



<b>Title</b>	The Not-Forgotten Empire: Images of Persia in English Renaissance Writing
<b>Authors(s)</b>	Grogan, Jane
<b>Publication date</b>	2010-09-02
<b>Publication information</b>	Grogan, Jane. "The Not-Forgotten Empire: Images of Persia in English Renaissance Writing." Wiley, September 2, 2010. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-4113.2010.00747.x">https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-4113.2010.00747.x</a> .
<b>Publisher</b>	Wiley
<b>Item record/more information</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/10197/7746">http://hdl.handle.net/10197/7746</a>
<b>Publisher's statement</b>	This is the author's version of the following article: Jane Grogan (2010) "The Not-Forgotten Empire: Images of Persia in English Renaissance Writing" Literature Compass, 7(9): 912-921 which has been published in final form at <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-4113.2010.00747.x">http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-4113.2010.00747.x</a> .
<b>Publisher's version (DOI)</b>	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-4113.2010.00747.x">10.1111/j.1741-4113.2010.00747.x</a>

Downloaded 2026-05-01 23:49:07

The UCD community has made this article openly available. Please share how this access benefits you. Your story matters! (@ucd\_oa)



© Some rights reserved. For more information

*Published in Literature Compass 7: 9 (2010): 912-21*

## **The Not-Forgotten Empire: Images of Persia in English Renaissance Writing**

**Dr Jane Grogan, University College Dublin**

### **Abstract**

This essay argues that the image of Persia is a familiar, largely positive and particularly compelling one for English Renaissance readers and writers. It surveys the range of sources of information available, and the kinds of uses to which they were put. Challenging the weight of recent scholarship on the Ottomans which presents them writ large as the representatives of the 'East' for English audiences and readers, I hope to show that the distinctiveness of Persia in the English imagination is an important counter-weight to this sense of Eastern difference predicated on conceptions of Ottoman threat.

The failure of Said's Orientalist model to take full account of the encounters between East and West in the early modern period has become something of a platitude in recent years, on historical and conceptual grounds alone (e.g., Barbour, Porter, Ahmed). But its identification of a broadly imperial and Eurocentric agenda underpinning scholarly and cultural engagements with the East apparently remains securely in place. The trend of recent scholarship seems to be moving ever more confidently towards models of globalization often drawn from post-colonial and popular economic theory. Jonathan Burton, for example, highlights some alternative contemporary paradigms in the title of his important study, *Traffic and Turning: Islam and English Drama, 1579-1624*, and in a sign that the market has accepted these new models, an excellent Blackwell *Companion to the Global Renaissance*, edited by Jyotsna G. Singh, has just been published (2009). But perhaps unsurprisingly given the provenance of much recent globalization theory in postcolonial studies, empire and commerce continue to be identified as the primary desiderata of English engagements with the East, textual or otherwise. My own research on the image of Persia in the early modern period, however, does not fit easily into either of the classic orientalist or globalizing models, suggesting that the terms in which we read the East in early modern English texts need some further refining yet. Far from being "forgotten", as the title of a 2005 major exhibition on the Achaemenid empire at the British Museum suggested, ancient – and contemporary – Persia were highly visible in early modern English culture. But while Orientalist theory fails to reflect the material and historical circumstances of English images of Persia in the sixteenth century, or the imitative aspirations within which these image were constructed, globalization theory tends to undervalue the long and prestigious textual tradition of enquiry into Persian peoples and practices. This essay will survey a wide selection of sources and deployments of English images of Persia in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as well as recent work in the field, in order to point out the necessity of a more nuanced understanding of the place that Persia occupied within the early modern English cultural imagination.

