# OSMANLI ARAŞTIRMALARI
# XIX



# THE JOURNAL OF OTTOMAN STUDIES
# XIX

İstanbul - 1999

Sahibi : **ENDERUN KİTABEVİ adına İsmail Özdoğan**

Tel: (0212) 518 26 09 Fax : (0212) 518 26 63

Yazı İşleri Sorumlusu : **Nejat GÖYÜNÇ**

Tel: (0216) 333 91 16

Basıldığı Yer : **KİTAP MATBAACILIK**

Tel: (0212) 567 48 84

Cilt : **FATİH MÜCELLİT**

Tel: (0212) 501 28 23 - 612 86 71

Adres : ENDERUN KİTABEVİ Büyük Reşitpaşa Cd. Yümni İş Merkezi No: 46
Beyazıt - İSTANBUL Tel. (0212) 528 63 17 - 528 63 18

# INTEREST OF THE ENGLISH IN TURKEY AS REFLECTED ENGLISH LITERATURE OF THE RENAISSANCE

## II

## THOMAS GOFFE

*Orhan BURIAN (1914-1953)*

### Introduction

*Professor Orhan Burian (1914-1953) whom we have lost so young, only when he was about to be forty was one of the leading intellectuals, translators and critics of the Republic Period. Beside his writings about mental subjects, art, literature and social topics, his studies mainly about the relations of Turkish and English cultures and especially the ones about the Turkish reflection on English writers are considered important. Such researches are published mainly in Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi, Belleten and Ufuklar. "Interest of the English as reflected in English Literature of the Renaissance" which was published in Oriens (V/2, 1952, 567-589, has been recently translated into Turkish by Çiğdem İpek (Belleten, LVI/216, 1992, 209-229).*

*Professor Burian has knitted a lot of researches, essays and translations together in his short but unbelievably productive life span. After his death some of his works has been published by his close friend Vedat Günyol, especially in Ufuklar (later Yeni Ufuklar) which Burian himself was one of the founders. Only there is no doubt that there are other works which has not been discovered yet. His rich library, notes and manuscripts are in his niece Ms. Kısmet Burian's house now in Yalova. The research on Thomas Goffe (1591-1629) which we found typed was in this library. This writing includes two tragedies*

*concerning Ottoman history written by English drama writer Thomas Goffe. Actually this writing was prepared as the second part of the writing that we have mentioned above which was published in Oriens; but the second part was never published. The publishing of this writing is an expression of our respect to him. I feel obliged to Ms. Kısmet Burian for letting us publish the writing. I also would like to express my gratitude to the publication committeee of Journal of Ottoman Studies who were kind enough to let us have this opportunity and publish this writing.*

*Zeki ARIKAN*

Richard Knolles' Generall Historie of the Turkes was one of the earliest histories to be written in the English language, and by several discerning judges like Johnson and Coleridge it has been praised as a monument of Elizabethan prose. From the time of its first publication it was very popular. The first edition of 1603, dedicated to James I, was followed by the second of 1610, which the author brought up-to-date and saw through the press.* During the seventeeth century it went through several other editions; Rycaut completed his revised and enlarged edition of it in 1700, and an abridged version of it by John Savage appeared in 1701. For over a century it was the principal English source for those interested in Turkish history. This, however, should not imply that Knolles was completely original in his work. In his preface he cites a number of Latin and French authors as his sources, while later scholarship has concluded that he was mainly relying on Boissard. At any rate the synthesis was his, and he had the flair to make this synthesis both dramatic and colourful. He does not show to his subject the impartiality which we expect from a modern historian. He is biassed and even prejudiced. He writes with hatred for the enemies of his faith. Yet he seems, true Elizabethan that he was, fascinated by the possibilities of his subject. The rise of a small nation, in three hundred years, to the heights of an empire without a rival in power and glory, was his theme. And he embellished this theme with all the stories he came across, about the ruthlessness of the people and the exotic splendour of their lives.

Thomas Goffe apparently found the inspiration and all the necessary material for his two historical plays, The Raging Turke and The Couragious

* Richard Knolles, *The Generall Historie of the Turkes,* etc. third ed. 1621, pp. 431-491.

Turke, in this Historie of Knolles that was so popular in his time. Judging by the plays he was most of all attracted to those aspects of the book which coincided with the fierce and ambitious nature of the Elizabethans, with their unscrupulous pursuit of power. But he did not, and the chances are that he could not, select stories that would have special potentialities for a dramatic handling. A comparison of the plays, in some detail, with the relative chapters in Knolles reveals not only the fact that his source was no other than Knolles, but that a fondness for the spectacular and for the fiercely passionate had always the upper hand in his work as a dramatist.

The historical events bearing upon The Raging Turke are to be found in Knolles in the chapter entitled *"The life of Baiazet, second of that name, and second emperor of the Turkes."*

At Mahomet II's death both of his sons, Baiazet and Zemes, were away from the capital, *"the one at Amasia, and the other at Iconium in Lycaonia."* Two factions arose at once, each claiming the throne to be the right of one of these princes; and the Janizaries made this confusion an excuse to assault the rich of the city, without any discrimination of Turk, Christian, or Jew. The three great Bassaes of the empire, Isaack, Mesithes, and Achmetes (the conqueror of Otranto in Italy), with a desire to end these troubles, devised the scheme of declaring Corcutus *"one of the younger sonnes of Baiazet, a young prince of eighteene yeares old"* as emperor. Their secret purpose was to rule the country as they pleased. Both Baiazet and Zemes, in the meantime, rushed to Constantinople. The former arriving first found that he had been already anticipated by his son; so, *"he in the griefe of his heart, poured forth most grievous complaints before God and man."* In the end, by entreaties, and gifts, and the support of his two sons-in-law *"the Aga or captaine of the Janizaries"* and *"Cherseogles the Viceroy of Graecia"* he persuaded those concerned to the resignation of Corcutus in his favour, *"which he presently tooke upon him with the generall good liking of the people, and made Corcutus governour of Lycia, Caria, and Ionia, with the pleasant and rich countries thereabouts"*; he also nominated him as his heir. Zemes hearing of the situation in Constantinople at once returned to his own provinces, raised an army, and marching through Anatolia took possession of the land, thus limiting his brother's rule to the Turkish territories in Europe alone. Baiazet gathered an army and crossed over to Anatolia to meet his brother's forces. On the way Achmetes came to him

