



RESEARCH PAPER

An Orientalist Reading of *The Travailes of The Three English Brothers* by John Day, George Wilkins, and William Rowley

**Dr. Abdul Ghaffar Bhatti¹ Bushra Saeed²
Dr. Muhammad Arslan Raheem*³**

1. Associate Professor, Department of English, University of Education, Lahore, Multan, Campus, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Lecturer, Department of English, University of Education, Lahore, Multan Campus, Punjab, Pakistan
3. Assistant Professor Department of Education, University of Education, Lahore, D. G. Khan Campus, Punjab, Pakistan

DOI

[http://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2022\(6-II\)31](http://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2022(6-II)31)

PAPER INFO

ABSTRACT

Received:

February 9, 2022

Accepted:

April 28, 2022

Online:

April 30, 2022

Keywords:

Binaries
Cultural superiority,
Eurocentric
perspectives,
Orientalism,
Representation

***Corresponding
Author**

drarslanraheem@
ue.edu.pk

This article investigates the representation of the Oriental characters, particularly the Persians in John Day, George Wilkins, and William Rowley's joint play *The Travailes of the Three English Brothers* (1607). The study explores how the writers have attempted to establish and assert the western cultural superiority and soundness of Christianity in the play in contrast to the Oriental culture and Muslims. While employing Edward Said's views in *Orientalism*, the researchers attempt to deconstruct the three playwrights' Eurocentric perspectives under which influence they have misrepresented the Orient and Oriental characters. It unveils textual contradictions and inconsistencies cloaked under the verbal rhetoric and which usually go unnoticed by a naïve reader. Due to their Eurocentric perspectives, the playwrights have depicted the positive and noble images of the English characters while demonized the Persian Muslim characters which explicitly indicates their biased and prejudiced attitudes towards the Orient in general and the Persian Muslims in particular. These opposite poles of values form what Said terms as binaries in his Orientalism.

Introduction

The term Orientalism was in vogue before Edward Said popularized it by publishing his seminal work *Orientalism* (1978) which has been reprinted many times. Throughout this article, the researchers have cited the edition of *Orientalism* that was printed in 2003. Traditionally, the term had apolitical connotations and referred to the study of Eastern countries' languages, literature, philology, culture, and history. Said imparted political meanings to it and now it means "cultural imperialism using the control of discourse not only in the Orient but anywhere in the world" (Abrams & Harpham, 2015, p. 306). This discourse helped the West create the Orient of their own and thereby hegemonize the Orient. While analyzing the varied discursive practices of the early modern English period, Said deconstructs the Eurocentric perspectives of the Western authors and argues that they have misrepresented the Orient because of their

vested interests. While employing the literary discourse of drama, Day, Rowley and Wilkin has created a rich and colorful but biased image of the Orient in their joint play *The Travails of the Three English Brothers*.

Literature Review

The West-East cultural contact has never been straightforward or homogeneous. Due to social, theological, ideological and cultural differences, one could detect complexities and irregularity in the connections between Eastern and Western. In this sense, the early modern era of English literature keeps significant historical, religious and cultural importance. However, the Christians are divided into Protestants and Catholics because of Martin Luther's initiative. Catholics adhere to the Pope of the Church of Rome, but Protestants consider the Bible the final authority, rather than Pope or priests. As with several other Protestant nations, the Widow England attempted to liberate [herself] from the wild boar of Rome. Yet, during the period of Queen Elizabeth who held the combined status of Head of State and Supreme Governor of the Church of England, England strengthened her state religion (Sanders, 2000, pp. 104-105). These theological tensions fueled hatred between Catholic Spain and Protestant England in particular.