Just as the Ottomans dominated Mediterranean geopolitics in the sixteenth century, so in turn have they dominated critical scholarship of the East and its literary influences on English writing in the early modern period – and consequently, the paradigms within which English relations with the ‘East’ tend to be understood in contemporary scholarship. Bernadette Andrea writes cogently of the occlusion of women and women’s literary and cultural agency by the dominance of the trope of ‘turning Turk’, something that has, she writes, “assumed the status of a ‘false universal’ in current criticism” (3). But also occluded by the Ottoman focus is the Persian model, and its divergence in many key respects from the religious, political, historical and ethnic contours of the Ottoman empire – as early modern readers and audiences knew perhaps better than us.<sup>1</sup> Long after the classic study of Samuel Chew, *The Crescent and the Rose*, the last decade or so has seen a new wave of interest in representations of and encounters with the Islamic world in the early modern period. Such scholarship has been dominated by studies of the Ottomans, and has given us such valuable paradigms as, for example, imperial envy (Gerald MacLean), alternative and attractive models of religious tolerance (Nabil Matar), mercantile and economic relationships with significant cultural force (Daniel Vitkus, Matthew Dimmock), and more bipartisan models of “traffic” between east and west (Jonathan Burton, Richmond Barbour). This interest is motivated not simply by its topicality, but also by an increasingly informed sense of the extent and energy of English interest in the East. The recurring and varied expression of this interest in the public theatres also provides a catalyst for scholarly research, but the array of textual materials in less canonical genres upon which dramatists drew remain less well-known, even in the case of Ottoman-centred material. More importantly, I would suggest, to get a full picture of early modern English conceptions of the East and of Islam, and the basis upon which political, economic and diplomatic relations with the Islamic world were conceived and negotiated, the special case of Persia – hitherto a blind spot of early modern English studies – needs to be added to the ‘Turks’ narrative. This material, long neglected, is beginning to find its champions, among them Linda McJannet, Anthony Parr, Chloe Houston, Ladan Niayesh, Matthew Birchwood and myself; such studies of Persia in early modern English writing promise to challenge, and perhaps overturn, existing paradigms, approaches and theoretical assumptions governing our understanding of English relations with the East in the period.<sup>2</sup>

The array of visual and verbal forms to which early modern English readers could have looked for images of Persia was both wide-ranging and well-stocked. Material in English as well as Latin, Greek, Italian, French and other European languages, was available from publications at London, Oxford and Cambridge as well as from continental printers and suppliers. It traversed the most learned and recondite academic domains (surely the prize in this category must go to the calculations by James Ussher and others on the age of the universe based on biblical references to ancient Persian kings?) as well as the popular and ephemeral (tragedies for the public stage from its earliest days (e.g., *Cambyses* (1561)); pamphlets, ballads and doggerel verse). The new taste for comparative histories, universal geographies, increasingly detailed maps in both large and more portable formats, compendia and epitomes, atlases and almanacs, ensured that Persia remained in view. So comprehensively familiar was Persia to early modern Europeans that some of the major seventeenth-century accounts of Persia were written by

men who had never been (see Elio Christoph Brancaforte). All the same, early modern English readers had access to a goodly number of accounts by travellers to Persia, both by Englishmen and Europeans: Samuel Purchas gathered and synthesized most of these in his 1617 *Purchas His Pilgrimes*, but the commencement of full diplomatic relations with Persia in 1626 gave rise to several important accounts in the 1630s and beyond, notably those of Sir Thomas Herbert and Henry Blount. Notwithstanding the rich and varied contribution of travel-related work, I would argue that the most important source of information about Persia, at least within English literary culture (and extending to its plentiful mercantile connections with the London guilds) was the classical legacy of histories and ethnographies by ancient Greek writers and travellers and their later Roman mediators. Even the most influential travel writing, after all, relied volubly on classical accounts.