unarmed, *"and peresented himselfe upon his knees before Baiazet, his sword hanging at his saddle bow... as if he had nothing to do with armes."* For, some years earlier, when Mahomet II was fighting against *"Assymbeius Usun-Cassanes the king of Persia"* and Baiazet, who was in charge of a wing of the army, not being prompt in his command, the Sultan had dispatched Achmetes who had at once recovered the loss. Baiazet had taken this to heart as a disgrace and had sworn revenge; and Achmetes learning of it had sworn never to bear arms under him. But now Baiazet made up for that past discord, and *"in token of grace stretched out to him his scepter"*, and raising him up made him the general of the army. The battle with Zemes was fierce, and cost many lives, but at the end *"the policie of Achmetes prevailed."* Many of Zemes' followers though *"Baiazet would have pardoned and enlarged"* them, were put to the sword on the *"persuasion of Achmetes."* Zemes himself escaped to Iconium, and a few days later, taking along with him his mother and his son and daughter went to Egypt, which was then under the rule of the Egyptian sultan Caytbeius. Although Baiazet did not find Zemes in Iconium, the civil war at any rate was at an end; so he returned to Constantinople. Zemes was well received in Egypt, and Caytbeius undertook to send an embassy on his behalf to Baiazet. But Baiazet would not allow Zemes to return and lead, as he termed, *"a private life"* in his father's kingdom. *"Wherefore Zemes more upon stomacke and desire of revenge, than for any hope he had of empire"*, sought to war. The King of Caramania, living in exile in Armenia, instigated him to this fight, hoping thereby to recover his own lost territories. Zemes left Egypt against the wish of Caytbeius, and joined forces with the King of Caramania. A rumour spreading in the Turkish army that many of the soldiers favoured Zemes, Baiazet had *"a wonderfull masse of money"* given to them before the battle; and *"loding their minds with ample promises of farre greater rewards"* made sure of their allegiance. Ostensibly he first sought a peaceful settlement by sending ambassadors to Zemes; but secretly *"he went about to stop all the straits and passages, in such manner as that it should not be possible for them againe to retire backe into Syria."* Zemes had counted on a revolt in Baiazet's army. Since that could not be effected any longer, he would not risk an open battle, and accordingly he retired to the south, disbanded his army, and, after corresponding with the Grand Master of the Knights of Rhodes sailed to Rhodes. He was received kindly by the Knights. Baiazet too was willing to let him stay there, provided the Grand Master took on himself the responsibility

for his custody; and to that end the Sultan paid the Knights 30,000 ducats every year. Rumours, however, that during the expedition against his brother some of his soldiers and generals had nourished hopes of his brother's success, kept worrying Baiazet. Isaack Bassa, *"the most ancient Bassa of the court, and of the greatest authoritie next unto Baiazet himselfe (whose daughter, a ladie of exceeding beautie, Achmetes had long before married; but doubting that she had yeelded her honour to the wanton lust of Mustapha the eldest sonne of Mahomet the late emperour, had put her from him, and would by no meanes be reconciled; for which cause there was a secret hatred ever after between those two great Bassaes)"*, fed Baiazet's suspicions by alleging that Achmetes had secretly been in touch with Zemes, and that his great authority over the Janizaries made him a danger to the throne. So, on Achmetes' return to the capital from one of his commisions, a royal feast was given where plenty of wine was drunk. Before the party was dispersed Baiazet had a rich robe with *"a faire guilt boule full of gold"* distributed to each guest. *"But upon Achmetes was cast a gowne of black velvet, which amongst the Turkes may well be called the mantle of death; being so sure a token of the emperors heavie indignation, as that it is death for any man once to open his mouth or to intreat for him upon whom it is by the emperours commandment so cast."* Achmetes' son, waiting for his father outside, learned from the other guests his father's doom; and, running through the city, raised all the Janizaries, who made such an uproar before the palace that Baiazet had to set Achmetes free. The general never used his popularity with the soldiers to betray his master; but Baiazet could not be reconciled to him. The constant instigations of Isaack kept his enmity fresh, and Achmetes was one day *"by Baiazets commandement as he sat at supper in the court thrust through the bodie and slaine."* Baiazet wanted to punish the Janizaries also, but they were too powerful, and found out about his schemes in time. Zemes remained a greater and more constant anxiety to Baiazet; and consequently was a hostage that was coveted by many European potentates, among them the French king Charles, Matthias King of Hungary, and Pope Innocent VIII. The Grand Master of Rhodes was at last persuaded to deliver him to the Pope (1488). *"So Zemes at the great profit of the bishop (who received from Baiazet a yearely pension of fortie thousand duckats) remained in safe custodie at Rome all the time of Innocentius, and also of Alexander the sixt his successour: untill that the French king Charles the eight, passing through the heart of Italie with a strong armie, against Alphonsus king of Naples in the*

*yeare 1495, and making his way through the citie of Rome, so terrified the great Bishop, who altogether favored and furthered the title of Alphonsus, that he was glad to yeeld to such articles and conditions as pleased the king; and amongst the rest to give in hostage unto the king his gracelesse sonne Caesar Borgia Valentinus, and also to deliver unto him Zemes his honourable prisoner."* The captivity of Zemes in Rome had lasted seven years. *"Within three daies after he was delivered unto the French (he) died at Caieta, being before his deliverance poisoned (as it was thought) with a powder of wonderfull whitenesse and pleasant taste; whose power was not presently to kill, but by little and little dispersing the force thereof, did in short time bring most assured death: which pleasant poison, Alexander the bishop skilfull in that practise (corrupted by Baiazet his gold, and envying so great a good unto the French) had caused to be cunningly mingled with the sugar wherewith Zemes used to temper the water which he commonly dranke."* But Zemes had been only one source of trouble to Baiazet: for about twenty years following his accession to the throne, his hands were kept full with wars against Caramania, Syria, Egypt, and Venice, and with invasions to Podolia and Illyria. Returning from one of these expeditions, *"upon the way (he) met with a Dervisler (which is a phantasticall and beggarly kind of Turkish monks, using no other apparell but two sheepskins, the one hanging before and the other behind) a hestie strong fat fellow, attired after the manner of his order with a great ring in each eare: who drawing neere to Baiazet, as he would of him have received an almes, desperatly assailed him with a short scimitar which he had closely convaied under his hypocriticall habit. But Baiazet by the starting of the horse whereon he rid (being afraid at the sudden approach of the hobgoblin) partly avoided the deadly blow by the traitor entended, yet not altogither unwounded: neither had he so escaped the danger, had not Ishender Bassa with his horsemans mase presently struck downe the desperat villaine as he was about to have doubled his stroke."* Worn out with so many dangers and cares, *"Baiazet gave himselfe unto a quiet course of life, spending most part of his time in studie of philosophie, and conference with learned men: unto which peaceable kind of life, he was of his owne naturall disposition more enclined than to warres; albeit that the regard of his state, and the earnest desire of his men of warre, drew him oftentimes even against his will into the field."* But four or five years later, internal risings of a religious nature caused an upheaval and great bloodshed in the country. These eventually led to the wars between