Likewise, theological "strife in Islam resulted in the split of Muslims into Shiite Muslims in Persia and Sunni Muslims in the Ottoman Empire throughout the sixteenth century. The Shiites of Persia follow the Holy Prophet Muhammad (P.B.U.H.) and Mortus Ali and believe that Abubakar, Umar, and Usman, the first three caliphs, deposed Ali" (Baron, 1642, pp. 187-188). On the other hand, Turks (followers of Sunni) adhere to the Prophet Muhammad (P.B.U.H.) and all 4 Caliphs completely. Mortus Ali, according to the Persian Shiites, was the Prophet Muhammad's proper successor. "...he professeth a kind of holinesse and claims to be descended from the blood of Mahomet and Murtezalli: and although these Persians are Muhometans, as the Turks and Tartars are, they honour this false fained Murtezalli..." writes Richard Hakluyt (1903), "quoting Anthony Jenkinson's views on Shah Thmasp of Persia and the Persian version of Islam" (Ibid., p. 170). Because of their opposed perspectives, the Turks and the Persians despised one another and engaged in deadly confrontations. For previously discussed reasons in Chapter Four of this study, the English were well aware of the sectarian tensions that existed between the Persian and Turkish peoples and wished to take advantage of them for political and economic benefit. According to an Iranian researcher, if the Persians and Turks went to war, it would benefit the Europeans because "Persia will serve as a buffer against Ottoman threats to Europe" (Farahmandfar, 2016, p. 145).

Thus, in this environment, England utilized "the age-old colonial tactic of 'divide and rule' to inflame these sectarian differences" (ibid). "If England had a religious rivalry with Spain, she was also seriously disturbed due to the increasing conquests of the Ottoman Turks to whom Richard Knolles, an English historian, calls the present terror of the world and there was a constant threat that the Turks might invade England" (Knolles, 1603, p. 1). Although Persian was a Muslim nation, they were less aggressive than the Ottomans Turk and presented no danger to England. In this situation, England perceived a critical need of a diplomatic and army ally, although opposed to the strength of Spain, and on the other side, to fight the expanding danger of the Ottoman Turks. "As a Protestant country at the border of a largely Catholic Europe, England would welcome any ally to maintain its position within a

hostile Christian world..." (Stephen Schmuck, 2005, p. 4). Because of the expanding military victories Ottoman Empire, all European nations faced danger from the Turks in the early nineteenth century. Because of the Ottoman invasions, the English were plagued by anxieties of conversion, piracy, and the vulnerability of maritime commerce routes, among other things. They were exploring various solutions and possibilities to accomplish their goal.

Due to doctrinal differences and the resulting hostility between the Turk Ottomans and Persian Safavids, the English preferred the Persian-Christian alliance against the Ottomans. The English anticipated that Persian Sophy, i.e. Shah Abbas, would form a political and military alliance with them, assisting them in fighting the Ottoman Empire, safeguarding their sea routes, and bolstering the English economy. Additionally, via their writings and experiences, several English explorers, historians, and novelists built a gentler and more attractive image of the great Sophy. As Anthony Nixon notes in his biography of Robert Sherley, the Sophy "pays such meticulous attention [to Christianity] [...] that he [Robert] has no doubts [...] that he [The Sophy] would eventually be converted to Christianity." p. 180, 1903). (1903, Hakluyt, p. 180). Manwaring (1933) echoed a similar attitude, believing that Sophy "was almost a Christian in her heart" (p. 208). On the other hand, these beliefs were based on mythology, such as the story of John Prester. Cartwright (1611) accurately notes that the notion of Sophy as a Christian convert was "better suited to a stage, to be marvelled at by the common people, than to any man's private study" at the time (pp. 70-71). The drama *The Travailes of the Three English Brothers* has been created and produced in context of these socio-religious and political realities.

Material and Methods

The researchers have analyzed the three playwrights' joint play *The Travailes of the Three English Brothers* (1607) in the perspective of Said's Orientalism. The descriptive textual analysis method has been used that comes under the domain of qualitative research. While employing Said's views in *Orientalism*, the researchers have investigated the key concepts like representation of the Oriental characters, binaries and playwrights' Eurocentric perspectives. In *Orientalism*, Edward Said (2003) claims that Western writers have been misrepresenting the Orient for many years, if not millennia. Their ideas have been skewed and prejudiced when it comes to the Orient. These are what the literature refers to as Eurocentric perspectives. Said underlines the need to dismantle these Eurocentric ideas that have persisted for a long time in Western literature. Abdul Rehman M Ridha (1974) makes an accurate observation when he notes, "The majority of these ideas originated mostly from medieval stories, notably the claim that Islam was a distortion of ancient Greek religious traditions" (p. 30). Aeschylus did it in *The Persians*, Tuold did it in *The Song of Roland*, and Dante did it in *The Divine Comedy*, and Day, Rowley, and Wilkins have done it in this production of *The Song of Roland*. This has been part of the Western purpose of establishing their supremacy over the Eastern world and the Eastern world's inferiority to the Western world. The Western world achieved cultural hegemony by letting go of their sense of superiority. As Said (2003) points out, "the notion of European identity as superior to all other non-European peoples and cultures" has been "the main component" (p. 7) of the growth of European cultural hegemony since the Renaissance. They have accomplished this objective via a range of discursive strategies, including appropriation and the projection of negative images of the Orient. For this reason, Jonathon Burton (2009) asserts that the play constitutes a significant chapter in the epic

