EARLY MODERN LITERARY STUDIES

The Heretical Foreign Woman, the 'Raging Turk', and Martial Figures in Fletcher's *The Tamer Tamed* and *The Island Princess*

Sarah Johnson
Royal Military College of Canada
Sarah.Johnson@rmc.ca

John Fletcher's *The Tamer Tamed* (1609-11) and *The Island Princess* (1619-21)share several structural similarities despite their generic differences.[1] A farcical domestic comedy, the earlier play presents a reverse taming narrative while also giving voice to the rampant misogyny of the would-be wife-tamer and his allies. *The Island Princess*, a romantic tragicomedy and travel drama set on the islands of Ternate and Tidore, stages Malukan resistance to European resource exploitation while also portraying the Portuguese colonizers' vituperative contempt for the islanders and their religion. The similar attitudes of patriarchs and colonizers in these plays exemplify the interconnectedness, which scholars have long pointed out, of gender and colonial discourse.[2] This discursive connection alone, however, does not account for specific plot similarities between the plays, nor do the source materials that the plays draw upon.[3] These similarities include the lead female character's attempt to convert a male love

[1] For more on farce in *The Tamer Tamed*, including its subversive power, and for an explanation of the play's dating, see John Fletcher, *The Tamer Tamed* ed. by Lucy Munro (London: Methuen Drama, 2010), pp. xiv-xvi. All citations of *The Tamer Tamed* refer to this edition. See John Fletcher, *The Island Princess*, ed. by Clare McManus (London: Methuen Drama, 2013), pp. 1-5, for the dating and genre of this play, which McManus labels as 'romantic tragicomedy', 'tragicomic romance', and 'Turk play'. All citations of *The Island Princess* refer to this edition.

[2] On the discursive connections between gender, colonialism, and race, see, for example, Kim Hall, *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and Gender in Early Modern England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), pp. 165-6, 173-5; Lara Bovilsky, *Barbarous Play: Race on the English Renaissance Stage* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008), p. 15; Joyce Green MacDonald, *Women and Race in Early Modern Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 10-11.

[3] For the source materials of *The Tamer Tamed,* see Munro (ed.), *The Tamer Tamed*, pp. x-xii, and for sources of *The Island Princess*, see McManus (ed.), *The Island Princess,* pp. 49-57.

interest to her 'faith' and the male character's disproportionate rage in response. In each play, the male character – Petruchio in *The Tamer Tamed* and Armusia in *The Island Princess* – receives advice from his allies to rape Maria and Quisara respectively. Each play ends with the male character's mock martyrdom and the ambiguous restoration of gender and colonial hierarchy. I argue that theatregrams are behind these structural parallels, namely, the tropes of the heretical foreign woman and of the 'raging Turk'. Apart from Quisara in *The Island Princess*, Fletcher's use of characters not overtly identified as a heretic or 'Turk' as iterations of these tropes in effect destabilizes the tropes themselves. This destabilization, however, fails to undo the associated constructions of race as they apply to women. In each play, moreover, a civilian character appropriating a military identity embodies one of these two tropes, which contributes to the increasingly complex and varied representations of martial identity in the period.

Before turning to the plays, I explain, briefly, the concept of 'theatregrams' along with the two tropes that I am using to frame my argument. In Louise George Clubb's conceptualization, 'the interchange and transformation of units, figures, relationships, actions, *topoi*, and framing patterns' in theatre 'gradually [built] a combinatory of theatregrams that were at once streamlined structures for svelte play making and elements of high specific density, weighty with significance from previous incarnations'.[4] Theatregrams, in other words, were ready-made building blocks for dramatists, formal elements recognizable to audiences that would instantly convey complex meaning through the associations that come pre-packaged with them and also through the ways a current iteration might depart from previous versions. The concept of theatregrams is helpful for discussing specific structural similarities across plays of different genres and by different writers. Indeed, Clare McManus and Mark Hutchings each discuss the usefulness of theatregrams in repertory studies.[5] McManus synthesizes the concept with three similar ideas: Janet Clare's notion of 'stage traffic', which involves 'the migration… of… theatrical tropes, scenarios, and structural components' across plays; William N. West's 'call for "understanding theatre as made out of other performances"'; and Mary Malcolm Gaylord's 'architectural concept of the "adaptive reuse of structures inherited from earlier builders"'.[6] As McManus explains, attending to theatregrams is 'partly a question of scale, of looking not to the play text [as a whole] but to smaller theatrical units

[4] Quoted in Clare McManus, '"Constant Changelings", Theatrical Form, and Migration: Stage Travel in the Early 1620s', in *Travel and Drama in Early Modern England: The Journeying Play*, ed. by Claire Jowitt and David McInnis (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), pp. 207-29 (p. 225, n.16).

[5] McManus, 'Constant Changelings', p. 209; Mark Hutchings, *Turks, Repertories, and the Early Modern English Stage* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), p. 162.

[6] McManus, 'Constant Changelings', p. 209.

shared between texts'.[7] The smaller theatrical units I focus on in my analysis of *The Tamer Tamed* and *The Island Princess* are the motifs of the foreign heretical woman and of the 'raging Turk'. I draw on Clubb's notion that theatregrams emerge not just from repetition but from transformation of units to make the case that Maria in *The Tamer Tamed* fits the heretical foreign woman motif, despite not being explicitly identified in the play as foreign. Similarly, I suggest that Petruchio in *The Tamer Tamed* and Armusia in *The Island Princess* reiterate the trope of the 'raging Turk', although neither is identified as Turkish or Muslim.

Taken together, these two tropes in early modern drama evince a combination of attraction to and distrust of non-Christians foreign to England. Clare McManus discusses 'the changeable, heretical foreign woman' as a 'common figure of 1620s stage travel', designating Quisara in *The Island Princess* as one example.[8] McManus links this figure to personified Fortune, fickle and 'bewhored', who often presides over the travel mode.[9] She identifies three marks of the 'changeable, heretical foreign woman' in the trope's redeployment within travel drama: 'the structural technique of *peripeteia*', the mirroring of the 'alluring' heretic's body in 'the play's architectural imagination', and the 'scenario' of the heretical woman being 'outwitted in her attempts to seduce a man to murder'.[10] *Peripeteia* is Aristotle's term for a reversal in the protagonist's fortunes, and McManus draws on Michael Neill's work that relates *peripeteia* to the 'turn' of 'apostasy and conversion… illuminating the way that such a structural "turn" others and racializes the heretic'.[11] The heretical foreign woman is not only herself changeable, but she threatens to overcome and change whoever succumbs to her allure.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Ibid., p. 217.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid., p. 218. In this essay, I focus on the first mark of the trope, but I note here that the two additional marks McManus discusses in relation to Quisara are also present in *The Tamer Tamed*'s depiction of Maria. For the second, Maria's body is mirrored 'in the play's architectural imagination' in that she occupies, with her allies, upper chambers in a fortified building that Petruchio cannot enter, just as he cannot access her body, despite it being their wedding night. The correlation of architecture and Maria's body continues when, as an analogue to Maria's continued assertion of bodily autonomy past their wedding night, she claims control of Petruchio's house when she moves in, directing the purchase and removal of various household goods and changing its décor (3.2.99-109). The third mark is present to a lesser degree, but still hinted at: Maria is not foiled in any serious murder plot, but she does warn Petruchio of her capability of inciting murder, telling him that if he were to strike her, 'what man I meet first / That has a spirit to deserve a favour -- / Let him bear any shape, the worse the better -- / Shall kill you, and enjoy me' (4.1.148-51).