Unlike the Ottoman Turks whose rise to power was relatively recent (or so early modern writers liked to claim; see Meserve), Persia's ancient pedigree as one of the four worldly empires noted in the Book of Daniel, for which respected classical historical records existed, guaranteed that, to English minds, Persia had a well-established prestige and renown rarely challenged. Indeed, bemoaning the demise of Persia's ancient glory is a favourite gambit even by those writers who only mention Persia in passing (see, for example, Boemus, sig. K8v). The accounts of this ancient imperial glory come not as we might expect from the Graeco-Persian wars of the fourth century BCE, but primarily from two earlier authors: Xenophon and Herodotus, one a prolific but nowadays neglected writer and soldier, the other a traveller and historian. It is largely the Persia narrated by these two authors that becomes the template for a later wave of Roman writers to embellish upon: historians, lawyers and political philosophers such as Justin and Diodorus of Sicily, and, in a less substantial (but in Renaissance terms, disproportionately influential) way, Cicero and even Plutarch. The Persia narrated by these authors was a country of barbarians, certainly, but barbarians of a far different order to those of neighbouring Scythia and even Assyria. Most influential was Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, a heroic narrative of the life and achievements of Cyrus the Great, founder of the Achaemenid empire, and the man who led the Persians to defeat their Median overlords before establishing an empire that was to last for centuries and encompass a vast swathe of Europe, Africa and Asia. Only the empire of Alexander the Great rivalled it, and it was Alexander who finally brought the Persian empire to an end. Xenophon's text was imbued by Greek values, as well as a more personal biographical interest: his hardy, temperate Persians loyally serving a charismatic military leader faintly evoke the army of hardy, temperate Greeks later to traverse Persia under a charismatic captain – Xenophon himself – as described in his *Anabasis*. Its first English translator, William Barker, advertised his work to early modern readers as a piece of advice literature offering “better matter for life, order for war lines, policy for courtliness, wisdom for government, temperance for subjects, obedience for all states” (Barker, sig. A6v). (Unfortunately, no Persian written historical chronicle exists, although archaeology has made significant contributions, notably important artefacts such as the Cyrus Cylinder and Nabonidus Chronicle, both held at the British Museum.)

Xenophon's account is suspiciously rosy, however, and he deliberately ignored less positive material about Cyrus to be found in Book 1 of the *Histories* of his forerunner, Herodotus, the second major source of information about ancient Persia. The

salacious nature of some of the information peddled by Herodotus, ‘father of history’, later brought opprobrium from Plutarch, another important conduit of classical learning about the east for early modern English readers, and Xenophon’s remained the dominant account. After this early period, the famous wars between the Persians and Greeks narrated by Thucydides consolidated the view of Persia and Persians first presented by Xenophon and Herodotus as fierce, cruel but worthy opponents, especially in their temperate ways, and the Greek colouring of creeping Persian vices (luxury, cruelty, etc.) further extended Xenophon’s elucidation in the later books of the *Cyropaedia*.<sup>3</sup> The Roman phase of appropriating the Greek authors gave this image of a hardy, warlike nation an additional measure of respect thanks to their own enduring conflicts with the Parthians whose self-identification with the Achaemenid Persians was wholly accepted by Rome. The Persian political regime also comes in for more attention from classical Roman authors, and is given a utopian inflection by Cicero and others, a political impetus that becomes an important strand of the image of Persia in the English Renaissance, both within and beyond the confines of the mirror-for-princes tradition (see Grogan).

A second influential set of texts shaping the image of Persia in the English Renaissance was that initially centred around the Muscovy Company, and later the Levant and East India Companies, in which trade (actual and, more usually, potential) between England and Persia was the prime concern. Despite the familiarity of Persia from classical authors, the dominance of the Ottomans and Venetians in the Mediterranean, together with the “almost continuall warres betweene the Turkes, and the Persians” (Abbot, sig. C3v), and the Portuguese/Spanish control of key points of access, as well as other domestic factors, meant that a sea-route to Persia from England was dangerously risky and not seriously considered until a couple of decades into the seventeenth century. But English merchant travellers did manage to reach Persia and initiate inquiries into opportunities for trading there through the efforts of the early envoys of the Muscovy Company seeking a viable trading route to – and from – Russia. Although the north-east passage was discovered by chance rather than by design, the passport of the tsar allowed travel to the borders of Persia and encouraged merchants and envoys such as the much-lauded Anthony Jenkinson to pursue opportunities there too on behalf of the Company. The letters of Jenkinson and his fellow-merchants appeared prominently in Richard Hakluyt’s *The Principall Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation* (1589), and were celebrated by Hakluyt himself in the introduction: “which,” he demands, “of [“all the [other] nations and people of the earth”] hath euer dealt with the Emperour of Persia, as her Maiesty hath done, and obtained for her merchants large & louing priuileges?” (sig. \*2v). The English were not alone in their interest in trading with Persia; the French had broken ranks with other European countries by setting up direct trading relations with the Ottomans in 1535, and retained strong interests in the area, as did the Dutch East India Company a little later. Much later, in the seventeenth century, works by French travellers such as Jean Chardin, Francois Bernier and Jean-Baptiste Tavernier became an important source of information about contemporary Persia, information that found its way into romances in both French and English. (Building on this tradition some time later, Charles de Montesquieu’s fictional *Persian Letters* (1721) was a big hit in French and English literary circles.) Across Europe more generally, the seventeenth century saw an expansion of literary interest in Persia, and texts such as the German scholar Adam Olearius’s translation of twelfth-