saga of the founding of the British Empire. He presents a wealth of information in his statements, noting, "If early modern English literature creates an imperial rhetoric, appropriation is the defining mode of that rhetoric" (p. 40). When we deconstruct the play's Eurocentric perspectives, we can see how apparent the three dramatists have appropriated the material.

Results and Discussion

The play is a fictionalized depiction of events, not a genuine narrative. As the play progresses, the Persian Sophy returns triumphant from a war against the Turks. The Governor of Casbin notifies the Sophy of the three English brothers' arrival at the Persian court. Additionally, he tells Anthony that he has described to the Sophy "Your circumstance, your habit, your charming manner, / And as well as my feeble oratory may repeat" (*ibid.*, 1.11-12, p. 46). All of this idolatry and adoration for a total stranger during a first meeting is surprising and overpowering. This is a case of "appropriation," as Burton refers to it. It will be straightforward to detect further instances of this kind with a more in-depth deconstructive reading of the play. According to Peter Barry's (1999) work, once the deconstructive process begins, the text is shown to be "fractured and contradictory," as well as "symptomatic of a greater cultural and linguistic malaise" (pp. 76-77).

Additionally, the Sherleys' non-English narratives refute the assumption that they were subjected to excessive process. Additionally, the Sophy's response is startling, since the Sophy abstains from the traditional and ceremonial foot kissing and instead refers to Anthony Sherley as "courteous" (Ridha, 1974, 1.33, p. 47). The Sophy then illustrates how Persian conflicts are fought, with Persian troops "approaching with their heads on their swords" (*ibid.*, 1.p.48). Following that, Anthony Sherley and his brothers exhibit the Christian manner of battle, including the fact that they do not murder their opponents but rather imprison them, which surprises Sophy. When Sophy inquires about Anthony Sherley's opinions on the subject, he says that our difficulties are distinct from yours. They only imprison their opponents in order to display their compassion, kindness, and tolerance during their battles. The Sophy is astounded by this demonstration of Christian valor that he proclaims, "Until today, we had never heard of honor" (*ibid.*, 1.111, p. 51). He continues, "we respect thee: thy wars are royall" (*ibid.*, 1.89, p. 50). As a consequence, Sir Anthony's promises of Christian compassion and charity seem to be contradicted when he discloses to the Sophy that they may slaughter people, smash towns to the level of their pavements, and destroy skyscrapers and ships on the seas with "engines of greater strength," i.e. cannons (*ibid.*, 1.112, p. 51). Ladan Niayesh (2008) believes that "Western domination now expresses itself as a cannon, which Sophy seems to witness for the first time," leading him to "adore both the object of devotion and the man who controls and governs it, Sir Anthony" (p. 131). "I'm like a person who has been kidnapped," Sophy says of his obsession with the cannon display. The Persian Sophy reduces himself to the point of saying:

"But God or Christian, or what ere he be,

I wish to be no other but as he" (Ridha, 1974, 1.78-79, p. 50).

Again, Anthony Sherley's adoration and devotion come as a surprise and are based on exaggerated claims. In particular, the final statement is notable since it states: "I aspire to be no other than him" (*ibid.*, 1.79, p. 50). To erase her own personal, cultural,

and national identities while accepting another's identity is absolutely irrational and foolish on the part of Sophy. Particularly noteworthy when one considers the fact that Persia was one of the most important Muslim nations of the time period. As a result, it is incredibly counterintuitive that the most powerful person on the planet, such as a king, would demand something like this. As a result, the three authors have painted the Persian Sophy as disdainful of his own culture and eager to accept and adopt a foreign identity, which they believe is exaggerated and inappropriate. This is evident throughout the play, and it reaches its "zenith at the play's conclusion, when the Persian Sophy first opposes and then consents to the marriage of Robert Sherley and his Niece, the establishment of a Church in Persia, and the christening of Robert and his Niece's new born infant. Robert and his Niece's new born infant is christened at the end of the play" (ibid, 16. 170-200, pp. 133-134). Shakespeare's playwrights have cemented England's religious and cultural preeminence through all of their attempts.