[11] McManus, 'Constant Changelings', p. 218.

This threat of conversion links the heretical foreign woman motif to that of the 'raging Turk'. Linda McJannet identifies 'the raging Turk' as 'the most common pejorative western stereotype for the Ottomans'.[12] Related to 'raging', other 'pejorative epithets associated with the Ottomans in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries included "bloody", "cruel", and "barbarous"'.[13] The Turks were also 'compared to forces of nature (whirlwinds or floods) or beasts… and depicted in bestial terms such as "unbridled" or "swarming"', and 'their rule was described as "tyranny" or a "yoke"'.[14] McJannet traces a longstanding association, in English culture, between Turks, Herod, and rage. 'Extreme, uncontrollable emotion – wrath, grief, frustration, or a combination of all three – often leading to violence', she explains, fits with the primary early modern sense of 'rage' as 'raving' or 'furious madness'.[15] Within this definition, the trope of Turkish rage in English texts could hold contradictory meanings. 'After a battle', for example, it could signify 'temporary insanity' that should be ignored by a sultan's subordinates, but it could also constitute an appropriate response to injustice or injury, especially when exhibited by a member of the nobility.[16] Rage could show 'the sultan not as invincible and dangerous, but as weak, defeated, or easily manipulated'.[17] And yet rage was also associated with 'martial fury', heroism, and Islamic expansionism resulting from 'the fierceness and success of the Ottoman armies as they pushed westward into Europe and Africa'.[18] This latter association involves the threat of conversion. As Mark Hutchings relates, the Ottoman empire was 'the greatest power of the age', and in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, thousands of Europeans 'turned Turk'.[19] Conversion 'evoked horror' in the English, 'in theological, ideological, and cultural terms', as Hutchings explains, but 'the theatre understood that conversion was driven by desire, which… was symbolised by the Seraglio, and the harem it contained',[20] or in other words, by the alluring foreign woman.

In *The Tamer Tamed*, Petruchio and his male allies describe his new bride, Maria, as heretical and foreign, contributing to the way her character functions as a reiteration of

[12] Linda McJannet, *The Sultan Speaks: Dialogue in English Plays and Histories about the Ottoman Turks* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), p. 17. Hutchings discusses the imprecision of the term 'Turk' in early modern England, which, in addition to Ottoman subjects, could refer to non-Ottoman Muslims (pp. 3-5).

[13] McJannet, p. 16.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid., p. 18.

[16] Ibid., pp. 20-5.

[17] Ibid., p. 24.

[18] Ibid., 20, 17.

[19] Hutchings, pp. 7 and 45.

[20] Ibid., p. 49.

the trope. This construction of Maria, which I trace further on, arises in response to Maria and her allies taking up arms and military language to promote their cause – freedom from male tyranny in marriage. It arises, in other words, from an escalation of conflict over power and resources.

Maria's martial stance at once mocks male pretensions and presents the stakes of the ongoing early modern debate about women as immediate and embodied. Derision is apparent in the female characters' use of military terms and practices. They name 'treaty' conditions, for example, consisting of 'thirteen causes', with the first cause containing 'seven branches' (2.5.119, 75, 79-80). Expressing willingness to die for these terms, the country wife envisions an honourable military burial with her 'hood' as 'hearse-cloth', and she 'under it like Joan of Gaunt', with her 'distaff stuck up beside' her in place of a sword (97-9). She also designates the women's 'plackets' as their 'crests' (114). In these examples the female characters poke fun at the solemnity of a role officially denied to them, comically producing an official-sounding treaty document of seemingly endless articles to convey their demands and feminizing the symbols of martial honour with the image of Joan in place of John of Gaunt. And yet their adoption of military personas makes clear that their opposition to Petruchio, and to men in general, is not merely rhetorical. By weaponizing their household implements, including tongs, bodkins, pans, pot-lids, ladles, toasting irons, and chamber pots (2.3.56-8, 2.5.111), the women point to the power of their domestic labour and the potential of using it as leverage in a battle for their collective 'cause' (2.4.5).[21] In designating 'plackets' as the women's 'crests', the country wife takes the body as the women's unifying heraldic badge, one that transcends lineage and class: 'plackets' refer to 'slits in a skirt'[22] and euphemistically to the vulva.[23]

---

[21] The female characters make numerous references to their 'cause', which brings seriousness to their assumed martial stance. At the same time, their assumed martial stance can have the effect of emphasizing their position of fighting for a cause.

[22] Munro (ed.), *The Tamer Tamed*, 2.5.114n.

[23] John Fletcher, *The Tamer Tamed or, The Woman's Prize*, ed. by Celia R. Daileader and Gary Taylor (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), 2.3.45n. The *Oxford English Dictionary* (*OED*), s.v. 'crest (n.1), sense 1.b', December 2023, https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/7711009897, defines 'crest' as, 'In phrases, such as to erect one's crest, elevate one's crest, let fall one's crest', a 'symbol of pride, self-confidence, or high spirits. Cf. crestfallen *adj*.'. *OED*, s.v. 'crest (n.1), sense 3.a', December 2023, https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/9087263456, notes that in heraldry, a crest was a 'figure or device (originally borne by a knight on his helmet) placed on a wreath, coronet, or chapeau, and borne above the shield and helmet in a coat of arms; also used separately, as a cognizance, upon articles of personal property, as a seal, plate, note-paper, etc' and includes the following quotation, 'As it represents the ornament worn on the knight's helmet, it cannot properly be borne by a woman, or by a corporate body, as a college or city. (It is a vulgar error to speak of the arms or shields of such bodies as *crests*.)' Both meanings were extant in the early seventeenth century.

Maria also draws explicit attention to the body's place in her defiance of male marital tyranny by refusing to have sex with Petruchio until he changes his beliefs about women. She further asserts her bodily power by reminding him that 'there was never man without our moulding, / Without our stamp upon him, and our justice, / Left anything three ages after him / Good, and his own' (3.2.159-62). In other words, all men come from women, and the legacy of children depends upon women's bodies. The centrality of the body in the women's resistance on one hand aligns with the rollicking nature of the genre (they 'dance with their coats tucked up to their bare breeches / And bid the kingdom kiss 'em', for instance [2.5.40-1]), but on the other hand, it makes their adoption of a militant stance fitting and something that cannot be dismissed as merely laughable.