*"Selymus, Baiazet his successor"* and *"Hysmael (commonly called the Great Sophi of Persia"*, that is, Sunnite Turkey and Shiite Persia, which were not brought to an end until 1500. The remaining years of Baiazet's reign were taken up by the struggle among his sons for the throne. Of his eight sons two died in his own life-time, two others were executed for causing his *"heavie displeasure."* Of the four remaining, Mahometes was the most *"princely"* in character and carriage, and for that reason was held both by this father and by his brother Achomates in *"no small jealousie." "Desirous to see the manner of his brothers life and government"*, Mahomates disguised himself with two friends as religious mendicants of a certain order *"which the Turkes call Imalier"*, and visited the province under his rule. But he was disappointed to find his brother to be *"of a spare hand."* Next, in the guise of a seafaring man he went to Constantinople to see *"how all things were by his fathers appointment ordered and governed."* Some time after return to his own province the news of this secret visit reached Baiazet, and aroused so much his suspicion, that he had letters written to Asmehemedi *"a gallant courtier, and alwaies neere unto Mahometes, to poison him with a secret poison, for that purpose inclosed in thoses letters sent unto him."* Yet, when his order was executed the news of it grieved him much: the court went into mourning, and the Sultan's tool Asmehemedi, *"in reward of his unfaithfulnesse towards his master, was by the commandement of Baiazet cast into prison, and never afterwards seene, being there (as it was thought) secretly made away."* Of Baiazet's three remaining sons, Achomates was the one most favoured by the Sultan and his court. Corcutus was loved by all, but because of his mild and scholarly nature, was not thought fit to rule, although Baiazet had at the beginning of his reign promised him the succession. Selymus was the most ambitious of the brothers, and by *"infinit bountie, faigned courtesie, subtile policie, and by all the other meanes good and bad"* sought partisans for himself. He succeded in securing the voice of the commander of the Janizaries and of some of the Bassaes. Baiazet himself was anxious to settle the state on one of his sons, preferably on Achomates, both because he was *"farre worne with yeares"*, and also because he was afraid that his sons might cause trouble by their aspirations after his death. When they learned his intention, his sons began to scheme each separately. Selymus, who was the governor of Pontus, sailed from Trebizond to Theodosia, and there, without his father approval, married the daughter of the King of the Tartars, who was willing to support him to win

the Turkish crown. With fifteen thousand horsemen put under his command, Selymus marched into Europe and across the northern shores of the Black Sea. His intention, as given out, was to invade Hungary; but in reality he wanted to terrify his father, and keep him from nominating either of his other two sons as his successor. Baiazet could well guess Selymus' real objective, but he ignored it and first sought to disperse the army under his command by appeasing Selymus. Therefore, sending ambassadors to him he told him that wars with Hungary had always been costly for Turkey on account of the Hungarians forces being a most warlike nation; so, the attack on them should be deferred until a greater could be mustered to cope with them satisfactorily. Selymus in his answer argued that the enemy was estimated more highly than it deserved, and that the would not be overawed. The truth was that he had heard from his friends at the court who had pointed out his greatest hope to be in *"quicke speed"*, since Achomates, summoned by his father, was advancing at the head of a great army towards the capital. To strengthen his elder son's claim, Baiazet now openly declared him as his successor. But the soldiers did not approve of it, *"crying aloud with one voice, That they would know no other emperour but Baiazet, under whose conduct and good fortune they had now served above thirtie yeares."* Besides, they did not want to *"be defrauded of the rewards usually graunted unto them during the time of the vacancie of the empire, arising of the spoile taken from them which are of religion different from the Turkes."* Baiazet sought to persuade them by offering 500000 ducats, in of that future spoil. But the soldiers still resisted; the reason was that they expected better rewards, later on, from the restless nature of Selymus than from the peaceable Achomates. Such backing encouraged Selymus to come with his army as far as the outskirts of Adrianople, where his father was at the time, and to ask an audience from him. He anounced that he would pay his respects, and personally explain his grievances. But Baiazet refused to see him; telling that he had disobeyed his father's orders, had entered and spoiled friendly countries at the head of a *"forraine power."* Selymus was requested to disband at once his army and to return to Pontus. But, instead of doing so, he resolved to march on Constantinople. Learning of this plan of Selymus and not wishing to be forestalled, Baiazet also started for his Capital. Overtaken by his son on the road, he was for standing against him with his army. But his Bassaes, who were secretly inclined towards Selymus, sought to dissuade him. They argued that the issue in either case would be unhappy, whether Baiazet were to defeat

