANA. And I, in my perplex condition, must
Become unnatural, or else unjust;
Must leave a Son to Empires cruelty,
Or to a gen'rous Prince inhumane be.
My Husband, whom I love, I cruel make,
Even against Nature, yet for Nature's Sake.
(IV, V, 656-61)

There is an elegiac tenderness at the end of the play, when both sons are dead through actions Roxolana could not control. She was forced to confess the part she unintentionally played in bringing about the deaths of her sons, divorced from the sultan, and cast out perpetually from the presence of her husband.

3.2. Manley's *The Royal Mischief*

Delariviere Manley's *The Royal Mischief* (1696) is set in the exotic realms of Islam. Manley utilized the European perception of both the Ottoman Empire and all Islamic countries, as Lowenthal declared, "their exoticism and sensual excess, especially as a site where women's lives were reputed to be markedly different and where Turkish men of status were slaves to their excessive sexual desires" (Lowenthal 125). Concurrently, Turkish women were not free and they had to lead a

limited life under male control because they had to live within the limits of the harem⁵ where women's desire was always veiled. In fact, the harem was a place where the mothers of the sultans were the real power behind the throne. The power of the mother increased if her son wore the crown, so this caused complicated and murderous schemes designed by the mothers of the sultanate to be.

Manley chose a Turkish setting for a plot which centered around a strong and sexually responsive but at the same time wicked princess, Homais who had been locked in her castle while her husband was at war abroad. Her desire for her husband's nephew caused an action of violence in which the honorable Bassima's eyes were gouged out and her hands, nose, and mouth cut off as a punishment for a supposed adultery with the vizier Osmand. Aided by Acmet and her ex-lover Ismael, the princess achieved her wish, which was only found out in the last act by her husband. While she died, she called her husband "a Dotard, impotent in all but Mischief" (45). Although Homais' husband offered forgiveness about his nephew's sexual transgression, the young man fell on his sword and died overwhelmed by guilt. Acmet was racked, Ismael was executed, and Bassima suicided after drinking the poisoned sherbet.

Manley reinscribed the "female desire, which Islamic and early British culture demands be as veiled" (Lowenthal 135) in this play. Gazing at a portrait evoked her sexual desire, which was never allowed to be pronounced in any Islamic society. As a matter of fact, women were excluded and put within the limits of the harem, thus they would hide their desire. Wearing veil appeared to be a symbol of women's chastity, which placed them as outcasts from the public gaze or life. This may also be considered as a sexualized display of the "Oriental woman" and their intrigue in the harem life (Lewis, *Rethinking* 143). The wicked Ismael testified the traditional male fear about female distinctiveness as follows:

Virtue in [women's] Souls is like their form,
Only exterior Beauty, worn to deceive
...
But when they meet a Lover to their wish,
They gladly throw the borrow'd Veil aside,
And naked in his Arms disclose the cheat. (10)

As Murphy declares, "female sexuality became a symbol of human weakness" (1), thus women "were also perceived as sources of danger" (2). This idea comes from the mythology: Hesiod perceived the arrival of

⁵ Harem is the seclusion of women from the public life in Islam.

the first woman called Pandora as being sent by the angry God, Zeus, to be the cause of men's misery (Murphy 2). The very same idea recurs in the biblical story pointing out that humanity was thrown away from Eden because of Eve's eating the forbidden apple. In this perspective, women, female desire, and sexuality were considered as threat to the power of patriarchy. This idea appears in the quotation above. Ismael's speech drew attention to the power of female desire and fear of female sexuality.

3.3. Farquhar's *The Beaux' Stratagem*

The establishment of the Western fear of the expansionist Ottomans and their consequent curiosity and interest created another "devastating" and "sensuous" figure in George Farquhar's *The Beaux' Stratagem* (1707). This Restoration play consisted of the least Turkish settings or character because Farquhar slightly mentioned the Turkish theme appearing as a negative image. Said (1979) emphasized the attitude of the Europeans towards Islamic expansion as follows:

Yet where Islam was concerned, European fear, if not always respect, was in order

Not for nothing did Islam come to symbolize terror, devastation, the demonic, hordes of hated barbarians. For Europe, Islam was a lasting trauma. Until the end of the seventeenth century the 'Ottoman peril' lurked alongside Europe to represent for the whole of Christian civilization a constant danger . . . (59).

Not much Muslim Turks were found in *The Beaux' Stratagem* if compared to the other contemporary Restoration dramas in which the Ottoman Empire appeared on the British stage. Farquhar, like all other dramatists of the era, was affected by the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish people. Still, the image of Muslim Turks appeared ideologically in the play, although the play was neither about Muslim Turks nor a Turkish setting.