Indeed, the women's physical fortifications and taking up of arms alarm the men enough to urge Petruchio to 'grant conditions' (2.3.80).[24] But perhaps the most telling indicator of male anxiety at the spectre of armed women is registered in the reversal, throughout *The Tamer Tamed*, of the trope comparing sexual intercourse to combat. This trope frames sex as erotic striving, conquest, and surrender – we need only think of Horatio and Bel-Imperia's amorous encounter in *The Spanish Tragedy*.[25] In contrast, the men in Fletcher's play use sexual puns to trivialize the women's actual armed resistance. The double-entendre of 'trenches' is one example: when Sophocles says he is on his way to see 'the women's trenches', Roland's exclamation, 'Trenches? Are such to see?', displaces the image of battle fortifications with the slang meaning of the word, female pudenda. Sophocles himself calls Maria's army 'a regiment of rutters' (1.4.32). While 'rutters' was a term for 'cavalry soldiers' or 'swindlers', to 'rut' is also 'to have sex',[26] the pun neatly

[24] Fiona McNeill discusses Petruchio's fear of 'female intelligence networks' supporting Maria in the context of rural and economically disadvantaged women's heavy involvement in riots over land enclosure and grain shortages at this time; see McNeill, 'Gynocentric London Spaces: (Re)Locating Masterless Women in Early Stuart Drama', *Renaissance Drama* 28 (1997), 215-20, https://doi-org.journal.rmc.ca/10.1086/rd.28.41917340,

[25] Thomas Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedy*, ed. by David Bevington (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1996), 2.4.34-49: *Bel-imperia.* If I be Venus thou must needs be Mars, / And where Mars reigneth there must needs be wars. / *Horatio.* Then thus begin our wars: put forth thy hand, / That it may combat with my ruder hand. / *Bel-imperia.* Set forth thy foot to try the push of mine. / *Horatio.* But first my looks shall combat against thine. / *Bel-imperia.* Nay then, to gain the glory of the field, / My twining arms shall yoke and make thee yield. / *Horatio.* Nay then, my arms are large and strong withal; / Thus elms by vines are compassed till they fall. / *Bel-imperia.* O, let me go, for in my troubled eyes / Now may'st thou read that life in passion dies. / *Horatio.* O, stay awhile and I will die with thee; / So shalt thou yield and yet have conquered me. In another example from a Fletcher play, Caratach declares, in *Bonduca*, that '*Hymen* / Ne'er ty'd a longing Virgin with more joy, / Then I am married to that man that wounds me' (1.1.60-2), and Junius similarly asserts that war makes a better mistress than a woman (4.1.33-50).

[26] Munro (ed.), *The Tamer Tamed*, 1.4.32n.

conflating the women's militant stance with both theft and sexual appetite. Correspondingly, the men imagine that an assertion of sexual dominance will defuse the situation. When Sophocles inquires whether Roland has heard about 'what a state of quarrel the new bride / Stands with her husband', Roland retorts, 'Let him stand with her, and there's an end', with 'stand' punning on erection. Sophocles similarly assures Petruchio that if he agrees to the terms of Maria's army, 'When you are once a-bed, all these conditions / Lie under your own seal', implying that by having sex with Maria, Petruchio will gain dominance over her (2.5.152-3). The men constantly downplay the women's adoption of martial personas, suggesting an unwillingness to countenance this militant expression of agency.

In this same vein of degradation, the men apply racialized images and terms to Maria and her fellow soldiers. Singling out a leader of Maria's troops, 'a tanner's wife', Jaques tells the men 'her placket / Looks like the straits of Gibraltar, still wider / Down to the gulf' (2.3.42, 45-7). Jaques's simile figures the opening in the leader's skirt, and by extension her vulva, as the space between Spain and Morocco, both countries the English associated with Islam and the figure of the 'Turk'.[27] The image thus links the leader to the foreign while implying gaping carnal appetite. Jaques adds that 'all sun-burned Barbary / Lies in her breech' (47-8). 'Breech' denotes both 'buttocks' and 'trousers ending just below the knee'.[28] Calling 'Barbary', North African countries, 'sun-burned' constructs not just the land but the inhabitants' skin as physically damaged, and likening these countries to what 'lies in [the woman's] breech' images them obscenely as fecal matter. In a stroke, Jaques degrades the foreign body and the body of the tanner's wife – here imagined as damaged, incontinent, a 'leaky vessel', as per the conventional humoural mode of pathologizing the female body.[29] In another example, complaining that his attempts to coerce Maria to consummate their marriage were 'to no end', Petruchio states, 'I wash an Ethiop' (3.2.60). His use of this 'Eurocentric proverb for an impossible task' associates Maria with the imagined Ethiopian.[30] Petruchio implies that change – from rebellion to obedience and from Blackness to whiteness – is impossible, yet desirable. Kim Hall draws attention to the motif of whitening Black women as a demonstration of sovereign power – that of King James in Jonson's *Masque of Blackness*, for example.[31] In contrast to James, Petruchio's small-scale version of sovereign power as husband and head of household

[27] McManus, 'Constant Changelings', p. 220.

[28] Munro (ed.), *The Tamer Tamed*, 2.3.45-8n.

[29] On female bodies as leaky vessels in drama, see Gail Kern Paster, *The Body Embarrassed: Drama and the Disciplines of Shame in Early Modern England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993).

[30] Daileader and Taylor (eds.), *The Tamer Tamed*, 3.3.11n. On this proverb, see also Patricia Akhimie, *Shakespeare and the Cultivation of Difference* (London and New York: Routledge, 2018), pp. 3-5.

[31] Hall, p. 170; see also MacDonald, p. 7.

fails to transform Maria, or whiten the Ethiopian according to his analogy. If we imagine Maria's perspective, however (which is arguably a premise for the play) the Blackness of Petruchio's analogy comes to represent resolution or steadfastness, while the washing away becomes an effacement, a rape. Moreover, the leader Jaques singles out in degrading terms demonstrably belies those terms in the very act that makes her Jaques's target – showing public support for Maria and her fellow townswomen, which only Jaques and his male interlocuters link to moral laxity. In the same way, in her refusal to obey Petruchio, Maria remains true to her stated 'cause' of 'redeem[ing] her country' from male tyranny. Jaques's and Petruchio's analogies, however, depict the Tanner's wife and Maria as erring from whiteness in erring from gender expectations of female obedience and voicelessness.

Compounding their use of racialized terms, Petruchio and his supporters consistently refer to Maria or her regiment as belonging to a religion other than Protestantism. They call the women 'Catholics' (3.1.50), 'Amorites' (3.2.20), and 'heathen' (21). Petruchio confides to the audience that Maria 'would have made a most rare Jesuit' because 'She can prevaricate on anything' (4.1.54-5). He also asks, 'what would this woman do, if she were suffered, / Upon a new religion?', to which Sophocles answers, 'Make us pagans' (4.4.166-7). McManus discusses how English Protestants viewed English Catholics and Jesuits as insidiously working against the state from within.[32] As one sixteenth-century commentator, Thomas Scott, put it, they 'undermine… with mere wit (without gunpowder)'.[33] In likening Maria to a Jesuit, Petruchio defines her as just such an internal threat to the state, with her witty challenges to patriarchal household rule. Calling her heathen and Pagan carries the same effect: she is an insider (a townswoman) and an outsider (an adherent to a different faith) at once. Maria herself even expresses her own transformation from 'gentle, tame Maria' to 'nothing but tempest' (1.2.75, 77) as a confessional change. She claims, 'I have a new soul in me'; responds affirmatively when Livia, astonished at Maria's declarations, asks 'Are you of this faith?'; and solemnifies her decision to leave her past life behind with a vow to a goddess, Lucina (1.2.76, 145, 107-21). On the whole, the play associates Maria's dissenting views on gender hierarchy with both foreignness and heretical adherence to another faith.

Maria's transformation of Petruchio thus figures as a conversion, which further aligns her with the heretical foreign woman trope. Maria announces her intention to work 'a miracle upon him', and claims she will 'turn him, and bend him … and mould him' (1.2.68-

[32] McManus, 'Constant Changelings', p. 217.