century Persian poetry (*Persianisches Rosenthal* (1654), as well as Madame de Scudéry's *Le Grand Cyrus* (1649-53)) capitalised on this vogueishness.

The intimate connection that the French case shows between such travel literature about Persia and the genre of romance in particular is present, but less insistently so, in the English literary tradition. Information from travel literature tends to follow the broadly admiring tone of classical writings on Persia, and indeed many of the most apparently up-to-date atlases and histories as well as the travel writings themselves draw extensively on ancient sources such as Strabo, Pliny, Xenophon and Herodotus, as well as on Mandeville and medieval wonder literature: the unicorn and Prester John are alive and well and living not too far off in many of these texts (see, for example, Cartwright). Travellers are also careful to note the strong differences, on ethnic but especially on religious grounds, existing between the Ottomans and the Persians, and in terms that more often favour the Persians than the Ottomans. Take this representative example from the 1577 edition of Pietro Martire d'Anghiera's *The History of Trauayle in the West and East Indies*, translated and edited by Willes and Eden: "For the Sophians or Persians, folowe one maner of interpretation of Mahumettes religion, and the Turkes an other: the which interpretations neuertheless are so differyng one from the other, that the one of them esteemeth the other for heretikes. The Persians are of liberall nature, of much civilitie and curtesie, greatly esteeming artes and sciences: they acknowledge a certain worthinesse or nobilitie among men, wherein they differ much from the Turkes, which make no difference between slaues and worthier men or Gentlemen" (sig. 2U1v). The Persia described in these varied sources is by no means a fixed or uniform concept, of course, but one striking, recurring feature – especially when compared with material on the Ottomans – is the largely favourable construction of the country, its peoples, history, manners and even its religion.

Another important body of texts that helped to define and refine the image of Persia in England is the collection of works clustered around the activities of the Sherley brothers, leading to a sudden burst of new information about Persia in the early years of James's reign. These texts were produced largely in response to the contrasting returns to England of Thomas and Robert Sherley in 1607 and 1611 respectively, one as the recently-released prisoner of the Turks, the other the ambassador of the shah on a doomed diplomatic foray to unite Christian nations in alliance with Shah Abbas against the Ottomans. Although the Sherleys were unsuccessful in their ancillary bid to encourage English trade with Persia at the expense of trade with the Ottomans, and proved themselves to be somewhat of a liability both at home and abroad, some of the most interesting literary engagements with Persia arise out of their adventures and the propaganda surrounding them. Despite their unreliability, the Sherleys seem to have been relatively well-connected. King James intervened on behalf of two of the Sherley brothers when they were imprisoned on different causes in Venice and Constantinople. Thomas Middleton, temporarily strapped for cash, it seems and not a natural sympathiser, found himself translating and embellishing a pamphlet in their honour describing the visit of Robert Sherley to Cracow. The brothers were not publicity-shy, and directly undertook their own public relations as well in the form of writing narratives and commissioning portraits. Anthony published a vivid and self-exculpating *Relation of his Travels Into Persia* (1613), Thomas produced a manuscript "Discours of the Turkes" (1607) while in Constantinople just after his release, while in the 1620s, Robert and his 'Persian' wife

