

Ottoman Visions of the West (15th-17th Centuries)

by
Arda Eksigil
History and Classical Studies,
McGill University, Montreal

December 2014

A Thesis
Submitted to McGill University,
in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of
Master of Arts

© Arda Eksigil, 2014

Abstract

This study is a preliminary attempt to chart out the manifold ways Ottomans envisioned and imagined the Euro-Christian world during early modern times. Through the study of a selection of various sources ranging from pseudo-historiographic warrior epics to lyric poetry, the main objective will be to expose the multivocality and ambivalence of Ottoman texts dealing – exclusively or partially - with the Western cosmos. By a careful analysis of the narratological structure of specific Ottoman works, the degree to which Euro-Christians had permeated the minds (and souls) of Ottoman-Muslims will be evaluated. The examination of recurrent stock images, stereotypes, and depictions of Euro-Christians will hint at the ways Ottomans constructed and articulated a discourse of alterity based on the juxtaposition of a (pure and ideal) Self against a (reprehensible and threatening) Other. Simultaneously, instances where these seemingly unflinching and fixed boundaries were questioned, challenged, or overlooked will be located and contextualized. All in all, the aim will be to open a vista to the complex and colorful representational world of early modern Ottomans.

Résumé

Ce mémoire a pour but d'effectuer une étude préliminaire destiné a tracer et dévoiler les différentes visions et perceptions que les Ottomans ont pu avoir des Euro-Chrétiens durant l'époque pré-moderne. À partir d'une analyse basée sur une multitude de sources allant des épiques de guerres pseudo-historiographiques jusqu'à la poésie lyrique, l'objectif principale sera d'exposer la multivocalité et l'ambivalence des textes Ottomans couvrant – exclusivement ou partiellement – le cosmos Occidental. Une analyse minutieuse de la structure narratologique de ces textes nous permettra d'évaluer l'étendue de la pénétration Euro-Chrétienne dans les mentalités Ottomanes. L'examen de thèmes, images et stéréotypes récurrents qui contribuèrent à la construction et a l'articulation d'un discours d'altérité feront part de la formulation d'une vision dichotomique entre un Soi idéal et pur, opposé à un Autre, hostile et menaçant. Toutefois, on tentera également de montrer que ce contraste, radical et absolu en apparence, sera constamment questionnée et remis en doute par les Ottomans même. L'objectif principal sera donc d'ouvrir une nouvelle perspective sur la versalité des visions Ottomanes de l'ère pré-moderne.

Leyla'ya

To Leyla

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Introduction: Modern Visions of Ottoman Visions.....	1
Chapter One: Making Sense of the <i>Frengistan</i>	15
I) A Historical Outline.....	15
II) Domesticating the <i>Frengistan</i>	19
III) A Shady <i>Christian</i> Land.....	37
IV) “Divide and Contain”.....	54
Chapter Two: Ill-Mannered Hat-Wearers: Ottoman Depictions of <i>Frankishness</i>	63
I) A Brief Reassessment.....	63
II) <i>Allah</i> vs. <i>The Light of Fire</i>	65
III) Black-Clothed Wine-Drinkers; Hat-Wearing Pork-Eaters.....	74
IV) The Weakest Link: Frankish Women.....	80
V) A Tentative Conclusion: A <i>Frankish</i> Pestilence?.....	88
Chapter Three: A Shared Destiny: Ottoman-Frankish Confrontation, Friendship, and Love.....	92
I) Flexible and Durable Identities.....	92
II) The Wise Frank.....	96
III) Ottoman-Frankish <i>Amicizia</i>	105
IV) Ottoman Sentimentalism: The “Frankish Beloved” in Galata and Beyond.....	119
An Inconclusive Conclusion: Ottoman <i>Occidentalism</i> ?.....	135
Bibliography.....	142

Acknowledgments

My interest in human perceptions, visions, and imageries of distant and foreign lands was initially fostered by a discussion with an anonymous taxi driver in Istanbul who, upon hearing that I was living in Canada, asked me if Canadian roads were actually heated from underground. Although I was sorry I could not confirm the apocryphal legend, I still wish to thank him here for his inspiring query.