[33] Quoted in McManus, 'Constant Changelings', p. 217.

9,173). The verb 'turn' was commonly used to describe apostacy, as in 'turning Turk'.[34] Interfaith conversion usually registered as a threat in contemporary drama and writing, one that evoked anxieties of being overwhelmed or consumed by the foreign and losing the self.[35] In addition to being construed as foreign and heretical, Maria exhibits the changeability component of the trope. Petruchio is baffled by her precisely because she is changeable, or as he puts it, 'A kind of linsey-wolsey mingled mischief', a description she earns by tactically changing her demeanour each time Petruchio encounters her (4.1.18). This changeability reads as deceptive: like the typical shrew figure, Maria showed no signs of 'tongue' (1.3.85) before her marriage, and, as noted above, her post-marital use of her tongue earns her the label 'Jesuit' for its cleverness. Besides calling her 'Jesuit', 'heathen', and 'Pagan', Petruchio and the men habitually refer to Maria as the devil, another term associated with deception and imbricated in early modern conceptualizations of race.[36] This conceptual link between changeability and deception corresponds with Jonathan Burton's observation that none of the extant early modern

[34] Hutchings points out a spike in references to 'Turks' in both historiographical and dramatic texts between 1600-1610, while the 'Turk play' reached its zenith in the 1590s (pp. 7-21). He discusses this interest in the context of the significance the Ottoman empire held for early modern Europe and England, but contends that historical context alone does not adequately explain the theatre's investment in the figure of the 'Turk'; rather, 'internal forces' of 'theatrical culture' played a role in creating an 'anamorphic Turk' figure that was malleable and yet 'brought with it a readymade context all in the playhouse presumably understood'. For the ambiguity in the label of 'Turk', see Hutchings, pp. 3-5 and Jacques Lezra, 'Translated Turks on the Early Modern Stage', in *Transnational Exchange in Early Modern Theater*, ed. by Robert Henke and Eric Nicholson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), pp. 159-78 (pp. 161-3). On 'turning' as 'the hallmark of the heretic, the Catholic, the Spanish, or the infiltrator', see McManus, 'Constant Changelings', pp. 219-20. For scholarship on English anxiety about conversion to Islam, see Lieke Stelling, *Religious Conversion in Early Modern English Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), p. 6, and Jane Hwang Degenhardt, *Islamic Conversion and Christian Resistance on the Early Modern Stage* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), pp. 1, 6-7.

[35] Hutchings, p. 45.

[36] Nandini Das, João Vicente Melo, Haig Z. Smith, and Lauren Working note that 'Africa, Africans, and popular ideas of blackness played an important role in constructions of difference in moral literature. The colour black often represented malignity, death, or wickedness. Witches and dark-skinned figures were associated with the devil, and in a didactic world of contraries and comparisons, blackness stood in opposition to the purity of whiteness… Of all European languages, it was English that used the same word – "fair" – to denote virtue and light skin. This relationship between skin colour and moral traits recurred often, not only to condemn blackness but to denounce the sins of English men and women'; see *Keywords of Identity, Race, and Human Mobility in Early Modern England* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2021), pp. 42-3. The frequent references to Maria as a devil align with the references to her as Catholic, heathen, or Pagan, as well as with Petruchio's comparison of her to an Ethiopian he cannot make white. The play's implicit construction of whiteness as Christian virtue and obedience relies upon explicit constructions of Maria, in her rejection of patriarchal authority, as foreign, non-white, pagan, and Catholic.

'Turkish plays' enacts an instance of successful conversion to Islam,[37] despite the reality that many English did convert and enjoyed significant benefits as a result.[38] And yet, in this comedy, Maria, a version of the 'changeable, heretical, foreign woman' trope, 'turns' Petruchio to the couple's mutual benefit. In the final scene he declares 'I am born again' (5.4.60). The symbolism of Petruchio rising from a coffin – roused by Maria's hilarious eulogy while he is pretending to be dead, underscores his assertion. At this instant, Petruchio echoes Lear, crying 'Unbutton me!', in a symbolic indication that Maria's efforts have indeed undone him (5.4.39). Jane Hwang Degenhardt observes that '"turning Turk" implied not just a religious conversion, but also the complete undoing of all things constitutive of an English Christian identity'.[39] While nothing indicates Maria has wrested her new husband from Christianity into another established religion, she has 'wrought' a change in him that entails relinquishing his past self, his vaunted identity of wife-tamer (1.2.69).

Before his capitulation, however, Petruchio himself resembles the stereotype of the 'raging Turk'. Petruchio is a domestic tyrant, which aligns with the 'raging Turk' figure's association with tyranny in many early modern English texts, and he repeatedly succumbs to outbursts of rage fitting the primary definition linked to this figure. Regarding Petruchio's domestic tyranny, his own friends express concern for his new bride, observing, 'His very frown, if she but say her prayers / Louder than men talk treason, makes him tinder', and 'She must do nothing of herself, not eat, / Sleep, say "Sir, how do ye", make her ready, piss, / Unless he bid her' (1.1.41-2, 45-7). They speculate he will 'bury her' within three weeks (47-8). As for his rage – which Bianca warns 'nothing can bind' (1.2.60) – in response to Maria's decision to barricade herself on their wedding night, Petruchio raves about violent ways he would like to punish her. These include forcing her into positions on a wooden pole or frame,[40] taboring her like a drum, beating her with a cudgel and then giving her a hard bed, and force-feeding her constipating foods (2.3.20-3, 28-32). This variety of wished-for punishments bears some resemblance to the inventiveness of torture typically ordered by stage 'Turks', such as Acomat's torture of Aga in *Selimus*, which includes stuffing his cut-off hands into his chest (14.91, sd), and his execution of his nephew by having him flung from a tower onto soldiers' spears

[37] Quoted in Hutchings, p. 47

[38] Stelling, p. 6. Hutchings notes that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, 'men "turned Turk" in their thousands, whether under duress in captivity or more willingly tempted by the lure of wealth or advancement' (p. 45).

[39] Degenhardt, p. 1.

[40] See Munro, 2.3.20n on 'she should ride the wild mare'. The reference to the 'wooden frame on which soldiers were made to ride as a punishment' is fitting given Maria's appropriation of a soldierly identity.

(13.20-2).[41] Despite his cruel ideas, however, Petruchio's rage turns out to be comical rather than bloody, as befits the play's genre. Petruchio spends most of act 3 scene 4, for example, imprisoned in his own home, furiously shouting to be let out, with increasing frustration that no one will comply because everyone – thanks to Maria – believes he has the plague. When he finally breaks out of his house, firearm in hand, everyone has already exited. Alone on stage, Petruchio rails for almost forty lines about his griefs against women, ending with another wish for violent retaliation: 'I'll go a-birding yet, and some shall smart for't' (135). In this instance, especially, Petruchio's intemperance, his lack of 'moderation and timeliness', reads as unmanliness, a connection Gordon McMullan has discussed in Fletcher and Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*.[42] Intemperance is also a trait of the 'raging Turk' trope.[43] McJannet observes, as noted earlier, that the rage of the 'raging Turk' figure conveyed 'impotence and defeat' as much as 'military power and success'.[44] The symbolism of Petruchio's futile phallic weapon when he bursts onto an empty stage certainly underscores the former form of rage. His allies' decision to ignore him, moreover, compares to the above-mentioned scenario McJannet describes when a Sultan's subordinates should regard his rage as temporary insanity and refuse to act upon his commands.

