

print for a long time. However, readers who want a definitive life of Donne, one that corrects the thematic biases of past biographies and recognizes the possibilities of both biographical truth and fiction-making in the poetry, will have to wait a little longer. Oxford University Press has engaged M. Thomas Hester and Dennis Flynn to edit a complete edition of Donne's letters, which will surpass in completeness even the I. A. Shapiro edition promised years ago but never published. Undoubtedly, these letters will offer a trove of material that could clarify some of the more obscure patches of Donne's life. Until then, the poetry may seem for some too tempting a source for biographical speculation to resist.

Jonathan Burton, *Traffic and Turning: Islam and English Drama, 1579-1624*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2005. Cloth \$ 55.00. 319 pp. Review by NABIL MATAR, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.

In *Orientalism* (1978), Edward Said wrote about the polarization between Western European countries, specifically Great Britain and France, and the Islamic East. He described the "discourse" about the East that underpinned the European imperial project on regions extending from Morocco to Iran and India. By focusing on the world of Islam, Said showed how the West had vilified the civilization and culture of the Muslims in order to justify domination.

While some scholars agreed with Said's thesis, others found it too damning and inflexible and sought evidence to challenge it. These latter critics contested the idea that the West was to blame for the "clash of civilizations" (a phrase that post-dated Said), and they turned to study medieval, early modern, and modern sources in the hope of demonstrating that the West had not really always vilified or demonized the Islamic world—especially when the West had not yet possessed the military or economic power to do so.

In *Traffic and Turning*, Jonathan Burton urges readers to move beyond the binarism of Said. For him, even critics who disagree with Said remain confined within the parameters of the established discourse. Burton therefore argues that early modern British drama—and the book is nearly all focused on English plays (*Tamburlaine*, *Lust's Dominion*, *Othello*, *A Christian Turn'd Turk*, and *The Renegado*) and some travel accounts—showed "more multiple, fluctuating,

and susceptible to Eastern influence than has been previously recognized” (15). Burton believes that Arabic and Ottoman (and in the case of Leo Africanus, Maghribi-Italian) portrayals and texts found their way onto the English stage and produced a Muslim who was not necessarily always polarized or demonized.

In chapter 1, he examines Christopher Marlowe’s *Tamburlaine* and shows how the play reflects the growth in contact between the Ottomans and the English during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, specifically from the 1580s on. Burton argues that Marlowe’s Turks are not presented as the “conventional stereotypes” of Muslims in binary opposition to Christian Britons. Rather they are part of a triangle that includes Protestant Britons, Muslims, and Catholic Spaniards. As a result, the Islamic identity of *Tamburlaine* is magnified or diminished, depending on the conflict with Spain. By carefully studying letters and other material published in Hakluyt (1589), Burton convincingly shows how extensive political and commercial relations were between Queen Elizabeth and her Ottoman counterpart. Burton then concludes that such negotiations influenced Marlowe’s construction of *Tamburlaine*.

This leap, however, is not corroborated by evidence from the play: what, one wonders, in the Ottoman correspondence that Burton cites, could have inspired the image of *Tamburlaine* burning the Qur’an? Or what Islamic sources inspired the bizarrely impossible names that Marlowe used for the “Muslim” potentates of North Africa? What is there in “Muslim” *Tamburlaine* that is “uniquely differentiating” or that is drawn from actual English interaction with Muslims? Burton cites Thomas Dallam, who went to Istanbul to assemble an organ sent as a present to the sultan, as proof of direct and first-hand English familiarity with Ottoman Turks. True, Dallam’s account shows that the “English discourse was not only permeable, but also permeated and influenced by Muslim voices” (52). But Dallam wrote years after Marlowe had died, and his account remained in manuscript. And of course, the image of Islam and Muslims that Dallam provides is vastly different from the “Islam” of *Tamburlaine*. Burton’s leap is unfortunately very similar to many such leaps in recent scholarship about Islamic influences on English literature: juxtaposing historical information with literary works and then assuming, without proof, that the former influenced the latter.

In order to refute Said and his followers regarding the demonized image of Muslims in West European Christian thought, Burton tries to show that

there were different representations of Muslims in English drama—different images that were inspired by different meetings with, or texts about and by, Muslims. In chapter 4, for instance, Burton turns to the discussion of Fulke Greville's play, *Mustapha*. Burton rightly shows that Greville presented Mustapha as a noble and Christ-like figure—and he seizes on Mustapha as proof of the “heroic” Muslim on the English stage. But that Greville's Mustapha is as Muslim as Dekker's Eleazer and Shakespeare's Othello needs strenuous proof. After all, both Eleazer and Othello are presented in the plays as converts to Christianity (Othello had been baptized), and neither playwright uses a single Muslim allusion or reference to establish a “Mahometan” identity for the protagonists. True, Mustapha does not reflect the stereotype of the stage “Mahometan”—lascivious and brutal; but then he is the figure who is murdered by his father and stepmother. Greville followed Knolles' *History of the Turkes* in portraying the stepmother of Mustapha, Roxolana, as cruel and amoral, willing even to condone the killing of her daughter, as well as her stepson. Suleyman too condones the killing of his son. While Mustapha is a Christ-like figure, all those around him are vicious Muslims, representing the stereotypical images of the fearful and “cruel” Turk, practicing polygamy and cold-blooded infanticide. Even Roxolana, who had been known to have been born Christian, once she enters the Muslim harem, becomes a ruthless woman who will not hesitate to use friends and family to attain power: “Vertue, nor vice shall in themselves have nothing” (2.3). If Mustapha is a Christ-figure, then Greville emphasizes the horrific viciousness of the Muslims in defeating the paragon of Christian virtue and the hero of the play.