The title of the play, *The Travails of the Three English Brothers*, makes sense in this context. The play is set in the English countryside. Additionally, it might be a reference to the *travailes*, i.e., the efforts of the three playwrights Day, Rowley, and Wilkins, who have gone to great lengths to develop and memorialize the three brothers' heroic exploits in the production. In reality, the situation was rather different. For starters, the three brothers' quest was unofficial in the outset. It was either pushed by the Earl of Essex or motivated by personal fame and money of the participants. Secondly, the three brothers were known as renegade Englishmen and traitorous state workers when they were younger (Chew, 1937, p. 338). They gained their reputation as a consequence of their unauthorized mission, conversion from Protestantism to Catholicism, obscene behaviour and activities, and allegiance to rulers of countries other than England, all of which were outside the laws of England. Mr. Nixon refers to the three brothers as "three heroes of our time," but he also expresses regret that "we used them unkindly, turning them into outsiders here in the United States of America" (Casellas, 2013, p. 36). He makes a really hilarious observation, which provides valuable insight into the three brothers' true characters. As a result, the Sherleys' travel excursions do not qualify as true travels. Instead, they are linguistic adventures, in which the three writers use the Sherleys' eloquence and oratory to create a dream world in which they may all live happily ever after. It captures the attention of the Sophy, who expresses her admiration for Anthony Sherley with the following words:

"Let me feast upon thy tongue, I delight

To heare thee speake" (Ridha, 1974, 1.157-158, p. 53).

As a result, playwrights created pictures of the Orient and Oriental characters and depictions of contemporary reality, using linguistic rhetoric. According to Anthony Parr (1996), the British Imperial concept may have been a deliberate attempt to project and promote "an embryonic form" of "the British Imperial idea" (p. 30). The playwrights have done everything possible to obscure and gloss over the political ideology expressed in the text. Nonetheless, when read in contrast to itself, the book reveals the ideology's weaknesses and chasms. The Persian Sophy gets entranced by Anthony Sherley's oratory and confesses the following to him:

"Those tongues do imitate the voice of heaven" (Ridha, 1974, 1.123, p. 52).

And

"If thou hast God-head, and disguis'd art come

To teach us unknown rudiments of war" (ibid, 1.126-127).

Due to Anthony's oratory, the Sophy first appoints him General of the Persian army and then deputizes him as "Lord Ambassador" (ibid., 2.267), together with Duke Hallibeck, to convince other Christian kingdoms to join them in an alliance against the Ottoman Empire. Additionally, the Sophy appoints Robert Sherley as General of his army in the absence of Anthony Sherley, who previously held the role. It is implausible to suppose that any of these scenarios is possible. What power does a monarch have to appoint a foreigner to such positions of prominence? To be more explicit, the playwrights portrayed the Sherleys as heroes capable of combat and diplomacy and capable of a broad variety of jobs, thereby asserting and maintaining their own cultural superiority and awe. On the other hand, reality is rather different. According to a number of contemporary critics, including E. Dennison Ross (1933), Samuel Chew (1937), and Jonathan Burton (2009), "Sir Anthony was an inveterate and unscrupulous instigator, a sententious hypocrite devoid of genuine sentiment and incapable of unwavering devotion to any person or cause" (p. 26).

The play's protagonist, Anthony Sherley does not believe in the effusive adulation bestowed upon him by the Sophy throughout the play. He is astounded and taken aback, and he desires the Sophy:

"Oh, let your princely thoughts descend so low,

As my beings worth, think me as I am:

No stranger are the deedes I show to you

Then yours to me" ... (Ridha, 1974, 1.129-132, p. 52).