Paradoxically, paranoia about being perceived as unmanly is the source of the rage that marks Petruchio as unmanly, and in this desire to uphold appearances, he further resembles the 'raging Turk' figure. Mark Hutchings identifies the 'Irene trope' as one of two the playhouse used to '[exploit] interest in the Ottoman Empire' (the other trope being the spectre of conversion to Islam).[45] According to legend, following Mehmed II's conquest of Constantinople, his advisors expressed concern over his infatuation with his Greek captive, Irene. Mehmed slit Irene's throat in front of them to demonstrate that 'nothing in the world can deter' him 'from upholding the greatness of the house of Osman'.[46] Though Petruchio displays no such bloody rage, he reveals a similar concern to Mehmed's. He claims he cannot possibly grant pardon to Maria without 'all the world… laughing' (2.3.1-4) and rhetorically asks, 'May I with reputation / … with safety of mine honour – /… suffer this Cicely, / … / To hang her fights out, and defy me, friends, / A well-known man-of-war? (2.5.10-20). In both cases the man seeks to show that he

[41] Robert Greene, *Selimus, Emperor of the Turks* in *Three Turk Plays*, ed. by Daniel J. Vitkus (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), pp. 55-148. Subsequent quotations are from this edition.

[42] Gordon McMullan, Introduction in William Shakespeare and John Fletcher, *King Henry VIII*, ed. by Gordon McMullan (London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2000), pp. 85-6.

[43] McManus, 'Constant Changelings', pp. 218-19.

[44] McJannet, p. 18.

[45] Hutchings, p. 33.

[46] Quoted in Hutchings, p. 44.

will not allow a woman to undermine his prowess as head of a dynasty – or household in Petruchio's case. If we accept Hutchings's claim that 'the Turk play was maintained in the playgoer's consciousness' and 'the motif came to signify "internally", in plays not otherwise associated with the subject', then, on the whole, Fletcher's Petruchio can be read as an iteration of the 'raging Turk' trope, even though he is never explicitly identified as a 'Turk'.

An allusion to *Othello* in Maria's lines helps to think about what cultural work might be effected by the reiteration of the heretical foreign woman trope and the 'raging Turk' trope with characters not identified, beyond a figurative sense, as either foreign or Turkish. Near the end of *The Tamer Tamed*, after being accused of having 'killed' her husband with her 'stubborn and unworthy way', Maria makes a request that very clearly echoes Othello:

> Pray you all hear me,
> And judge me as I am, not as you covet…
> 'Tis true, I have cause to grieve, a mighty cause
> And truly and unfainedly I weep it. (5.4.5, 11-15)

This double allusion first recalls Othello's exhortation of witnesses to give a true account of him. That Maria speaks it when Petruchio, unlike Desdemona, is pretending to be dead, makes Maria a kind of mock-tragic figure, pre-empting the comic crescendo of her eulogy for Petruchio. The allusion next recalls Othello's fixation, signalled by his repetition, on "the cause" as separate from Desdemona herself. The distinction Maria is drawing, however, is quite different: she hilariously goes on to clarify that the 'cause' for which she weeps is not the loss of Petruchio himself, but rather, as Lucy Munro puts it, 'the mess that he made of his life'.[47] But the allusion to Othello, in particular, does more than highlight the comic mode through contrast with a tragedy. Othello resonates both with Maria's appropriated soldierly identity and imputed foreignness or outsider status: he is a general who sees himself as at once Turk and Christian, vanquished and vanquisher, at the moment of his death. At the moment of her final triumph over Petruchio, Maria is similarly paradoxical – she submits to him in the very instant that she has tamed him, declaring, 'I have tamed ye, / And now am vowed your servant' (45-6). Maria's echo of Othello's lines, however, also points up differences between these characters. Though Maria appropriates a soldierly role, because of her gender she could never hold such a role officially or attain the state and social recognition Othello has. And though the men construe female obedience as white and Protestant by associating Maria's rebellion with

[47] Munro (ed.), *The Tamer Tamed*, p. viii.

Blackness, Catholicism, and heathenism, Maria, unlike Othello, is not perceived to have what Patricia Akhimie identifies as a 'somatic marker *like* indelible blackness' that 'signals an indelible social difference'.[48] At the end of the play she can return to being 'little England', again, in Petruchio's words (5.4.61). The tropes, then, of heretical foreign woman and of 'raging Turk' that the characters Petruchio and Maria reiterate are similar to Maria's verbal evocation of Othello. Since the play does not give us to understand that Maria and Petruchio are actually a foreigner and a Turk, these tropes they inhabit become, perhaps, more apparent *as* tropes. In one sense, the Maria and Petruchio iterations of these tropes detach changeability from the foreign, heretical woman, and rage from the Turk, depicting these traits instead as homegrown tendencies, and thus pushing against the stereotypes perpetuated by these well-recognized devices. Another possibility, of course, is that the use of these two tropes works as shorthand to flag Maria's and Petruchio's shortcomings, thus confirming and perpetuating the stereotypes embedded in these theatregrams.

In what follows, through comparing the use of the same theatregrams in *The Island Princess*, I suggest that the destabilization of the two tropes is a likely effect in each play. The constructions of race applied to women, however, instead of becoming similarly destabilized, become even more entrenched in *The Island Princess* than in *The Tamer Tamed*, where Maria's final promise of obedience to Petruchio equates to her return to whiteness. I begin my discussion of *The Island Princess*, though, with a consideration of Armusia's martial identity because this identity informs his relationship to Quisara, the Queen of Maluku and his eventual wife-to-be.

Whereas Maria appropriates a military persona to defend a cause she shares with other women, Armusia appropriates militarism to claim a desired prize, Quisara herself, and figuratively, in the colonial context of the narrative, the land and resources she represents. Unlike Rui Dias, who captains the Portuguese fort on the island of Tidore, Armusia is 'a newly arrived venturer', as the dramatis personae indicates, not a member of the Portuguese military. Nonetheless, Armusia takes military-style action upon hearing Quisara's promise to bring 'love and majesty' to whoever will 'win [her] with his worth' (1.3.124-5) – her words voicing a colonial fantasy that among the competitors for the 'spice islands' a nation exists that deserves monopoly over their riches and to which the islands would willingly belong.[49] Armusia proves more decisive and tactical than two sets

[48] Akhimie, p. 5.