Teresa sat in full Persia costume for Anthony Van Dyck, who produced two extraordinary surviving portraits. Teresa Sherley was actually a Circassian Christian, and, like Robert, a convert to Catholicism, surviving her husband by many years and ending her days in the spiritual care of the Carmelites in Rome. But the stories promulgated by the texts surrounding the Sherleys, however, was keen to portray her as either a “cousin Germaine” or even the niece to the Persian Shah Abbas I. Arguably, ‘Persian’ Teresa even more so than the Sherley brothers themselves, haunts various Jacobean plays and treatises, and even Mary Wroth’s *Urania* (see Andrea, 30-52). The cluster of texts around the Sherleys is not just colourful; perhaps because of the dicey history, impolitic tendencies and ambiguous ambitions of the family, texts such as the Day, Rowley and Wilkins play, *The Travailes of the Three English Brothers* (1607), as well as Middleton’s pamphlet and even the cautious narrative of their fellow-traveller, John Cartwright, *The Preachers Travels* (1611), are highly subtle but revealing texts about English images of Persia at a critical juncture in the years between Elizabeth’s polite but expedient disinterest (given her establishment of diplomatic and commercial relations with the Ottoman Sultan Murad III in 1580) and the fruitful alliance between England and Persia to expel the Portuguese from the strategic island-port of Ormuz in 1622. The Persia that emerges from them is a land of riches, hospitality and commercial opportunity, promising liberty of conscience and a cordial welcome for aspiring Englishmen.

Along with these broad perceptions from classical and more recent commercial sources, a variety of other kinds of information about Persia came from travellers’ tales and related genres (e.g., those collected by Samuel Purchas, and the independent writings of figures such as Herbert, Blount and even the “Odd-combian legge-stretcher” (as he regularly described in himself in publications such as his *Trauellet for the English Wits* (1616)), Thomas Coryat), from diplomatic and commercial correspondence both directly and from neighbouring countries, from theological hermeneutics and polemic (including Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs*), from the great number and variety of texts dealing with the Ottomans and the perceived threat from the “Turks”, from comparative histories, ethnographies and geographies such as Giovanni-Tommaso Minadoi’s *A History of the Warres betwene the Turkes and the Persians* (translated into English by Abraham Hartwell, 1595), Johann Boemus’s *Omnium Gentium Mores, Leges etc Ritus* (1520) (translated into English as *A Fardle of Facions* (1555)) and John Speed’s *A Prospect of the Most Famous Parts of the World* (1627), as well as from an array of visual sources (costume-books, emblem books, wood-cuts, and so on). But the primacy of the classical legacy on Persia (see also Mathee) remains clear at every turn: for example, Hartwell takes at least six years to publish his translation of Minadoi’s *History* (having entered his translation in the Stationers’ Register in 1589) because he deemed its account of events of the previous century’s conflict to be incomplete without the inclusion of “certain aduertisements and collections, aswell out of the old auncient writers both sacred and prophane, that haue written of the most stately & magnificent Empire of the Medes and Persians in times past”.<sup>4</sup> Even as late as the 1670s, Jean Chardin can remark upon a strange collocation of the ancient and the modern in Asia, and particularly in Persia: “So that one may reasonably believe, That in that part of the World, the Exteriour Forms of Things (as their Manners and Customs) are the same now, as they were Two Thousand Years since, except in such Changes as may have been introduced by Religion, which are nevertheless very Inconsiderable” (sig. [C1v-[C2])<sup>5</sup> The sense of ease expressed by

Chardin, even in the face of the *not* inconsiderable religious differences perceived between Christianity and Islam (at least in the earlier part of the century), once again reveals the more positive disposition towards Persia available to Western European nations in the early modern period, a difference predicated on the wealth of information available on Persia. If I might reach grimly for the distressingly relevant words of one Donald Rumsfeld: when images of Persia are considered alongside those of the Ottoman empire (as they very often are, in this period), the question becomes one of “known unknowns” and “unknown unknowns”, with the level of threat to Western interests judged accordingly. Those (e.g., Richard Knolles) who sought to give account of the powerful Ottomans derived much fuel from their alleged obscurity of in European history – quite against the facts and scholarship already available, in fact (see Meserve). The trope of the sudden rise of the Ottomans, their obscure and (by implication) ignoble and (by polemical innuendo) barbarian origins is not something that obtains with Persia. It was the familiarity of classical Persia and its longstanding respectability and prestige for ancient Greeks and Romans that, for Europeans, gave it the less fearful status of “known unknown” within the early modern Islamic world.