or to be defeated. The safest action would be speedily to reach Constantinople, to prevent thus Selymus from entering it, and to force him in the end either to seek his father's forgiveness or to perish with forces against the superior power of the imperial army which would be gathered in the meantime. *"The author of this counsell was Mustapha, the most auncient Bassa"*, who liked Selymus and secretly loathed Baiazet for promoting younger Bassaes. *"Of all the rest, only Cherseogles Bassa (whom the Turkes histories call also Achmet Hertezec-ogli) a faithfull, constant, and upright man, free from all double dealing and deceit, a fast and assured friend unto Baiazet his father in law"*, was not for flight but for Selymus' immediate punishment by giving him battle. Baiazet acted by the latter's counsel; and his speech to his soldiers revealed that he still held their general esteem. In the ensuring battle (1511) which was one of great violence, Baiazet was victorious. Selymus could save his life with some difficulty, and escaped to his father-in-law's country. Soon after Baiazet's return to Constantinople, Achomates also reached the capital at the head of his army. He solicited his father to resign in his own favour. Once more, however, the Bassaes and commanders, who were at heart supporters of Selymus set obstacles in the old Sultan's way, protesting that *"so long as he lived, they would acknowledge no other soveraigne but Baiazet."* Baiazet, partly baffled, but also *"delighted with the sweetnesse of soveraigntie"*, advised Achomates to return to his seat in Amasia and to wait until he could discover a more opportune moment to call him back. Achomates was disappointed by this refusal. He returned to Amasia with the intention of invading Anatolia, so that *"if he must needs by force of armes to trie his right against either of his brethren, he might therein use the wealth of that rich province."* With the help of his two sons he at once put his plan into action. Baiazet first sought to avoid open warfare and sent him an ambassador *"to reprove him for his disloialtie"* and to request his immediate return to Amasia. But Achomates put the ambassador to death. This outrage infuriated Baiazet. The Bassaes and the commanders also urged him to declare Achomates a traitor. But when it came to commanding the Sultan's army against him every one of them excused himself, saying that, *"it were a great indignitie, that the emperours armie should be led against his sonne by any of his servants."* Their aim was to have Baiazet reconciled to Selymus and allow his return to Constantinople to take the command of the army and of the situation. Finding Baiazet perplexed, Mustapha Bassa craftily advised him to set the two princes against each other,

and thus *"to drive out one naile with another"*, for which purpose it would be enough to show favour to one of them for the time being: after serving as an instrument to destroy his brother, he himself could be duly punished. The other Bassaes, excepting the faithful Cherseogles who kept silent, warmly supported this scheme, and persuaded Baiazet to write and call back Selymus. In the meantime, Corcutus, learning about the confused state of affairs in Constantinople, had left his seat in Magnesia and come to his father. He expected Baiazet to make good his word given thirty years before, and to settle the succession on him. He warned him that, once that *"most desperat and ambitious man"* Selymus was received into the city, Baiazet would lose his freedom forever. Baiazet explained to him how he hoped by this strategy to be rid of both of his sons, and convinced Corcutus to abide his time. When Selymus arrived, and prostrating himself before his father, begged to be forgiven, Baiazet had to simulate love and forgiveness towards this *"crocodile."* At the council of war Selymus feigned reluctance to accept the generalship, contending that the office should be given to Corcutus. But he was *"by the generall consent of all parts"* nominated general; and no sooner than this was done, the soldiers, who were instructed beforehand, *"with lowd acclamations saluted him, not for their Generall only, but for their sovereigne lord and emperor also."* Baiazet was approached by Mustapha *"in whose wilie head all this matter was"* to resign himself to the situation. However he might curse Selymus and Mustapha, Baiazet colud do nothing but yield. Thus Selymus was solemnly declared emperor. Baiazet chose to retire to Dimotica. Corcutus, *"whether it were for greefe of his hope now lost, or feere of his life"*, secretly returned to Magnesia. But Selymus did not feel at ease at all: his father might return to Constantinople and assume the power again while he was in Anatolia fighting against Achomates. So, he resolved, *"most viper-like"*, to kill his father before starting on his expedition. For this end, *"he secretly compacted with Hamon a Jew, his fathers cheefe physition, to poyson him."* When his order was accomplished, instead of rewarding the doctor, he had his head cut off. Before long his brothers also being put out of the way, Selymus became the unquestionable ruler of the Ottoman empire.

A comparison of this summary with the play will leave no doubt that Goffe found all the material necessary for the plot of The Raging Turke in Knolles. But, whether deliberately or owing to inexperience, he had chosen such an

eventful reign that he was constrained to handle this unwieldy material very freely. From the very beginning of play he seeks to organize the characters and the events. Of the three Bassaes responsible, according to Knolles, for Corcutus' election to the throne, Achmetes is singled out to play the part of the honest general, somewhat reminding Banquo, and therefore is kept out of all the ensuing conspiracies. From the first, he takes the side of Baiazet, who is the true heir to the throne. Later, he shows humanity to Baiazet's rival, but without any thought of unfaithfulness to his sovereign. His enemies, however, make a pretext of this to blacken him in the Sultan's eyes. The characterisation of Achmetes, thus, is new and Goffe's own invention. He substitutes for the third Bassa who helps Corcutus to the throne a certain Mustapha, not mentioned by Knolles in this connection. He refers in his first stage-direction, incidentally, to Corcutus as the *"youngest son"* of Baiazet, while Knolles talks of him as *"as one of the younger sons"*, since Selymus was the youngest. The encounter of Achmetes with Zemes in battle, and that entire episode, is Goffe's own device and is not to be found in Knolles. On the contrary, according to Knolles, Achmetes was more ruthless in his treatment of the enemy than the lenient Baiazet desired; whereas, in Goffe, Achmetes actually spares Zemes' life. Goffe further omits the flight of Zemes to Egypt, and his appeal for help to the Sultan of Egypt, who was also the Caliph and therefore *"the faithfull keeper and maintayner of our Law and Religion."* Zemes' long sojourn in Rhodes, too, is left out. Perhaps he found it more dramatic to make the Mohammedan prince at once seek his safety with the *"Bishop"* of Rome. Furthermore, Achmetes' disgrace with Baiazet has an immediate connection with the escape of Zemes, which again evidences a free treatment of his source by Goffe. For, in Knolles Baiazet has a general suspicion that many of his men favour Zemes; and Isaack, for personal reasons, directs this suspicion on Achmetes. The rest of Achmetes' story follows Knolles; except that, Goffe makes Baiazet himself stab Achmetes in the end, while Knolles clearly states that the murder was committed by an agent. Many important events that occupied Baiazet at home and abroad are inevitably skipped over by Goffe. Of the plot between the Sultan and the Pope to poison Zemes, only the last phase has a part in the play. Even there some condensation is made, and Zemes dies in the papal palace; and not, as history reports, after his delivery into the custody of the French King. Next, leaving all other events aside, Goffe comes to the last years of Baiazet, when he, "very aged and sore troubled with the gout", he had to fight for his crown

with each and all of his sons. Goffe, of necessity, contracts again his original source a good deal; but he is throughout faithful to it. He only takes occasional and minor liberties, such as Baiazet's commision of his son Mahometes' murder to Asmehemedi, which is given directly in the play, and by letter in Knolles. The cause of Baiazet's death, too, is less explicit in the play: he is apparently poisoned by a drug that operates very slowly, since he asks for his potion and dies before Hamon fetches it. Whereas in Knolles his death is effected by a single draught.