The difference is striking and reflects Said's concept of binary oppositions, as Sophy exaggerates and idealizes, while Anthony portrays Anthony realistically and pragmatically. Consequently, the authors are instilling in the audience the belief that Easterners are emotionally volatile, irrational, and illogical. Westerners, on the other hand, are realistic and practical.

Orientalist discourse, as shown by Said (2003), is filled with binary differences or "difference[s] between East and West" (p. 2). This is the vocabulary that Western experts and writers have used to describe the Orient and its people.. This discourse asserts that the "Oriental is irrational, depraved (fallen), immature, and 'strange,' whilst the European, on the other hand, is rational, mature, and 'normal'" (ibid, p. 40). It is clear that Said's argument is backed not just by the depiction of the Persian Sophy described above, but also by the representation of other Oriental characters in the play, which will be discussed individually in the ensuing discussion. According to the three writers, the Turks are savage, barbarians, and the personification of evil, whilst the English characters are shown as Christians who are educated, erudite, and pious, in contrast to the Turkish characters. A battle between Anthony's Persian army and the Turk army makes this abundantly evident to him. With religious connotations, the authors have imbued this battle with meaning. This fight aims to "purge the evil from among the righteous" (Ridha, 1974, 2. p. 64). All Christians are "virtuous men," but all Turks are "demons," according to the Bible (ibid, p. 58). As leader and participant in this crusade against the Turks, who have been called "Christ's opponents" (ibid, page

59) as well as "pagans" and "devils" (ibid, page 58), Anthony will be cheered on by his fellow Christians as they defeat the pagans (ibid, p. 58). Dramatists often use these types of binaries to promote and declare their own religious and cultural superiority.

Female characters that are "typically Oriental" are more prone to the authors' biased and prejudiced attitude toward oriental characters (Said, 2003, p. 6). The authors portray Sophy's Niece and her maid Dalibra as sexual monsters, which is not fully truthful. When Niece inquires about the Sherleys, Dalibra reacts in a way inconsistent with the royal ladies' usual responsibilities:

"Dalibra: I think Madam, if they be as pleasant in tast, as
they are fayre to the eye, they are a dish worth eating.

Niece: A Caniball Dalibra, wouldst eat men.

Dalibra: Why not Madam; fine men cannot be choose but bee fine meate.

Niece: I, but they are filling meat" (Ridha, 1974, 3.5, p. 69).

The exchanges between Niece and her maid Dalibra do not correctly portray the authentic roles of a royal lady and her maid. The Niece's respect for the Sherleys and her uncle the Sophy lead to her developing affections for and the potential of dating the young Robert Sherley, an American residing in Iran. She even rejects the affections of the Persian Duke Hallibeck in order to save Robert's reputation.

When the Niece and her maid, Dalibra, discuss the Sherleys, Robert Sherley comes and is warmly received and accepted by the Niece as "a goodly personage, / Composed of such rich perfection" (ibid, 3.63-64, p. 71). The Niece extends her hands to be kissed by him as a sign of respect and thanks for the Sherleys' services to the people of Persia. The conversations between the Niece and Robert contribute to the further elucidation of the Niece's genuine nature. Robert refuses to go despite his Niece's entreaties, adding, "I am incapable" (ibid, 3.77-78, p. 72). The material presented here and following discussions demonstrate that the Niece is emotional, assertive, and makes an effort to court Robert Sherley. Robert, on the other hand, is composed, poised, and talks with self-control:

"I am high enough, the Shirlies humble ayme,

Is not high Maiesty, but honour'd Fame" (ibid, 3.85-86, p. 72).

When the Niece praises the Sherleys, he exclaims for the second time, "You ouerprize us madame..." (3.97, p. 73 of the aforementioned book). Given the Niece's confidence and charming attitude, Robert must create the illusion that her uncle, the Persian Sophy, "Expects my aid" (ibid, 3.108, p. 73), in order to escape her and preserve himself. As a consequence, the whole romantic encounter serves as proof of Eastern women's stereotypical image. According to Abdul Rahman M. Ridha (1974), the writers incorporated this scenario into the play to underline "the soundness of Christianity in compared to Persian religious ceremonies" (p.20). Ridha feels that the episode involving Zariph, the Jewish moneylender, "highlight[s] the excellent features of Christianity as shown by the upright devout Sir Anthony in contrast to the dishonest and materialistic tendencies of both Zariph, the Jew, and Hallibeck, the Muslim" (ibid, pp. 21-22). Playwrights have sought to establish their cultural hegemony on the public

imagination via incidents and circumstances such as these. Hegemony, or more precisely, "... cultural hegemony at work," confers "durability and force" to Orientalism (Said, 2003, p. 7) and eventually adds to the West's domination over the East.