I should mention the names of Pierre Bonnechère, Christian Raschle, and Allan Greer for initiating me to the intricacies and hardships of historiography. Many thanks to Nancy Partner who, by (delicately) confronting me with the Linguistic Turn and the work of Hayden White, made me realize what I was doing when I thought I was writing *History*.

I would like to specifically thank my supervisor Paula C. Clarke for her patience. Her kindness and attention to my endless intellectual tribulations, as well as her support all throughout the redaction process have permitted me to reach my final goal with confidence.

I also wish to express my utmost gratitude to the late Neoklis Sarris as well as to Nikos Raptopoulos, Selim Kuru, Evangelia Balta, George Dedes, and Güven Güzeldere for their constant encouragement and assistance. Nights filled with discussions on Ottoman poetry, mumblings of rembetiko songs, and heated debates on the despicable state of Turkish soccer will never be forgotten.

I also wish to salute all my friends who have calmly waited for me to finish “whatever it was I was doing”. Thanks to Byron Ayanoğlu for revising an unfinished version of the manuscript. Finally, many thanks to my mother, my father, and my grandmother for their patience and understanding. All throughout my life, I worked and studied with the privileged comfort of knowing that they would support me no matter what. For that, I am forever in their debt.

Introduction

Modern Visions of Ottoman Visions

The main objective of this thesis is to explore a relatively understudied facet of early modern Ottoman history. While controversial themes such as the nature and evolution of the early Ottoman state or questions of Ottoman *decline* and *modernity* have led to heated and fruitful discussions among scholars, the topic of the Ottoman perceptions of the West (*Frengistan*) in early modern times does not seem to have raised much dispute in academic circles¹. Although criticized on various levels, the basic arguments laid out in the oft-quoted and influential monograph by Bernard Lewis, *The Muslim Discovery of Europe*, seem to have dominated the field and thus founded the epistemological grounding of further research in the area². Quite surprisingly and without too much inquiry, the popular assumption which holds that Ottomans' worldview – if they had a peculiar *world-view* at all – has always been limited to their own local and insular environment has been taken for granted and reproduced in an unexpectedly large number of studies³. According to this view, Ottomans' actions were mostly driven by

¹ For useful surveys of popular subjects among Ottomanists in the last decades, see the review articles by Christine Woodhead, “Consolidating the Empire: New Views on Ottoman History, 1453-1839”, *English Historical Review*, Vol.CXXIII, no.503, 2008, pp. 973-987; Leslie Peirce, “Changing Perceptions of the Ottoman Empire: The Early Centuries”, *Mediterranean Historical Review*, 19, 1, 2004, pp.6-28; Virginia Aksan, “Theoretical Ottomans”, *History and Theory*, 47, 2008, pp.109-122; *Idem*, “The Muslim World: Recent Scholarship on the Ottoman Middle East”, *Journal for Eighteenth Century Studies*, vol.34, no.4, 2011, pp.534-542.

² Bernard Lewis, *The Muslim Discovery of Europe*, Norton, (1982) reissued in 2001. For positive evaluations, see, Hazai, G. “The Image of Europe in Ottoman Historiography”, in *Turkic Culture: Continuity and Change*, Indiana University, 1987; Jacob Lassner, *Jews, Christians, and the Abode of Islam: Modern Scholarship, Medieval Realities*, University of Chicago Press, 2012, p.67; pp.96-100.