The relation of The Couragious Turke, with respect to its source, is less obvious than that of The Raging Turke. Goffe appears to have sought greater ingenuity in this tragedy. The result is that it consists of three disconnected episodes. First there is that of Amurath and the fair Greek slave, which occupies the first two acts of the play. Then there are the episodes of Amurath's struggle with his son-in-law, the ambitious Prince of Caramania, and his war with the King of Servia, who breaks the peace treaty, and with his allies. These two episodes are worked out simultaneous though without being properly fused, and they fill the last three acts of the play.

The first episode is clearly enough a rehandling of the theme of Mahomet and Irene the Fair Greek, which was quite popular among the dramatists down to the Restoration. Of the plays that have not reached us, one at least, The Turkish Mahomet and Hyrin the fair Greek was on the same subject. Goffe's treatment of it is the earliest among the plays that are extant. Lodowick Carlell's Osmond the Great Turk (1837) and Gilbert Swinhoe's Unhappy Fair Irene (1658) were other plays, following The Couragious Turke, to take up the same subject. Knolles gives the story in *"The Life of Mahomet, Second of that Name, etc."* Irene, there, is a Greek girl of exceptional beauty *"amongs many fair virgins"* taken prisoner during the fall of Constantinople. She was *"by him that by chance had taken her presented unto the great sultan Mahomet himselfe."* While busied with the occupation of the city, he left her in charge of his eunuch. Later on he found such pleasure in her company than *"all the day he spent with her in discourse, and the night in daliance."* No trace of his fierce nature was to be noticed any longer: *"Mars slept in Venus lap."* She had become the real commander now. The Sultan's subjects grew restless, and the soldiers openly spoke their dissatisfaction, saying that *"it were well done to deprive him of his government and state, as unworthie therof, and to set up one*

*of his sonnes in his stead."* The pashas were afraid of the course of events, but dared not say anything. At last one of them, a playmate of his childhood, risking his head, warned him of the situation, and remonstrated with him reminding how, single-mindedly, his ancestors had served the state. This talk both angered and troubled Mahomet, *"as in his often changed countenance well appeared."* He told the pasha to assemble all the dignitaries of state and the chief commanders of the army the following day. He himself spent the whole day and the night with Irene; he commanded her to be *"attired with more sumptuous apparell than ever she had worn"*, and to wear the most precious jewels. Then he took her to the great assembly hall, where everybody who set eyes on her thought her not *"a mortall wight but some of the stately goddesses, whom the Poets in their extacies describe."* Mahomet next asked the assembly whether, supposing they had possession of this beautiful woman, they would not be *"thrice advised"* before for going her. They all agreed without any dissenting voice that *"he had with greater reason so passed the time with her, than any man had to find fault therewith."* But the Sultan, exclaimed that the honour and conquests of his noble ancestors were of far greater consequence to him, and *"with one of his hands catching the faire Greeke by the haire of the head, and drawing his falchion with the other, at one blow strucke off her head, to the great terror of them all. And having so done, said unto them: 'Now by this judge whether your Emperour is able to bridle his affections or not."* Goffe faithfully follows this story as told in Knolles, except for the scene of execution; which in the play is not the assembly hall but the royal bedchamber, when the fair Greek is beheaded while asleep.

The incidents that make up the other two episodes of the play are to be found in the chapter entitled *"Life of Amurath, The First of that Name, etc."* of Knolles's Historie. But Goffe takes considerable liberty in rearranging the time-sequence, and adding such embellishments as wedding masques and heavenly portents preceding the final battle which are not to be found in his source. Otherwise, both in the development of events and in characterisation he is fairly close to Knolles. Besides Amurath and Iacup (who appears as Iacyl on the list of actors) Goffe includes among his characters certain of Amurath's generals and councillors who are frequently referred to in Knolles. Such are Lala Schahin, Carradin Bassa, Eurenoses, and Chase Illibegges. There are also the champions of the Christian cause: Lazarus, Sasmenos, and Cobelitz, who in

Knolles appears under his full name Milos Cobelitz, Amurath's son-in-law is Aladin both in the Historie and in the play; but in the list of players prefixed to the play there is an apparent misprint in *"Aldines wife."*

The events of the reign of Amurath I (1319-1399), as they are given in Knolles, may be summarized as follows: -

Amurath succeeded his father Orchanes as the third Ottoman sultan in 1359. He was at once confronted with danger from the combined forces of the Moslem principalities in Asia Minor. But he succeeded in defeating them all. Then he crossed to Europe, appointing his old tutor Lala Schahin the commander-in-chief of his army. After the capture of several towns Hadrianople was besieged. After the Greek commandant deserting with a portion of his army and escaped, the city yielded to the Turks, who not long after (1366) made it their capital, the Sultans residing there until the conquest of Constantinople in 1453. A few years later, while Amurath was in his Asiatic provinces, Servia attempted to drive the Turks out of Europe; but Amurath's generals, under the leadership of Lala Schahin, defeated the enemy at Zirf Zindugi and brought rich spoils of the victory to the Sultan. A few years after, to be exact in 1376, one of the Asiatic princes, Germean Oglu, *"for the more safetie of his state"*, gave his daughter Hatun in marriage to Amurath's eldest son Bajazet, presenting as a bridal gift important parts of his principality. Rich presents were also brought by other princes who were invited to the wedding; But they were all outshined by the governor Eurenoses, who gave hundred boys and hundred maidens dressed up in richly embroidered garments, carrying cups of gold filled with precious stones and cups of silver filled with gold. Amurath gave them all to the ambassador of the sultan of Egypt. The marriage-ceremonies being over, Amurath crossed to Europe once more, and overran Servia, besieged and took the important city of Nissa; whereupon Lazarus, *"Despot of Servia"* sought for peace, agreeing to pay a yearly tribute of 50,000 pounds of silver, and to send a force of 1,000 horsemen to the Sultan's wars. Meanwhile, Amurath's son-in-law Aladin, considering the time opportune since the Sultan was envolved in a European war, invaded his provinces in Anatolia. This was a double blow to Amurath, because Aladin was related to him and also because he professed the same faith, in spite of which he had not hesitated, by such a treacherous attack, dastardly to impede *"the increase of the Mohametane sincere religion.. in Europe."* Accordingly, he returned to Anatolia