Other Persian characters serve to bolster the notion that the Eastern are passionate, illogical, and irrational in their actions and thoughts. They are two Persian dukes, but they are depicted in the story as criminals and miscreants by Hallibeck and Callimath. Asides and one- or two-line quick dialogues have largely contributed to the development of their own identities. My demonstration of the two Persian dukes' unflattering portrayal will be limited to no more than two or three occasions in total. When Sir Anthony shows to the Persian Sophy how the English use the cannon, the Sophy expresses his appreciation for Sir Anthony's efforts. Anthony Sherley's advancement has caused Hallibeck to become jealous. He mutters to himself while passing, consumed by the torment of jealousy:

"Hallibeck: [Aside] Sure 'tis a Devil, and Ime tormented

To see him grac'd thus" (Ridha, 1974, 1.119-120, p. 52).

Similarly, when the Sophy hails Sir Anthony as the Persian "General against the Turks" (ibid., 1.153, p. 53), Callimath and Hallibeck's asides emphasize the negative qualities of their respective personalities:

"Callimath: [Aside to Hallibeck] Hee'll make him his heyre next.

Hallibeck: [Aside to Callimath] I'll lose my head first" (ibid, 1.154-155, p. 53).

By downplaying their roles as evil doers and schemers, the authors' method demonizes and expertly disempowers these two dukes on stage, effectively erasing their presence from the stage. Throughout the course of the conversation, their terrible qualities, which include jealousy, dishonesty, evil purpose, selfishness, and venom, are revealed. As Said (2003) points out in *Orientalism*, all of these characteristics are accurate: "Orientals are chronic liars, they are slow and suspicious, and they reject in everything the Anglo-Saxon race's clarity, directness, and grandeur" (p. 39). The writers emphasize the Dukes' negative tendencies in sequences in which both Dukes appear together, most notably in the passages in which Hallibeck travels to Europe with Anthony Sherley in an attempt to persuade the European Kings to join a massive coalition against the Ottoman Empire, which is a plot device used by the writers to make the Dukes look bad. The Turks seem to be marginalized to the greatest extent possible in the play's representation of them. However, despite the fact that the Ottoman Empire is depicted as a global superpower, the authors only include a handful of Turk characters in their story. All male characters in the film, including the great Turk, Basha, Jailor, Turk prisoners, and the Turk army, are given no names or identities and are depicted as devils, despite the absence of a female Turk character. The Persian and Turkish characters have not been developed in a logical and convincing manner by the dramaturges; by introducing the Turks as nameless, evil characters and reducing their stage presence, the writers have marginalized and deculturalized their respective peoples. In the words of S. Schulting, S. Muller, and R. Hertel (2012), the play "dehumanizes, if not dehumanizes, the Turks by portraying them as a community that speaks, fights, and even dies in unison..." In doing so, the Ottomans have rendered the superpower completely defenseless, which is a magnificent achievement. This is nearly identical to the Turk play, with the exception that there are no Turks (pp. 142-143). The

Oriental characters have been demonized by the authors, while the English characters have been elevated. They eulogize and rhapsodize the character of Thomas Sherley, as evidenced by the following passage:

"Shirlye a Christian and a Gentleman,

A Pilgrim souldier, and an Englishman" (Ridha, 1974, 7.54-55, p. 81).