Certainly, this long textual history of classical and medieval investigation and appreciation of Persia could be overwhelmed by more recent Mediterranean geopolitics and European Christian fears. But there too the old dictum that “my enemy’s enemy is my friend” sometimes proves irresistible. Anthony Nixon, probably commissioned by Sir Thomas Sherley, writing a pamphlet commemorating the Sherley brothers and their transactions with Persia still manages to sound waspishly hostile when he notes in that same pamphlet that the Persians “have heretofore beene held a people fierce and vncivill, little better than the Turkes”. But even here he gives way to the dominant narrative of latent Persian civility: “But of late they are growne very courteous, and respective unto strangers, by whose conversation they have much betred their manners & conditions” (sig. H2v). Nixon reminds us that, despite their great variety, provenance and substance, the common denominator across the many and varied attitudes towards Persia and the Persians disseminated in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was a *positive* appreciation of their difference from their neighbours – ethnic, religious, political. (As Anthony Parr has put it (slightly unsatisfactorily given his continuing reliance on the old orientalist binaries), “Persia was not so much Europe’s Other as its opposite or foil” (Parr 1996, 20).) Typically measured against the Ottoman Turks, the early modern sense of this difference is also registered against the other peoples of the East, classical or contemporary.

*The Travailes of the Three English Brothers* is a fascinating example of this. Often dismissed as “short and unremarkable” (Raiswell, in his entry on the Sherleys in the new Oxford DNB), even its Revels editor, Anthony Parr, understates its interest in deeming it “a fairly complex dramatisation of cultural encounter” (Parr, 13; for a more recent view of it, see Publicover). For one thing, it dramatises the schism within Islam – Sunni Ottoman as against Shi’a Persian – with sensitivity and interest, marking out the difference in language (e.g., frequent invocations of ‘Mortus Ali’ [Ali, the fourth Caliph of Islam and wronged first proper leader after Muhammed, for Shi’a Islam] by Persian characters), character (compare the genial, tolerant Persian ‘Sophy’ of the final scenes with the proud, bombastic Turkish sultan of the third Act), and plot (e.g., a scene showing Turkish (Muslim) captives being offered their lives in return for conversion to Shi’a

Islam). Partisan though it is, its obsessive exploration of the basis and durability of national religious identity finds voice and unexpected forms of resolution in numerous extraordinary scenes: Sir Anthony's encounter with the Pope; Sir Robert's captivation by the Sophy's niece; the niece's defence of Robert on the basis of his Christian virtues; the torturing of Sir Thomas by the Turks; Will Kemp's bravura performance in besting an Italian Harlequin, and so on. The play assiduously maintains a pivotal opposition between "Turkish tyranny" and Persian sympathy, characterising the Persian cause as a 'just warre' and heroising Englishmen who make such startling and radical statements (in the very opening scenes) as "our sinnes are all alike, why not, our God?" The play's subtle appreciation and treatment of the diversity and complexity of Islamic identity, of the imbrication of customs and religious principles, and the positive flexibility of English national and religious identity in encounters with the East are all aspects of the East to which current Ottoman-centred paradigms simply do not do justice.

Interestingly, the concerns articulated in English responses to the image of Persia sometimes look disconcertingly similar to those articulated through engagements with the Ottomans. But the image of Persia always bears closer scrutiny. For example, we find once again that the issues of empire and imperialism dominate, but the classical narrative of the ancient Persian empire brings with it a distinctly different ethical colouring than do treatments of the Ottoman empire. Similarly, the image of Persia proves more hospitable to radical gender politics than does either the Orientalist or the Ottoman-writ-large image of the 'East' (see Andrea on Persia in Wroth's *Urania*, for example). Nonetheless, Ania Loomba is right to emphasise (in another context) that "we cannot posit too absolute a divide between 'Eastern trade' and 'Western planting' or we risk obscuring the historical link between the rise of global trade networks and the establishment of European colonialism".<sup>6</sup> Early industrial espionage by English dyers (see Dimmock, 68) and ongoing attention to the Persian silk industry and to its potential in Virginia (see Hariot, Hartlib and others) are only two examples of the real currency of images of Persia in nascent English colonialism. Nor can the greater flexibility and proximity of Persia in the English political imaginary entirely override the masculinist agendas and values of its domestic and international projects.