and gathered a great army. Aladin had secured the support of *"all the other lesse Mahometane Princes of Asia, which were not under Amurath his obeisance, to whom the Ottoman Kings were now grown terrible."* But, not feeling confident of the issue, he sent ambassadors twice to his father-in-law to seek a peaceful settlement. In both cases he was rejected. The two armies met finally on the great plains of Caramina. At the start there was a serious wavering of Amurath's vanguard, which received a swift and timely relief from Baiazet. The day ended in victory for the Ottoman army (1387). After the battle Aladin's seat Iconium was besieged. A royal proclamation ordered the lives and goods of the populace to be left unharmed: they were all Moslems and the war had not been one of conquest. But when the city was taken some of the Servian soldiers sent by Lazarus disobeyed this injunction; but they paid for it so with their lives an incident which served as one of the incentives to the new and final encounter between Lazarus and Amurath. The capture of Iconium, as it turned out, did not end Aladin's rule as the King of Caramania. His wife, who was Amurath's daughter, interceded for him, and got her husband not only pardoned but also restored to his principality. The army now was disbanded. The Servians, too, returned home. But there they began fomenting animosity against the Turks. And Lazarus was goaded to appeal, secretly, for support to the Christian princes of Europe, who agreed to join their forces with his. This new crusade thus formed had some initial success, for the Turks were taken unawares. But when they recovered from this early shock, they began counter-move with Bulgaria: the country was overrun by Turkish invaders (1388), so that before long Sasmenos had to crave mercy from Amurath with a winding sheet round his neck. He was granted his pardon. But when the Turkish forces came to occupy Silistria, which he had promised to deliver as a token of his good faith, he set himself to fortify it against them. Amurath ordered, therefore, a second invasion of his country; and Sasmenos was besieged in Nicopolis. To save his life he appeared before the general of the besieging forces in the same attire of submission as before. The Turk, *"having alreadie taken from him the greatest part of his dominion and now cut of feare of further resistance"* pardoned him a second time. Amurath was ready now to turn on Servia. The two armies met on the plain of Cossova in Servia (1389). *"It is thought, greater armies than those two had seldome before met in Europe, Lazarus, as the Turkish histories report (but how truly. I know not) having in his armie five hundred thousand men; and Amurath scarce halfe so many."* During the battle Lazarus was slain, and

the victory fell to the Turks. As Amurath was walking round the battlefield at the close of the day, a wounded Christian, *"pressing neere unto him, as if he would for honour sake have kissed his feet, suddenly stabbed him in the bottome of his bellie with a short dagger, which he had under his soldiers coat: of which would that great king and conqueror presently died. The name of this man (for his courage worthie of eternall memorie) was Miles Cobelitz."* Baiazet succeeded his father as the fourth sultan of the Turks on the same battlefield. To avoid any future contention for sovereignty he then and there had his younger brothers Iacup strangled thus initiating a tradition of bloodshed in the succession-ceremony of the House of Ottoman.

When this material from history is compared with The Couragious Turke, it becomes evident that Goffe needed no other source for his play than Knolles, and that the play can everywhere be traced back to the Historie of Turkes. Nevertheless it does show certain divergencies with the historical facts. These are not important, nor of a nature to raise suspicions of some other source besides Knolles. They are interesting as Goffe's effort to give a dramatic turn to his material. For instance, there is no historical ground for Amurath's exclamation at the start of the play,

> I conquered Greece, one Grecian conquered me.

Greece was not to be conquered for another fifty years. Goffe himself must have been aware of the liberty he was thus taking with history. In the first line of his Argument prefixed to the play he qualifies the victory, which has presumably taken place immediately prior to the opening of the play, as an invention:

> A suppos'd Victory by Amurath
> Obtain'd in Greece, where many captives tane,
> One among the rest, Irene, conquers him...

But after this Irene episode, interpolated from the chapter in Knolles on Mahomet II, from the third act onwards he remains more strictly within the confines of his source. Amurath's reign was a long one and had to be condensed. Goffe makes a plausible attempt to cover the major events of this long reign from Lala Schahin's siege of Orestias, or Adrianople, in 1361 to the Battle of Kossova in 1389. The condensation gives rise to certain deviations from facts. Some changes are made for dramatic purposes; and on a few occasions Goffe misreads his source history.

Here is an example to give an idea of Goffe's condensation of events. Knolles, writing about the first military success of the reign, tells how Lala Schahin on his way to besiege Adrianople encountered fierce resistance, but how he defeated the enemy and dispatched the news with *"certaine of the heads of the slaine Christians"* to Amurath, and how Amurath, with his other generals Chases and Eurenoses, hurried to lay the siege himself to the city of Adrianople. Whereas in Goffe Schahin is presented as the captor of the city. Schahin and the other generals did score a victory over the Christians by themselves; But that was three years later, at the Battle of Maritza or Sirp Sindigi. The news of it was sent to Amurath, who was then in Anatolia, *"with the fift part of the spoile, and a great number of the heads of the slaine Christians."* Thus Goffe, to condense his source material, identifies the capture of Adrianople with the Battle of Maritza. In doing so he overlooks the point that Chase is not mentioned by Knolles after this latter victory for the simple reason that Lala Schahin had him poisoned following the battle, out of envy; for the victory had been secured by his surprise onslaught at night on the drunken allies. When, to introduce events that took place several years after this battle, Goffe has the Sultan consult his generals and say,

> Captains, what Countries next shall we make flow,
> With channels of their blood?
>
> A.III, s. 2

Eurenoses answers *"Servia!"* and Chase, in his posthumous self, *"Bulgaria!"*

Judging by the next scene, Amurath follows the advice of both of his generals; for, both Lazarus the *"Despot of Servia"* and Sesmenos the *"Governour of Bulgaria"* are in flight. Again, if we refer back to Knolles, we find that after recounting the marriage of Amurath's eldest son Baiazet, he briefly dismisses the events between 1363 and 1386, and comes to the war with Servia, which ended with the fall of Nissi (Nish), and Lazarus' appeal for peace. There is no foundation for Bulgaria's appearance as the ally of Servia, because the it was invaded a year before the war with the Servian Despot. In the play, Cobelitz appears before these abject princes in flight, as the image of Christian heroism, to upbraid and spur them to resistence. To heighten the dramatic effect of the situation Goffe introduces here a scene of squabble with drunken soldiers and trulls.