[49] Shankar Raman observes that Quisara is not just choosing between suitors, but nations, in his reading of Armusia as representative of England in contrast to Rui Dias as the representative of Portugal's presence in the islands; see 'Imaginary Islands: Staging the East', *Renaissance Drama* 26 (1995), 131-61 (p. 139).

of soldiers – first, the Governor of Ternate's soldiers who guard Quisara's imprisoned royal brother, and second, the Portuguese soldiers whom he beats to the punch in fulfilling Quisara's challenge. Armusia employs 'policy' and 'manly force' by first surveying 'each strength and place that may befriend us' and 'all [the Governor's] magazines' to gain 'perfect knowledge / Of where the prison is and what power guards it', and then carrying out a stealth attack with a handful of men (2.2.16-17, 12-14, 29-31). He even sounds like Shakespeare's Henry V rallying his troops before the battle of Agincourt when he remarks on the greater glory that each man will accrue when so few of them undertake the attack:

> Better a few – and clearer fame will follow us,
> However lose or win, and speak our memories –
> Than if we led out armies. Things done thus
> And of this noble weight will style us worthies. (2.2.19-22)

This echo aligns with Shankar Raman's reading of the Portuguese Armusia as a figure for Francis Drake, whose enterprising in the Malukas was famous in England.[50] Raman argues that the play splits the 'colonizing subject' between Rui Dias and Armusia. The fissure is between a nobleman who bases his identity upon blood and social status and who resembles the real Portuguese authority in its colonial possessions, on one hand, and the intrepid newcomer representative both of England (whose presence in the Malukas came after Portugal's) and of the rising merchant class, on the other.[51] As Raman explains, 'landed gentry and an emergent merchant class' were 'equally participants in England's imperialistic designs', and the 'fissure internal to the colonizing subject' becomes sealed when projected onto an 'external threat', the islanders.[52] On the whole, then, Armusia's appropriation of military aggression, though it might at first seem to undercut the military identity of Rui Dias and the old guard, is tied to colonial gain and a sense of western superiority over the Malukans.

That sense of western superiority manifests not only in the depiction of Armusia's intervention into Malukan politics with just a handful of armed men, but in the Portuguese characters' attitudes towards Quisara. Quisara exemplifies a person for whom social mobility is rendered impossible because of an indelible somatic marker, her perceived skin colour.[53] As princess of Maluku, Quisara has little need of upward mobility, and yet

[50] Raman, 135-8.

[51] Ibid., 136-40.

[52] Ibid., 140.

[53] I am drawing, here, on Patricia Akhimie's work, in *Shakespeare and the Cultivation of Difference*, which demonstrates 'how a somatic marker *like* indelible blackness signals an indelible social difference, the belief in which perpetuates disadvantage' (p. 5).

instead of recognizing Quisara's power, Pinheiro, nephew to the Portuguese captain, interprets it as a fakery of whiteness, framing her as an imposter of royalty. In response to Cristofero's admiration of Quisara's seeming efforts to redeem her brother the king from captivity, for example, Pinheiro remarks:

> …You are fooled, sir.
> Things of these natures have strange outsides, Pedro,
> And cunning shadows, set 'em far from us:
> Draw 'em but near, they are gross and they abuse us.
> They that observe her close shall find her nature,
> Which I doubt mainly will not prove so excellent.
> She is a princess and she must be fair:
> That's the prerogative of being royal. (1.1.39-46)

Pinheiro doubles down, here, on the common conflation of whiteness, a 'fair' complexion, with beauty and virtue.[54] In one sense he claims that, as a princess, Quisara can enforce the proclamation of her beauty and virtue, even though upon close examination she is not 'so excellent' as she seems to be from afar. In another sense, Pinheiro begins the commentary on makeup he picks up a few lines later, suggesting Quisara acts like royalty by painting her face. When Cristofero remarks, 'The very sun… affects her sweetness / And dares not, as he does to all else, dye it / Into his tawny livery', he reinforces the association of white skin with amiability (1.1.61-3). Pinheiro counters, however, that Quisara 'wears her complexion in a case' and 'would look like a lion' – 'tawny' in early modern understanding (1.1.65n) – were she to expose herself to the sun 'a week or two, or three' (1.1.65-6). For Pinheiro, and later for Armusia, Quisara's 'painting' obscures dark skin, which they associate with inner corruption. The 'case' of Quisara's complexion could refer to a container for cosmetics, or 'a protective mask used to prevent the sun melting the fucus', or even 'the hardened, sun-dried make-up itself'.[55] McManus points out that 'the pun on *case* as genitals connects the female sins of painting and promiscuity via the sun's *kisses*… Quisara must use cosmetics to hide the sexual voracity early moderns felt to be inherent in blackness'.[56] Not only does Pinheiro reproduce the conventional early modern association between whiteness, beauty, and virtue, then, but his claim that Quisara uses makeup connects the fakery of lighter skin with the fakery of morality. Pinheiro's class status is not on par with Quisara's royalty, and yet he assumes a position of judgement over her, from which he finds her as incapable

[54] See note 36.

[55] McManus (ed.), *The Island Princess*, 1.1.65n.

[56] Ibid.

of accessing true virtue as she is of changing her skin colour without makeup. Despite Quisara's royal status in Maluku, Pinheiro, by posturing as someone Quisara cannot deceive, frames acceptance into Portuguese, western, white society as a form of mobility she cannot possibly achieve.[57] Whereas Maria's militant push to claim some power from husbands results in descriptions of her and her allies as non-white, Quisara's display of the power she already holds quite apart from the presence of western traders meets with delegitimizing descriptions of her as a faker of whiteness.

Quisara, however, threatens to overcome the male and western subject through conversion. Her attempt at conversion, combined with her foreignness, sexual allure, and deception, fits with the heretical foreign woman trope she embodies. In contrast to Maria, though, Quisara fails to convert her husband-in-waiting to her faith. While I have argued that Maria is an iteration of the heretical foreign woman, since McManus has already discussed Quisara as a prime example of this trope, I focus on Armusia's response to Quisara, rather than on how Quisara fits the motif. Armusia, like Petruchio, reiterates the 'raging Turk' trope without being identified as a Turkish character. When, paradoxically, Quisara asks Armusia to prove his 'constancy' to her by changing his religion for hers, his rejection is vehement (4.5.29). Like Petruchio in *The Tamer Tamed*, Armusia fantasizes about physical humiliation, though with reference to Quisara's religion instead of to her body. This difference is in keeping with Quisara's representational function not just as an individual, but as a figure for Maluku itself, including its people and culture.[58] What Quisara acknowledges as 'powers eternal', Armusia calls 'puppets' and 'cold, senseless outsides' (4.5.64-5, 67). He declares, 'where I meet your maumet gods, I'll swing 'em / Thus o'er my head and kick 'em into puddles' (116-17). Armusia's 'thus' signals a demonstration of his intended violence, either mimed or with some object as stand-in for the 'maumet gods'. Such a demonstration before Quisara while calling the gods 'hers' aligns the princess with the object of his rage. Rather than stopping at his

[57] Quisara decides to convert to Christianity in the final act, and as Ania Loomba notes, 'Quisara's potential for assimilation into European culture, religion, and family is signaled by her fair skin' and 'Quisara is marked as unique among the natives', so that 'her future assimilation into Christianity will only underline (and not threaten to dissolve) the racial, religious, and cultural differences between the other Moluccans and Europeans'; see '"Break her will, and bruise no bone sir": Colonial and Sexual Mastery in Fletcher's *The Island Princess*', *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 2.1 (2002), 68-108 (pp. 77-8). Nonetheless, Pinheiro's rumination on Quisara's skin colour as not truly white, but only seeming so from afar suggests that her acceptance into western society will be similarly superficial, that the Europeans might afford her similar but not quite the same status they afford to those they perceive as inherently white.