The plot of *The Beaux' Stratagem* revolved around deception and the purpose of the main characters was finding a wealthy wife. None of the characters in the play was honest. In the first act, Farquhar introduced the motives and plan of Archer and Aimwell, two fortune hunting and flirting young men. In the second act, the playwright pointed out how Mrs. Sullen's marriage was insufferable. Actually, she had a stratagem in which she flirted with Count Bellair to take revenge on her husband. In the developing act, we learn that Bonniface (the innkeeper) and his highwaymen were frauds planning to rob Lady Bountiful. In the third act,

Aimwell fell in love with Dorinda. This act involved love and intrigue. In the next act, Aimwell who was pretending to be his brother Lord Aimwell, faked illness in Lady Bountiful's house in order to propose to Dorinda, while Archer proposed to Mrs. Sullen. The highwaymen arrived to rob the house at midnight. In the final act, a very complicated situation is resolved: Mrs. Sullen's brother, Sir Charles Freeman, met Sullen at the Inn and arranged for his sister to part from Sullen, and all agreed to aid him. Aimwell told Dorinda that he was not Lord Aimwell, but recent news that Aimwell's brother was dead, confirmed that now he was, in fact, the new Lord Aimwell. Cherry became maid to Dorrinda and Archer and Mrs. Sullen led the dance. Both couples were happy at the end of the play.

The image of the Turk appeared in Act Three, Scene Three, in which Count Bellair, a Frenchman and prisoner at Lichfield in the play, commented on Muslim Turks:

COUNT BELLAIR. Most certainly I would, were I a prisoner among the Turks; dis is your case: you're a slave, madam, slave to the worst of Turks, a husband.

MRS.SULLEN. There lies my foible, I confess; no fortifications, no courage, conduct, nor vigilancy can pretend to defend a place where the cruelty of the governor forces the garrison to mutiny.

COUNT BELLAIR. And where de besieger is resolved to die in the first place. – Here will I fix (kneels) – with tears . . . (Act III, iii)

The image of Muslim Turk appeared here as a tyrant who captivated Westerners. Muslim Turks in the passage as compared to a tyrant husband who captured his wife and made life a prison for her. Muslim Turks appeared as people to be scared of and avoided because of their "barbaric" nature. The words "prisoner", "slave", "worst" described the negative image of Muslim Turks. Here, we encounter the territorial expansionism characteristics of the Ottomans threatening Christian Europe. In this way the Muslim Turks appeared both as threat and as enemies. As Lowenthal emphasized the Muslim Turks were a military rival equal to and mostly greater than any other European forces that Britain encountered. Thus, they were never perceived as a target for British imperial wishes (14). It is obvious that "English attitudes to the Ottomans" were affected by "their relative insultation from direct attack but there was still plenty of popular fear and hostility directed towards the

great Turks . . .” (Orr 63). In fact, the fear of expansionist Ottomans appeared in Mrs. Sullen’s speech while she was describing the place as “the cruel of the governor forces the garrison”. The Ottoman Empire was called as “cruel” government that also embodied the common fears of the British Empire.

In the very beginning of Act IV, Mrs. Sullen comments on Muslim Turks and the situation of Turkish women as prisoners of the harem:

MRS.SUL. Were I born a humble Turk, where women have no soul nor property, there I must sit contended. But in England, a country whose women are its glory, must women be abused? Where women rule, must women be enslaved? Nay, cheated into slavery, mocked by a promise of comfortable society into a wilderness of solitude? I dare not keep the thought about me. – Oh, here comes something to divert me. (Act IV, i)

Mrs. Sullen here points out the conditions of Ottoman women of harem and polygamy that were inevitably the most discussed topics in Western culture of that era. Thus, the stereotype of the Oriental woman appeared as “docile, ignorant, inactive and uneducated” (Lewis, *Rethinking* 102). Both the seclusion and the polygamous life were associated with Islam especially through the last decades of the Ottoman Empire. It is important to note that this segregation and by implication of the polygamous life was central to the dominant Western Orientalist fantasy. It is most possible that “the West expects to hear unwholesome stories when it reads of the Eastern homes . . .” (Ellison qtd. in Lewis, *Rethinking* 100).

The exoticism of Turkey and the difference between the East and the West haunts the imagination of the Western culture. As emphasized in the quotation from the play, the West localized the oppression in the East and the position of women as prisoners of the harem. This tendency aims at misapprehensions about the harem and the life in the harem. The harem was also a place where the sons of Ottoman Emperor were raised by their mothers. However, only one son of the Emperor would become the Emperor in the future and would take the place of his father. The rest of the sons would be killed by the recent Emperor to avoid of the possibility of the upheaval. For this reason, there was rivalry going on among the mothers of the future sultans within the limits of the harem. Although polygamy and segregation put the Ottoman women in quest for self-definition and autonomy, the status of women in general improved much since the Tanzimat Reforms (1839-76).