In A.III, s. 4 the Christians have been defeated, any many of them taken prisoner; and Lalla Schahin suggests to Cairadin Bassa a plan which he has *"long thought upon"* in connection with them:

> They'l fit to be a neare attendant Guard
> On all ocasions to the Emperour;
> Therefore they shall be called Janizaries,
> By me first instituted for our Princes safeties sake.

This is going a few pages back in Knolles, to the parenthetical paragraph which tells of the inception of the Janizaries except that there the idea is attributed solely to Catradin Bassa, while Goffe fathers it on Lala Schahin. Although there was little occasion for it, Goffe perhaps thought it of some dramatic appeal to refer to this military institution thus, which was so much spoken of and dreaded in contemporary Europe.

Another rearrangement in the sequence of events is to be found in the next scene (A.III, s. 5) in which Amurath receives Germean Oglu's ambassadors to discuss his son Baiazet's marriage. The marriage took place about 1375. Knolles inserts this episode somewhat loosely, yet not anachronistically, between the victory of Zirf Zindugi (1363) and the invasion of Servia (1386). In Goffe it hangs in mid-air, and gives almost the impression that it followed the events of 1386. But the circumstance is authentic enough, and the conversation between Amurath and the ambassador can be substantiated from Knolles except for the names of two towns, Sansale and Abbettingon, mentioned in connection with the bride's dowry. The former name may stand for Knolles' Tavsanle; but there is no name, in history or geography, to resemble even remotely the latter. Still Goffe is often careless about the spelling of his proper nouns. In this episode of the play, too, Knolles' Germean Ogli becomes German Ogly, his daughter Hatun, Hatum; while Cutaie and Simav respectively change into Cutas and Simon; and the dynasty of the Zelzuccians to Zelzucciom.

The next scene of the act has no bearing on Knolles. But since it depicts in broad terms an army with its generals in utter defeat, it is not necessary to trace it back to some particular occurence. The closing lines spoken by Cobelitz, that Christian knight typified, hint at the decisive battle which was to be fought at Kossova in 1389.

Turk, once more at thee, Tyrant, mortals must
Command heavens favour in a case so just.

Act IV introduces us to the second of the play's historical themes, to Amurath's war with his son-in-law, the King of Caramania. Goffe does not pick up the story quite from the beginning: Aladin's second embassy has been rejected by Amurath with the warning that even though his own daughter, who was Aladin's wife, might *"upon her penitent knees be supplyant"*, he would not change his decision. This categorical answer of the Sultan's is an addition by Goffe, and an ironic anticipation of a later scene in the episode where he does forgive for the sake of his daughter. Otherwise Knolles is faithfully followed, even to the extent of reproducing the dialogue as much as it appears in his Historie. *"The embassadour returning, recounted.."* he tells us, *"how that he [Amurath] hoped shortly to take from him [Aladin] Iconium and Larenda (the principall cities of Caramania).. Which Aladin hearing said unto the confederate Princes that were with him, Verily Amurath threatneth to take from us the cities of Iconium and Larenda; but let him take heed that we take not from him his faire citie of Prusa."* And here are the corresponding lines in the play:

Embas. Moreover, my Lord will or win, or raze,
Aladin. Iconium and Larenda? I? No more?
Had best look first, how safe his Prusa stands!

Next, an oath of allegiance to Aladin taken by *"the confederate Princes"* earlier in Knolles is appropriately into this scene. Except that, whereas Knolles represents them *"kissing the ground"*, Goffe makes them kiss Aladin's sword.

The next scene, sandwiched between battles, to provide perhaps some emotional relief, represents the marriage-ceremony of Baiazet and Hatun (on this occasion spoken of as Hatam), and is Goffe's own addition. But again, the scene is general enough in its outlines not to require any definite source, except with the wedding gift of Eurenoses which is authenticated by Knolles. This gift, according to Knolles, consisted of, *"an hundred goodly boyes, with as many beautifull young maidens, all Christians captives, sutably attired in garments richly embrodered with gold and silver, everie one of them carrying a cup of gold in the one hand and a cup of silver in the other; the cups of gold having in them divers precious stores of great value, and the cups of silver being filled with gold."* Though preserving the spectacular cups of gold and silver, Goffe reduces the cup-bearers to the manageable size of *"sixe Christian Maidens"*, and quite effectively makes them *"daughters of sixe severall Kings"*,

the only survivors of the bloody battle that had just ended. And Amurath gives them to the bride, instead of the other guest-princes as he does in Knolles. Goffe reverts to Knolles, however, in bestowing the gifts of the princes on Eurenoses.

A.IV, s. 3 is another scene that owes its conception entirely to Goffe. For the death of Sasmenos, *"Governour of Bulgaria"*, is not mentioned in Knolles; nor does Lazarus take part in any funeral. The scene, as it stands in the play, is almost a sermon dramatized, Lazarus and Cobelitz meditating on death and decay, and on the necessity of suffering Goffe was in his element here, and there was little need of historical facts to device the scene.

The defeated Aladin's decision, in the following scene, to appeal to Amurath's clemency through his wife is once more in accordance with Knolles. The difference is in details alone. In Knolles Aladin sends first his wife to the Sultan: *"The Queen forthwith attiring her selfe, as was fittest for her husbands present estate, came unto her father: where falling downe at his feet upon her knees, with words wisely placed, and teares distilling downe her faire cheeks from her fairer eies, as if it had been from two fountains, in most sorrowfull maner, craved her husbands pardon... and would not be comforted or taken up, untill she had obtained grace."* For his daughter's sake Amurath not only forgives Aladin, but also gives him back his kingdom. Next day, on his wife's advice, Aladin himself comes and prostrating himself before Amurath admits his *"undutifulnesse"*. Goffe omits this earlier phase of the appeal. In the play the idea of sending his wife to the Sultan occurs to Aladin:

> My wife's his Daughter; since we cannot stand
> His fury longer, she shall swage his Wrath.