Overtaken by a gust of enthusiasm and fervour for his task, John Speed is in full hyperbolic flow when he begins his 1627 "Description of the Kingdome of PERSIA" by declaring that "now at last [...] the name of *Persia* reacheth farther then ever" (fol. 33). But it is not, I think, an exaggeration to suggest that *now* at last the name of Persia merits much more and closer attention than it has yet enjoyed from scholars of the early modern period. Such study should help to formulate more subtle appreciation of the enduring if protean challenges of both orientalism and globalisation.

### Works Cited/Bibliography

- Abbot, George. A Brief Description of the Whole World. London: T. Judson for John Browne, 1599.
- Ahmed, Aijaz. In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures. London: Verso, 1992. 159-290.
- Andrea, Bernadette. Women and Islam in Early Modern English Literature. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.

d'Anghiera, Pietro Martire [Peter Martyr]. The History of Trauayle in the West and East Indies. Trans. and ed. Richard Eden and Richard Willes. London: Richard Jugge, 1577.

Barbour, Richmond. Before Orientalism: London's Theatre of the East, 1576-1626. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.

Birchwood, Matthew. Staging Islam in England: Drama and Culture, 1640-1685. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2007).

Blount, Sir Henry. A Voyage into the Levant. London: J. L. for Henry Crooke, 1634.

Boemus, Joannes. The Fardle of Facions. London: John Kingston and Henry Sutton, 1555.

Brancaforte, Elio Christoph. Visions of Persia: Mapping the Travels of Adam Olearius. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard UP, 2003.

Bridges, Emma, Edith Hall and PJ Rhodes, ed. Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars: Antiquity to the Third Millennium. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007.

Burton, Jonathan. Traffic and Turning: Islam and English Drama, 1579-1624. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 2005.

Cartwright, John. The Preachers Travels. London: for Thomas Thorpe, 1611.

Chardin, Jean. The Travels of S[i]r John Chardin into Persia and [th]e East Indies. London: for Moses Pitt, 1686.

Chew, Samuel. The Crescent and the Rose: Islam and England During the Renaissance. New York: Oxford UP, 1937.

Coryat, Thomas. Coryats Crudities. London: William Stansby, 1611.

------. Trauellor for the English Wits. London: W. Jaggard and Henry Fetherstone, 1616.

Day, John, William Rowley and George Wilkins. The Travailes of the Three English Brothers. London: for John Wright, 1607.

Dimmock, Matthew. New Turkes: Dramatizing Islam and the Ottomans in Early Modern England. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005.

Fuchs, Barbara. Mimesis and Empire: The New World, Islam, and European Identities. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.

Gillies, John. Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.

Grogan, Jane. "Barbarous Utopias: Xenophon's Cyropaedia in the English Renaissance." Hermathena 183 (2007; published 2009): 163-74.

Hakluyt, Richard. The Principall Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation. London: George Bishop and Ralph Newberie, 1589.

Hariot, Thomas. A Brief and True Report of the New-Found Land of Virginia. London: for R. Robinson, 1588.

Herbert, Sir Thomas. A Relation of Some Yeares Travaile. London: William Stansby, 1634.

Houston, Chloë. "'Thou glorious kingdome, thou chiefe of empires': Persia in Seventeenth-Century Travel Literature." Studies in Travel Writing 13: 2 (2009): 141-52.

Knolles, Richard. The Generall Historie of the Turkes. London: Adam Islip, 1603.

Loomba, Ania. Review of Richmond Barbour's Before Orientalism: London's Theatre of the East, 1576-1626. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003. Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History 5:3 (2004). Project Muse. 15 March 2010

<[http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal\\_of\\_colonialism\\_and\\_colonial\\_history/v005/5.3loomba.html](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_colonialism_and_colonial_history/v005/5.3loomba.html)>.

MacLean, Gerald. Looking East: English Writing and the Ottoman Empire Before 1800. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

-----, The Rise of Oriental Travel: English Visitors to the Ottoman Empire, 1580–1720. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Matar, Nabil. Islam in Britain, 1558-1685. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.