The dramatists' use of all superlative adjectives for the Sherleys and all disparaging and negative terms for the two Dukes is especially striking.... The Sherley brothers exemplify these characteristics: they are heroic, noble, virtuous, skilled, calm, and collected; yet, the two dukes are envious, greedy, evil doers, and liars, while the Sherley brothers exemplify the polar opposite of these traits. The gentleman and Christian "Pilgrim Souldier" refers to himself as a "Pilgrim of Riches," referring to himself as a globe-trotting pilgrim of riches. Thomas Sherley's genuine intentions are revealed once again via a deconstructive interpretation of the book. He used the lyrics "At my returne wee le combat to gain Gould" to entice his troops and sailors back to the battlefield in preparation for an assault on a Turkish-controlled town (ibid, 9.41, p. 85). His disciples and sailors fled despite their temptations rather than risk their lives by remaining with him. This guy is not a pilgrim soldier, but a liar and a con artist who has fled his own nation in search of money and fortune. He is a fortune hunter, insatiably hungry for riches and notoriety, and he will go to any length to get them. The Sherleys' and playwrights' phrasing leads the reader to believe that the events are not as they seem on the surface of the page. The play's prologue (ibid, p. 44) and epilogue (ibid, 17.1, p. 135) also provide substantial insight into the Sherley family's fundamental motivations. They came to Persia in search of fame, celebrity, and wealth, not for noble or patriotic reasons, and they have no intention of returning.

The topic of conversion from Islam to Christianity is a key motif in the playwrights' works, which displays their Eurocentric beliefs. Throughout the play, the writers do a good job of concealing this issue. The movement throughout the play shows this concept. This theme has been incorporated into the play in a variety of ways during the course of the performance. As previously said, the Persians are shown to cherish, respect, and accept Christian culture and Christianity from the play's inception. Later in the book, this theme is expanded upon via the use of binaries and contrasts between the soundness of Christianity and the denigration of Persian Muslim culture. At the climax, we watch Robert Sherley marry his Niece and approve the construction of a church in Persia and the performance and celebration of Robert and the Niece's newborn babe's baptism. The second part of the film delves more into the concept of conversion. In other words, Persia is shifting away from its Shi'a Muslim faith and culture and toward the Western world's Christian religion and civilization. Thus, from a Eurocentric perspective, the romantic episode between Robert Sherley and Niece, as well as their subsequent marriage, serve as a symbolic representation of the two significant binaries in which the West is portrayed as masculine, dominant, and powerful, while the East is portrayed as feminine, weak, and emotional. After all, Ladan Niayesh (2008) claims that by the play's climax, "a feminine Persia seems to be symbolically conquered and held by the Christian West, to which Robert Sherley belongs" (p. 132). As a consequence, the play culminates with the conquest of a Western knight who ultimately wins the hand of an Eastern royal lady. It makes no difference whether the play is referred to as "nascent English colonialism," with the English traders' sights set on the Persian silk industry (Grogan, 2010, p. 919), or "England's

nascent imperial ambitions" (Hutchings, 2015, p. 44), the play unambiguously registers pre-imperial discourse, also known as "the Renaissance imperialist discourse" (Bartels, 1993, p. Xiv). This brings up the question of whether all of this happened historically and lawfully. Definitely not. All of this is contradicted by historical evidence. Without a doubt, the Persian Sophy was kind and accommodating to the Christians who entered her dominion. However, the writers' characterization of him in the play does not accurately represent reality. Despite the Persian Sophy's generosity and hospitality, both Anthony Parr and Ladan Niayesh see him as the polar opposite of Christian qualities. Parr (1995) refers to him as "a kind of enlightened pagan" (p. 11), whereas Ladan Niayesh (2008) calls him "the enlightened despot" (p. 2). (Section 132). Similarly, Teresa Sampsonia, a Christian lady who resided in the same home as Sophy's Niece, was not a related. Bernadette Andrea (2005) and Jane Grogan (2010), among others, affirm this. Teresa Sherley, like Robert, was a Circassian Christian who converted to Catholicism, according to Jane Grogan (2010), who declares definitely that "Teresa Sherley was actually a Circassian Christian" (p. 916). With proper regard for the period's cultural, political, and ideological imperatives, the playwrights manufactured facts while skillfully and convincingly executing this "act of cultural legerdemain" via an imperial language of plundered material from other cultures (Burton, 2009, p. 39).

Conclusion

The Travails of the Three English Brothers is a collaborative work of John Day, William Rowley, and George Wilkins. An Orientalist interpretation of the play reveals that the dramatists have intentionally occluded some parts of reality. Whether they did so to satisfy an English public that desired to see things in this light, or as a part of the wider English project's propaganda, whatever the reasons, the drama reflects the early modern English dramatists' biased approach to the representation of the Oriental characters. The researchers' conclusion that the three writers have not faithfully delineated the Orient and Oriental characters in order to establish their cultural and religious superiority gets verified when the play is examined in light of Said's views in his famous work *Orientalism*.