One of his men suggests that he might appeal with his entire family, wife and children, all arraying themselves *"in weeds, Of a petitioner."* This is a departure from his source for which Goffe's Christian zeal may have been responsible. In Knolles neither Aladin nor his wife appears before Amurath in a winding-sheet. She wears what would be appropriate for her husband's *"present state"*, which is that of a defeated prince. Therefore she is not likely to be decked in finery; but this does not imply that she wraps herself in a winding cloth. By Knolles' account this outward show of penitence was put on by Sasmenos, ruler of Bulgaria, when his country was overrun by the Turks in the following year. It

was he who *"thought it best betimes againe to submit himselfe unto Amurath"* and *"tying a winding sheet about his necke, in token that he had deserved death (after the manner of the Barbarians) he came to Amurath at Calcide, where falling flat upon the ground, at the horses feet whereon Amurath sat, he in most humble wise craved pardon."* Indeed, Sasmenos tried this emergency twice, and on both occasions with success. The first time the Sultan pardoned him, accepting in return his offer to deliver Silistria. But Sasmenos soon regretted his promise, and refused to yield the city. Angered at this fickleness, Amurath sent Ali Pasha to invade Bulgaria. When Sasmenos was besieged by Ali in Nicopolis he *"once againe (with shame enough) tying a winding sheet about his necke, as he had done before, and taking his sonne with him, went out of the citie, and in most abject manner falling downe at the Bassa his feet, craved pardon"*, which was *"easily granted"*. It must be this incident in the Historie of the Turkes that Goffe transposes, and attributes to the Mahomedan instead of the Christian prince whom in the previous scene has summarily dispatched to the other world.

The first scene of the last act is an elaboration of Aladin's repentance and pardon. The rhetorical speeches abound in Elzabethan conceits especially the dialogue between Amurath and his daughter. An element of pathos is introduced with his grandchildren begging mercy from Amurath for their father. The closing lines of the scene announce the *"immediate warres"*, and Amurath's purpose.

The Christians in Cassanoe's Plaines to meet with speed. Actually the site of that battle, which took place two years later, was not pitched upon by the Turk, but by Servia and her allies who preceded Amurath in the field.

A.V, s. 2, which is another scene reflecting a mood rather than recording action, owes much more to Goffe than to Knolles. Lazarus prides himself about the great army he has mustered, while Cobelitz is humble with his thoughts of life after death. The next scene, too, has no counterpart in Knolles. But the use of such dramatic expedients as comets and other unusual disturbances to foretell the approach of some important and often unhappy occurrences was a stock device of the contemporary stage. There is, however, no justification for Amurath's irreligious brag. On the contrary, *"this Amurath was in his superstition more zealous than any other of the Turkish Kings"*, says Knolles.

Furthermore, according to the same source, Amurath, instead of being so confident and conceited of the issue, was really, *"daunted"* on the eve of the battle, especially when he had viewed the opposing army which was twice the size of his own. He passed a wakeful night, an engaged the enemy in battle early next morning *"as soon as it was day"*, or in Goffe's words *"ere Phosphorus appeared."*

During the battle in the following scene, presumably for the sake of dramatic propriety, Goffe has Lazarus killed by Amurath's chief commander Schahin. Whereas Knolles simply records his death, then adds two alternative manners for his death: 1) that he was taken prisoner, but was killed with his son following the murder of Amurath; 2) that he died in prison, by natural death. As to Cobelitz, Goffe allows him full time to pour his invectives on Amurath after he has stabbed him. Whereas, as Knolles remarks, the Serb either died of his wounds or was killed immediately after the murder. Goffe is preposterous enough to have Baiazet attempt to kill Cobelitz, but a nobleman hold his hand! After the catastrophe there remains the last event to end up the reign of Amurath: Jacup's murder by the order of his brother Baiazet, who has just been proclaimed Sultan on the battlefield. Goffe, not being well-informed about Turkish history, puts in Baiazet's mouth words that ill agree with that ambitious monarch's temperament:

> We have a brother
> Who, as in the same bloud he took a share,
> So let him beare his part in Government.

But the generals, aware of the impossibility of such joint tenure, dissuade him. Besides, they say,

> You know the Turkish Lawes, Prince be not nice
> To purchase Kingdomes, whatsoe'er the price.
> He must be lopt.

The suggestion of Iacup's death may have conceivably come from the generals, who would be anxious to stem any future feud between the brother for the crown, as well as to please the new monarch for whom his brother's existence would constitute a constant danger. Knolles' account of the story allows for such an interpretation: *"Iacup.. yet ignorant of that had hapned, was by the great Bassaes sent for, as from his father: who casting no perill, but comming*

*into his fathers tent, was there presently by them strangled, by the commandement of Baiazet."* But Goffe goes completely wrong in talking about *"the Turkish Lawes."* Fratricide in Ottoman history begins with Baiazet, and is not formulated legally until some fifty years later. Knolles leaves no doubt to this in his comment on the act. *"This was the beginning of the most unnaturall and inhumane custome"*, he writes, *"ever since holden for a most wholesome and good policie amongst the Turkish Kings and Emperors, in the beginning of their reigne most cruelly to massacre their brethren and neerest kinsmen, so at once to rid themselves of all feare of their competitors."* Again, historically unfounded is Iacup's giving a hand in his own murder by twisting his kerchief round his neck, giving the one end of it to Baiazet and himself pulling the other end!

This examination of the plays in relation to their source bears out one point at least, that Goffe was depended throughout on Knolles for the plot of his plays. Leonclavius, Chalcondyles and other historians of Turkey did not furnished him with any material. In fact, there is no evidence in his work to show that he had consulted them at all. Where he departs from Knolles is in such scenes permitting an imaginative treatment of certain situations, without disturbing the historical sequence of events. Otherwise he drew entirely on his Historie of the Turkes for the construction of his Turkish tragedies.