[58] Claire Jowitt compares Fletcher's representation of Quisara to Samuel Purchas's descriptions of America as a female body; see '*The Island Princess* and Race', *Early Modern English Drama: A Critical Companion*, ed. by Garrett A. Sullivan Jr, Patrick Cheney, and Andrew Hadfield (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 287-97 (p. 290).

promise to swing and kick Quisara's gods, Armusia continues, 'Nay, I will, out of vengeance, search your temples / And, with those hearts that serve my God, demolish / Your shambles of wild worships (4.5.118-20). Armusia's addition, piling destruction on destruction, resembles Petruchio's vision of adding a flock-bed to further aggravate Maria's cudgelled bones and aligns with the cruel nature characteristic of the 'raging Turk'.[59] Quisara initially does not take his ranting seriously, associating him obliquely with the 'Raging Turk' figure by telling him she has let him 'storm a little' (4.5.98). Armusia's ranting, however, is replete with serious misogyny not unlike that demonstrated by Mehmed when he slits Irene's throat to prove his loyalty to his royal house cannot be shaken by the influence of a mere woman. Whereas Mehmed renders Irene a corpse, Armusia declares Quisara 'looks like death itself' and banishes her from him with curses, choosing his 'faith', the 'glorious cross', over her much as Mehmed chooses the house of Osmond over Irene (4.5.106, 121-2). As an iteration of the 'raging Turk' motif, Armusia shares with this figure both cruelty and the rejection or even obliteration of women to demonstrate his resolve.[60]

Armusia's behaviour also conforms to the primary early modern definition of rage as 'raving' or 'furious madness', the definition that most often applied to the 'raging Turk'. In a reading attentive to early modern geohumoural conceptions of race, Jonathan Gil Harris interprets Armusia's rage as 'the heat of Christian righteousness' in counter-distinction from the play's representation of the 'sickening' heat of Maluku's climate, food, pathogens, and incitements to desire.[61] This interpretation aligns with the earlier-noted alternative understanding of rage as an appropriate response to insult or injury. The consistently tranquil presence of the King of Tidore on stage during Armusia's raging, however, creates a striking and even comic contrast that undermines any potential righteous tenor to Armusia's anger. The King's patience in the face of Armusia's insults

[59] Referring to the islanders' places of worship as 'shambles', moreover, Armusia, as McManus points out, makes a 'jarring new accusation of human sacrifice' that is 'unfounded in the play' and that contains a 'subtextual attack on the Catholic Eucharist'; see *The Island Princess*, 120n. This accusation is just one instance of Armusia's tendency – and the play's tendency, as Jowitt and Loomba discuss – to play fast and loose with references to Quisara's religion; see Jowitt, '*The Island Princess* and Race', p. 293, and Loomba, 83. During his rant, Armusia confuses Islam with paganism and devil-worship, and often conveys anti-Catholic sentiment. This ignorance is itself a form of violence, a hollowing out of Quisara's religion so that it aligns with the imagined puppet gods Armusia yearns to desecrate.

[60] Recall Petruchio's fear of losing his 'man of war' status if he allows Maria to 'hang her fights out'. See also Selimus's summary execution of Acomat's Queen, who defies and criticizes him instead of begging for her life, and whose death Selimus commands with, 'Strangle her, Hali. Let her scold no more' (27. 23).

[61] Jonathan Gil Harris, 'Sick Ethnography: Recording the Indian and the Ill English Body', in *Indography: Writing the 'Indian' in Early Modern England*, ed. by Jonathan Gil Harris (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 133-47 (p. 144).

to the islanders' faith recalls his saintly endurance of the governor's torments earlier in the play. He addresses Armusia respectfully and calmly: when Armusia declares he will 'spit at', 'scourge', and 'grind' the island 'gods' into dust, the King interjects with, 'Good friend, be cooler' (132-3, 135, 137), and when Armusia degrades Quisara, the King pleads, 'softly', and 'you must be temperate' (138, 140). In response to Armusia directing Rui Dias to 'pursue' the Malukans after his anticipated martyrdom, calling them 'base, malicious people', the King magnanimously interjects with 'friend, be not desperate' (5.5.33-4). The context of the King's own dignified temperance, his apologies for having to apprehend Armusia when Armusia escalates his public threats despite the King's pleas, and his command to his guards to 'offer him no violence' set off Armusia's rage as over-zealousness for a martyrdom that seems wholly unnecessary (4.5.141). The King's Islamic faith, moreover (or rather, the play's confused representation of the islanders' faith as a mixture of Islam, paganism, and devil-worship), along with his eastern state align him – comportment aside – more obviously than the western, Christian Armusia with the 'raging Turk' figure. By portraying the character associated with the Turk through religion and geopolitics as temperate, and the western, Christian character who is also associated with Englishness as raging, Fletcher's play upends the 'raging Turk' motif, or rather, reiterates the trope in a way that pointedly detaches the rage from associations with Islam. The possibility that Fletcher was aiming for irony in placing the King and Armusia side by side as temperance and rage does not negate, I posit, the potential for such a reversal to challenge the cultural assumptions built into the 'raging Turk' trope.

One time that Armusia in *The Island Princess* and Petruchio in *The Tamer Tamed* do show moderation and depart from the trope's association with fierce conquest, domination, and expansion comes when they are encouraged to rape Quisara and Maria respectively. When Armusia's companions find him sulking about not receiving Quisara's immediate favour upon saving her brother, Sousa urges him to 'Go to her and take her in your arms and shake her. / Take her and toss her like a bar' (3.2.23-4). Emanuel adds,

> But be sure you pitch her upon a feather bed.
> Shake her between a pair of sheets, sir;
> There shake these sullen fits out of her. Spare her not there:
> There you may break her will and bruise no bone, sir. (3.2.25-8)

Petruchio-like, he further asserts that women 'love a man that crushes 'em to verjuice' (40). Similarly, when Petruchio complains about Maria delaying the consummation of their marriage, his friend suggests, 'It may be then, / Her modesty required a little

violence? / Some women love to struggle' (3.3.7-9). In both plays male characters affirm essentialist views about female nature (submissive to, and even preferring, male sexual aggression and violence), male entitlement (to authority, to the woman's body), and the assertion of that entitlement through sexual dominance. The advice makes Armusia 'smile' (37), but he calls his friends' recommended approach 'too boisterous' and decides to 'do something – / But not your way' (41-2). Later, he insists, 'I would not have her forced' (2.6.164). Petruchio, however, admits that Maria 'had' the opportunity to 'struggle' with him, but that he abandoned his efforts when she swore he would never have her 'mind or appetite' if he took 'her body prisoner' (3.2.58, 64-5). Petruchio's and Armusia's preference for consent is out of step with their violent threats of torture and sacrilege, respectively. While their threats convey their conviction of superiority as man (Petruchio cannot tolerate Maria insisting on her will) and colonizer (Armusia cannot stomach Quisara's request that he convert to her faith), their hesitance to rape reveals desire for that superiority to be recognized and accepted, rather than enforced.[62]