4. CONCLUSION

The Western hegemony mostly ignored the fact that the Ottoman Empire was the most modern and secular Muslim state playing a crucial role as “the last great Muslim power”. The Ottoman Empire was important for the Islamic revival as a conduit of progress and the development to the Islamic world because geographically the Ottoman Empire was an important country forming a bridge between the East and the West. This was the place where Muslim and Christians had lived side by side peacefully in the Ottoman Empire until the nineteenth century. However, Britain’s failure to recognize the crucial role of the Ottoman Empire reforming the Muslim world upset the balance between Muslims and Christians. According to Valyi the West was so conceited in its technological success that it failed to comprehend the spirit and the moral power of Asia and above all Islam that rested on the idea of “a spiritual unification of the world” (20). David Urquhart, traveler and radical Turcophile, proclaimed non-intervention in Ottoman affairs, supported the preservation of Turkish traditions free from foreign interference and recommended the admission of Turkey into the European Union (qtd. in Nash 197-98). However, Britain preferred a policy of “greater Greece rather than backing Turkey” and the history “laid the ruin of Islamic civilization at the door of Turks; in reality, as the organizers, assimilators, and doors of Islam, Turks had preserved it” (Nash 198).

As a result, the racialisation of Muslim Turks and their negative image as “devastating” Muslim Turks which dated back to the fifteenth century can clearly be observed in British literature, especially on the Restoration stage. The Orient and the Islamic culture were always in the position of “outsiders” and “the other” as it can be observed even in the literature of the era. Historically, Islam, the Arabs, thereafter the Ottoman Empire formed the basis of the “the Eastern question” positioning the Orient both as outsiders and the weak partner of the West. The displacement of the Orientals continued within the Western hegemony of the non-European, non-Christian, undeveloped peripheral of the world. Inevitably, in fragmenting, dissociating and decentering the Orient, there dwelled the European thought of “profound hostility, even hatred, toward Islam as an outlandish competitor (Said, “Orientalism Reconsidered” 356); one finds it explicitly on Restoration stage. As Said emphasized, “Oriental backwardness, degeneracy, and inequality with the West most easily associated themselves early in the nineteenth century with ideas about the biological bases of racial inequality” (*Orientalism* 206). Orrery’s *Mustapha*, Manley’s *The Royal Mischief*, Farquhar’s *The Beaux’ Strategem* where the Ottomans appeared on the British stage are only a

few examples reflecting the attitude of the Westerners towards the Muslim Turks. From those days until now, the establishment of this negative image of Muslim Turks did not change. There is continuously a negative campaign against the Muslim Turks by placing them as the “others” in the Western culture. This perhaps explains the reason why still Turkey is not accepted to become a member of the European Union.

REFERENCES

“First Crusade”, Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia, 21 Nov. 2010
<http://www.wikipedia.org/wiki/first_crusade/>.

Aydın, Kamil (1999). *Images of Turkey in Western Literature*. Cambridgeshire: The Eothen Press.

Burton, Jonathan (2005) *Traffic and Turning: Islam and English Drama, 1579-1624*. Newark: U of Delaware P.

Farquhar, George (1969). “The Beaux’ Stratagem”. In G. H. Nettleton (Eds.), *British Dramatists: from Dryden to Sheridan*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 349-86.

Hourani, Albert Habib (1991). *Islam European Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Kuran –Burçoğlu, Nedret (1999). “The Image of the Turk in Europe from 11th to 20th Century as Represented in Literary and Visual Sources”. In *Marmara Journal of European Studies*. İstanbul: A Publication of Marmara University European Community Institute. 187-2000.

Lowenthal, Cynthia (2003). *Performing Identities on the Restoration Stage*. Illinois: Southern Illinois UP.

Orr, Bridget (2001). *Empire on the English Stage, 1660-1714*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Orrery, Roger Boyle, Earl of, (1734). *Mustapha, The Son of Solyman the Magnificent*. London: n.p.

Lewis, Bernard (2000). “The Question of Orientalism”. In A. L. Macfie (Ed.), *Orientalism: A Reader*. New York: New York UP. 249- 70.

Lewis, Reina (2004). *Rethinking Orientalism: Women, Travel and the Ottoman Harem*. New Jersey: Rutgers UP.

Manley, Delariviere (1696). *The Royal Mischief*. London: n.p.

Montrose, Louis (1992) “New Historicisms”. In Stephen Greenblatt, Giles Gunn (Eds.), *Redrawing the Boundaries*. New York: The MLA.

Murphy, Jr. Cornelius (1995). *Beyond Feminism: Toward a Dialogue on Difference*. Washington: The Catholic U of American P.

Nash, Geoffrey P (2005). *From Empire to the Middle East: Travellers to the Middle East 1830-1926*. London & New York: I. B. Tauris.

Said, Edward (1976, 31 October). “Arabs, Islam and the Dogmas of the West”. *The New York Times Book Review*, 5.

--- (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

--- (2000). “Orientalism Reconsidered”. In *Orientalism: A Reader*. Ed. A. L. Macfie. New York: New York UP.

Soykut, Mustafa (2004). “A Practical Application of ‘Otherness’ in Political History: The Italian Case and the Ottoman Empire (15th -18th Centuries)”. In N. Kuran Burçoğlu and S. G. Miller (Eds.), *Representations of the ‘Other/s’ in the Mediterranean World and their Impact on the Region*. İstanbul: Isis Press. 93- 124.

Valyi, Felix (1925). *Spiritual and Political Revolutions in Islam*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner.

B. Ayça ÜLKER ERKAN