-----, Turks, Moors and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery. New York: Columbia UP, 1999.

-----, Britain and Barbary, 1589-1689. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2005.

Mathee, Rudi. "The Safavids Under Wester Eyes: Seventeenth-Century European Travelers to Iran." Journal of Early Modern History 13 (2009): 131-71.

McJannet, Linda. "Bringing in a Persian." Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England 12 (1999): 236-67.

Meserve, Margaret. Empires of Islam in Renaissance Historical Thought. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard UP, 2008.

Meshkat, Kurosh. "The Journey of Master Anthony Jenkinson to Persia, 1562-1563." Journal of Early Modern History 13 (2009): 209-28.

Minadoi, Giovanni-Tommaso. A History of the Warres betwene the Turkes and the Persians. Trans. Abraham Hartwell. London: John Wolfe, 1595.

Niayesh, Ladan. "Shakespeare's Persians." Shakespeare 4 (2008): 127-36.

Nixon, Anthony. The Three English Brothers. London: Adam Islip, 1607.

Parr, Anthony. "Foreign Relations in Jacobean England: the Sherley brothers and the 'voyage of Persia'." Travel and Drama in Shakespeare's Time. Ed. Jean-Pierre Maquerlot and Michele Willems. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. 14-31.

----- (ed.). Three Renaissance Travel Plays. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1995.

Plutarch, "De Malignitate Herodot." The Philosophy, Commonly Called the Morals by ... Plutarch. Trans. Philemon Holland. London: Arnold Hatfield, 1603.

-----, The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans. Trans. Sir Thomas North. London: Thomas Vautroullier and John Wright, 1579.

Porter, Dennis. "Orientalism and its Problems." Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader. Ed. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994. 150-161.

Publicover, Laurence. "Strangers at Home: The Sherley Brothers and Dramatic Romance." Renaissance Studies 2010: 1-16.

Purchas, Samuel. Purchas His Pilgrimage. For Henrie Fetherstone, 1613.

Sherley, Anthony. His Relation of his Travels into Persia. London: [Nicholas Okes], 1616.

Sherley, Thomas. A Discours of the Turkes. Ed. E. Denison Ross. *Camden Miscellany*, 16 (1936).

Singh, Jyotsna, ed. The Blackwell Companion to the Global Renaissance. Oxford: Blackwell, 2009.

Speed, John. A Prospect of the Most Famovs Parts of the World. London: John Dawson for George Humble, 1627.

Vitkus, Daniel. Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Xenophon. The VIII. bookes of Xenophon, containinge the institutio[n], schole, and education of Cyrus, the noble Kynge of Persye. Trans. William Barker. [London]: [Reginalde Wolfe], 1567.

---

<sup>1</sup> Here I reluctantly part ways with the important 1994 study by John Gillies, *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference*, which suggested (against the evidence offered in that very book) that Shakespeare and his contemporaries were, overall, something less than fastidious in their deployment of ethnic denominations, that Shakespeare fails to make real and meaningful distinctions between peoples outside of central Europe and instead relies primarily on the classical logic of the *oikumene* and the barbarians without.

<sup>2</sup> A recent (2009) special issue of the *Journal of Early Modern History* also features two essays (by Kurosh Meshkat and Rudi Mathee) on English and European relations with Safavid Persia. I am currently working on a monograph provisionally entitled *The Persian Empire in the Renaissance Imagination, 1548-1622*.

<sup>3</sup> For a detailed overview of Greek attitudes to Persia in the fourth century, see PJ Rhodes, 'The Impact of the Persian Wars on Classical Greece'. *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars: Antiquity to the Third Millennium*. Ed. Emma Bridges, Edith Hall and PJ Rhodes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. 31-45.

<sup>4</sup> He relates this in the epistle dedicatory to the Archbishop of Canterbury, his employer.

<sup>5</sup> This is from the English translation printed in London concurrently with the French original: *The Travels of S[i]r Iohn Chardin into Persia and [th]e East Indies*. London: for Moses Pitt, 1686.

<sup>6</sup> This comment appears in her review of Richmond Barbour's *Before Orientalism: London's Theatre of the East, 1576-1626*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.