The initial absence of such acceptance leads to Armusia's near martyrdom and Petruchio's mock martyrdom. The martyrdom episode allows Armusia and Petruchio to demonstrate their determination to die for their own 'faith' rather than convert to the 'religion' of the heretical, changeable woman. At the same time (and even though Petruchio himself does give up and convert to Maria's 'faith', in a sense), the deaths the men respectively court and fake effect a conversion instead in the foreign, heretical woman – a conversion that whitens her. As already discussed, Maria's vow of obedience to Petruchio, at the very moment she declares him tamed, results in her change from Jesuit, heathen, and Ethiopian to 'little England' in Petruchio's words. Similarly, when Quisara, inspired by Armusia's vehement refusal to convert, declares herself 'won' by his 'fair constancy', aligning steadfastness with whiteness, Armusia hails her praise as a 'fair argument' (5.2.109, 117). Quisara, in turn, explains, 'Your [Armusia's] faith and your religion must be like ye:… / When the streams flow clear and fair, what are the fountains?' (5.2.118-20). She reproduces, and Armusia confirms, Pinheiro's connection between whiteness, beauty, and virtue, in identifying as 'fair' what she now perceives to be the true religion. Whiteness links, too, to wifely obedience, as in *The Tamer Tamed*, with Quisara requesting to be instructed by her future husband (5.2.126). The near and mock martyrdom episodes do result in a humbling of sorts for the would-be martyr. Petruchio's

[62] Jowitt (in '*The Island Princess* and Race', p. 290) notes that the play's association of Quisara with Maluku itself encourages, in the colonial male reader or audience member, a chivalric mindset usually associated with romance writing. Key to this chivalric attitude is the notion that man/colonizer will gain more from the woman/land through marriage or chivalric protection than through rape and plunder. See also Loomba, who points out how, in the play, 'violence against women is strenuously disavowed, and a chivalric ideal is evoked in order to feature colonial mastery as international romance' (71).

most humbling moment comes when Maria's eulogizing prompts him to rise out of his coffin in exasperation, at once betraying himself as having faked his own death to punish Maria and accepting the failure of his ruse. Armusia's potentially sheepish moment comes after Quisara has submitted to him, when he excuses himself to the King and Quisara:

> Good sir, forget my rashness –
> [*to Quisara*] And noble Princess – for I was once angry
> And out of that might utter some distemper:
> Think not 'tis my nature. (5.5.72-5)

This almost-apology so grossly understates the invective and threats Armusia unleashed against the Malukans and their religion as to once more draw attention to their excessiveness. Nonetheless, this subtle undermining of Petruchio's and Armusia's authority does not undo the construction of a turn towards Christianity, steadfastness, and obedience as a turn towards whiteness.

Conceptualizing the heretical foreign woman and the 'raging Turk' tropes as theatregrams – that is, as well-worn motifs not restricted to travel or voyage drama[63] or to the Turk play, makes apparent their ongoing use and reach beyond their genres of origin. In the case of Fletcher's *The Tamer Tamed* and *The Island Princess*, these tropes function similarly in a domestic versus foreign setting and in a tragicomedy versus a farcical comedy. Genre certainly inflects each play's reiteration of these tropes: Quisara hints to Rui Dias that her brother's assassination would make her more free, for instance, while Maria's taking up of arms to increase her own freedom never threatens an actual death. Likewise, succumbing to Quisara would amount to actual apostacy, whereas capitulating to Maria entails only a figurative apostacy, which perhaps explains why the comedy can go so far as to present Petruchio as 'undone' and 'born again', while Armusia's categorical refusal to convert keeps the tragicomedy from slipping into tragedy. Similarly, as iterations of the 'raging Turk' motif, Petruchio and Armusia rave about the cruel actions they want to commit, but their rage is kept to the tenor of tragicomedy and comedy; neither enacts or reaches the heights of cruelty displayed by Turk figures in tragedies like *Tamburlaine* or *Selimus*. Nonetheless, the reiterations of these tropes shape the plays' treatments of race and gender in similar ways. The separation of the 'raging

[63] Claire Jowitt and David McInnis distinguish between 'travel drama', which 'is based on a particular documented voyage or focuses on the exploits of a historical traveller' and 'voyage drama', a 'more capacious term' to include imaginary voyages and creative engagement with travel materials; see *Travel and Drama in Early Modern England: The Journeying Play* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), pp. 1-3.

Turk' motif from Turkish or Muslim identity in both plays and *The Tamer Tamed*'s use of an English character to embody the heretical foreign woman carry potential to destabilize the racial stereotypes embedded in these motifs, especially with the presence of an Islamic king in *The Island Princess* whose calm reserve serves as a foil for the Christian Armusia's intemperance. And yet the association of the defiant, rebellious woman – even if the character is white – with blackness, paganism, and treachery associated with Jesuits, paired with the counter association of whiteness with both legitimate authority and female obedience to patriarchal authority – even if the character is not white – entrenches racial stereotypes for female characters.

Another structural component these plays share – a main character's appropriation of a military persona – becomes integrated with the two tropes. In both plays, the character taking on a military persona is also the one who effects the conversion at the play's end, with Maria subduing Petruchio (even though she simultaneously submits to him) and Armusia inspiring Quisara to convert to Christianity. This alignment evinces the association between military figures and conquest, which fits the heretical foreign woman's threat of overtaking and obliterating one's identity. It also fits the 'raging Turk's' link to conquest and Islamic expansion, though with this admired quality of the Turk transferred to the Christian Armusia. Leading up to the conversion moment, though, Maria's embodiment of a martial identity is defensive and collective: she and her allies name a common cause to fight for – resistance of male marital tyranny. Armusia, in contrast, assumes a military persona to claim Quisara for himself, she having set herself up as a prize to be won by the most effective armed intervention. In both cases, the appropriation of a military persona heightens a struggle taking place for resources and power, but in the comedy it links to female resistance, and in the romantic tragicomedy and travel drama, to male conquest. Correspondingly, the female characters taking up a martial stance in *The Tamer Tamed* are characterized as black, pagan, and Jesuit, while *The Island Princess* presents Armusia's martial intervention as western superiority – a decisive solving of Malukan in-fighting by a newly arrived Portuguese/English venturer. These appropriations of military personas carry contradictory resonances, perhaps reflecting a growing awareness in the period of the military profession *as* a profession and an identity that could be leveraged in very different contexts.[64] Despite these

[64] Although a professional standing army was not created in England until after Charles I's defeat in the Civil War, the aristocracy was already becoming less militarily and more administratively engaged beginning in the late medieval period, as Keith Thomas observes; see *The Ends of Life: Roads to Fulfilment in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 50, 46. The numerous military arts treatises, drill manuals, combat instructions, and military histories published in the early seventeenth century evince that military expertise was no longer the sole purview of nobles in charge of their own retinues, but was becoming professionalized. Many of these publications, as David R. Lawrence discusses,

contradictory resonances, Maria's and Armusia's appropriations of martial personas – like the reiterations of the heretical foreign woman and 'raging Turk' tropes – remain consistent in their reproduction of racial stereotypes pertaining to women.

were concerned with forming the perfect soldier; see *The Complete Soldier: Military Books and Military Culture in Early Stuart England, 1603-1645* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009). Elizabeth I deployed thousands of soldiers on expeditions to Ireland, France, Portugal, and the Low Countries, as Patricia Cahill notes; see, *Unto the Breach: Martial Formations, Historical Trauma, and the Early Modern Stage* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008 rpt 2013), p. 12. Correspondingly, as Andrew Gurr (cited in Cahill, p. 2), points out, war dramas were a staple of London playhouses for more than a decade at the end of the sixteenth century, and continued into the seventeenth century. This longstanding cultural engagement with war and the soldier, I suggest, generates new conceptions of soldierly identity, including ways that identity might be appropriated by civilians.