Burton can only valorize Muslim Mustapha by associating him with Christian virtue—as if there is no model of virtue in Islam. The good Muslim has to fit Christian criteria—is it because there are no Muslim criteria? Such a construction of the Muslim is quite similar to what Said had pointed to in the Western discourse about Islam—of the West/Western inventing an image which is then presented as the “authentic” Muslim. Burton's use of the example of Abdul Hamid (16-17) merely confirms the bias that underlines such construction: Abdul Hamid is the name of the American terrorist who converted to Islam and tried to blow up an airplane. What does an example from the early 21st century have to do with the early modern period? Such a rush towards “relevance” is deeply disturbing. What is the reader to expect at the outset of the book other than that converts to Islam in early modern British (and since

Lindh is American, world) history are converts to terrorism? After all, there were numerous examples of converts to Islam in the early modern period who integrated happily into Muslim society. Why are they ignored in favor of a convert who is an infamous criminal?

Although Burton wants to go beyond Said's Orientalist thesis, he recognizes the value of Said's other thesis—"contrapuntal analysis" (47), which Said presented in his later work. Burton argues for the need to bring in texts that have been unused or marginalized—specifically texts from the Arabic and Ottoman legacy. Such texts, in his view, could show that English (and perhaps European) literature engaged Muslim self-representations and definitions. In the introduction, Burton draws attention to a wonderful autobiography by al-Hajari (which, however, was only published and translated in the late twentieth century) and to the text by Khoja Sa'd ud-Din about the fall of Byzantium. Burton briefly uses these two sources, and in the final chapter, turns to a detailed analysis of the relation between *Othello* and Leo Africanus' account, which had been translated into English in 1600. This possibility of an Africanus-Shakespeare construction of Othello is tantalizing but needs to be approached in the context of Shakespeare's undisputed source: Cinthio. How much of Othello is exclusively traceable to Africanus and not to Cinthio? Burton is commended for urging other students and scholars to reach for texts that record the Muslim voice and to explore the contrapuntal dimension of textual and cultural engagement. Modestly, he admits that he is unfamiliar with the languages of the early modern Islamic world; but then, he proceeds to reject adamantly conclusions, based on Arabic sources, which showed Muslim anger at Christians as a result of the "violence, expulsion, and autos da f e committed by the Christians against the Muslims" (qtd. in n. 11, 260). Having admitted unfamiliarity with the non-European sources, how can Burton be "troubled" with what these sources present?

Notwithstanding these drawbacks, Burton's study presents a useful analysis of the relation between commerce and religious conversion, from and to Islam, with an interesting chapter on the role of Jews in the triangle of Christian, "Turk," and Jew (chapter 5). The book is clearly written and Burton brings together a wide range of primary sources while citing numerous scholars who have been active in the study of Anglo-Islamic relations in the early modern period. The bibliography is thorough along with the "Chronological List of Dramatic Works with Islamic Characters, Themes, or Settings." My

graduate students found the book quite helpful, although they were startled to find that the Christ-like Mustapha was really a portrait of an Ottoman Muslim. Muslims hold Christ in very high esteem, but it is quite a stretch to view the son of Suleyman the Magnificent as Christ-like.

April G. Shelford. *Transforming the Republic of Letters: Pierre-Daniel Huet and European Intellectual Life, 1650-1720*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2007. xii + 264 pp. + 7 illus. \$75.00 Review by G. MATTHEW ADKINS, QUEENSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK.

At a meeting of the Académie Française in 1687, Charles Perrault read his poem “Le siècle de Louis le Grand,” in which he insisted upon the superiority of modern culture and learning over that of classical civilization. Irritated by Perrault’s assertions, the poet and satirist Nicolas Boileau-Despréaux rose to object to the reading, but the érudit Pierre-Daniel Huet interrupted Boileau’s protest, stating flatly, “Monsieur Despréaux, it seems to me this concerns us more than you” (161-162).

The reading of Perrault’s poem, including Boileau’s interrupted protest and Huet’s retort, touched off, at least in the French Academy, the Quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns, a culture war that had been brewing for years and that would continue with skirmishes long after the main battles were over. Since scholars generally recognize Boileau as the leader of the “Ancients” in the quarrel, Huet’s rejoinder to him is puzzling. Devoted to ancient literature and a master of Latin, Huet was deeply critical of the decadence, as he saw it, of contemporary learning and had every reason to agree with Boileau. In the Quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns, Huet chose to side with the Ancients. Why, then, would he silence Boileau’s criticism of Perrault and even imply that Boileau was not one of “us?” April Shelford’s book, *Transforming the Republic of Letters* is ultimately an explanation of Huet’s hitherto poorly understood comment to Boileau. Shelford reveals that the Quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns went deeper than a debate over the relative merits of classical and contemporary learning, that the Quarrel represented a fundamental transformation of elite French intellectual culture. Boileau may have extolled the ancients, but to Huet he represented everything about contemporary intellec-