References

- Abrams, M. H., & Harpham, G. G. (2015). *A Glossary of Literary Terms* (10th International ed). The United Kingdom: Wadsworth–Cengage Learning.
- Baron. R. (1642). *Mirza a tragedie, really acted in Persia, in the last age: illustrated with historical annotations*. Michigan: university of Michigan, Digital Library Production Service 2011December (TCP phase2).
- Barry, P. (1999). *Beginning theory: An introduction to literary and cultural theory*. Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press.
- Burton, J. (2009). The Shah's Two Ambassadors: The Travels of the Three English Brothers and the Global Early Modern. In Charry, Brinda, and Gitanjali Shahani, eds. *Emissaries in early modern literature and culture: mediation, transmission, traffic, 1550-1700*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.
- Cartwright, J. (1977). *The Preachers Travels*. No. 858. *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum*.
- Chew, S. C. (1937). *The crescent and the rose: Islam and England during the Renaissance*. Oxford University Press.
- Cuddon, J. A. (2013). *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. Chichester.
- Day, J., Rowley, W., & Wilkins, G. (1973). *The Travailes of the Three English Brothers*. 1607. Ed. Rida Abdul Rehman Muhammad. *A Critical Edition of John Day, William Rowley and George Wilkin's play The Travails of the Three English Brothers*. The University of Nebraska_ Lincoln Ph.D., Language and Literature.
- Denison R. E. (1933). *Sir Anthony Sherley and His Persian Adventure*. London: Rutledge.
- Farahmandfar, M. (2016). *Against their forren foe that commes from farre: Shakespeare and Orientalized Persia*. *Postcolonial Interventions*, volume.1. Issue.2.
- Hakluyt, R. (1903). *The principal navigations, voyages, traffiques & discoveries of the English nation: made by sea or over-land to the remote and farthest distant quarters of the earth at any time within the compasse of these 1600 yeeres*. No. 1. J. MacLehose and Sons.
- Hutchings, M. (2015). *Staging The Shirleys' Travels*". *Cahiers Elisabethans* Volume 87 (Spring 2015), Manchester University Press.
- Knolles, R. (1603) *The Generall Historie of the Turkes from the first beginning of that nation to the rising of the Othoman familie. Together with the Lives and Conquests of the Othoman Kings and Emperours*, Adam, London
- López-Peláez Casellas, J. (2013). *Strangers at home: The Textual Construction of the Sherley Brothers*. *SEDERI Yearbook*, (23).
- Masood, H. A. (2012). *From Cyrus to Abbas: Staging Persia in Early Modern England* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Sussex).
- Matar, N. (1999) *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the age of discovery*. Columbia University Press.
- Niayesh, L. (2008). *Shakespeare's Persians*. *Shakespeare* 4. 127-136. Taylor & Francis.

- Nixon, A. (1970). *The Three English Brothers (1607). Facsimile, rpt.* Theatrum Orbis Terrarum Ltd. Amsterdam.
- Owens, M. E. (2005). *Stages of Dismemberment: The Fragmented Body in Late Medieval and Early Modern Drama.* University of Delaware Press.
- Parr, A. (1995). *Introduction to Three Renaissance Travel Plays.* Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press: 246-47.
- Parr, A. (1996). Foreign Relations in Jacobean England: The Sherley Brothers and the 'Voyage of Persia.'" *Travel and Drama in Shakespeare's Time* 278. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Said, E. W. (2003). *Orientalism: Western conceptions of the Orient.* Penguin Books Limited.
- Sanders, A. (2000). *The Short Oxford history of English Literature.* United States: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Schmuck, S. (2005). From Sermon to Play: Literary Representations of 'Turks' in Renaissance England 1550–1625. *Literature Compass* 2.1. Wiley Online Library.
- Schülting, S., Müller, S. L., & Hertel, R. (Eds.). (2016). *Early Modern Encounters with the Islamic East: performing cultures.* Routledge.
- Singh, J. G. (Ed.). (2009). *A Companion to the Global Renaissance: English literature and culture in the era of expansion* (Vol. 106). John Wiley & Sons.