³ Even before Lewis' authoritative work, see, Ménage, V. L. “Three Ottoman Treatises on Europe.” In *Iran and Islam, in Memory of the Late Vladimir Minovsky*. C. E. Bosworth (ed), 1971, where the author

ideological/religious motives (expansion or defense of Islam) while their ideas were shaped (or perceptions were clouded) by essentially Islamic principles and traditions. Just like any other Muslim polity or society, their irrefutable belief in the superiority of their civilization over all other surrounding *barbarians* left them indifferent and impervious to alien traditions or cultures. This contrasted with an *exceptionally* curious West which, rising from the darkness of the Middle Ages, eagerly documented, explored, experienced and made sense of the world beyond its traditionally held boundaries⁴. Consequently, in a time when Europeans had started to gather a previously unobserved amount of knowledge about the Muslim world, Ottomans/Muslims lay dormant, resisted change and progress as much and as long as possible while confining themselves to the study and reproduction of medieval Islamic knowledge⁵.

maintains that Ottomans were quasi-totally ignorant of Western affairs. For parallel views, see the articles by Svat Soucek, in *Studies in Ottoman Naval History and Maritime Geography*, Isis Press, Istanbul, 2008. Thomas Goodrich, in his fundamental study entitled *The Ottoman Turks and the New World: A Study of Tarih-I Hind-I Garbi and Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Americana*, Wiesbaden, 1990, similarly states, p.6, that in the 16th century “The Ottomans acquired the firm conviction that they had nothing of lasting importance to learn from the *kafirs* (infidels) and *putperests* (idol worshippers) who inhabited the non-

maintains that Ottomans were quasi-totally ignorant of Western affairs. For parallel views, see the articles by Svat Soucek, in *Studies in Ottoman Naval History and Maritime Geography*, Isis Press, Istanbul, 2008. Thomas Goodrich, in his fundamental study entitled *The Ottoman Turks and the New World: A Study of Tarih-I Hind-I Garbi and Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Americana*, Wiesbaden, 1990, similarly states, p.6, that in the 16th century “The Ottomans acquired the firm conviction that they had nothing of lasting importance to learn from the *kafirs* (infidels) and *putperests* (idol worshippers) who inhabited the non-Islamic world”. See also Nicolas Vatin, *Sultan Djem: Un Prince Ottoman dans l’Europe du XV^e siècle d’apres deux sources contemporaines*, Ankara, 1997, pp.80-81.

⁴ Lewis, 2001, p.9, notes: “It was a peculiarity of the European during a certain period in his history, to exhibit this kind of interest in alien cultures to which he has no visible or ascertainable relationship (...). For most of the Middle Ages, statesmen and scholars in the great cities of the Islamic world looked on Europe as an outer darkness of barbarism and unbelief, offering nothing of interest and little of value”. The same idea is repeated in countless other accounts by Lewis. See his famous (and otherwise useful) article, “The Use by Muslim Historians of Non-Muslim Sources”, in *Islam in History: Ideas, People, and Events in the Middle East*, 1993, p.115: “This universal historical curiosity is still a distinguishing, almost exclusive characteristic of Europe and her daughters”. Specifically referring to Ottomans, he states, in “The Ottoman Empire and Europe”, in *The Ottoman Middle East: Studies in Honor of Amnon Cohen*, Brill, Leiden, 2013, p.9: “The Ottomans showed remarkably little interest in what was happening among the unbelievers inside Europe”.

⁵ According to Lewis and many others, this period of ignorance and indifference comes progressively (and forcibly) to an end with the crushing military defeats of the Ottomans against their European (mostly Austrian and Russian) opponents. The Treaty of Karlowitz signed in 1699 between the Ottomans and the

Such oversimplifying and quasi-mythical narratives of Western intellectual and cultural superiority over the rest of the world based on an essential and unbalanced binary opposition of “Islam” vs. “Europe”, have been openly and successfully challenged by many scholars in the last few decades⁶. However, the idea that Ottomans/Muslims were *inherently* indifferent and uninterested in Western matters has proven to be astonishingly long-lasting, and has not completely faded away⁷. This, in turn, might account for the

Holy League is considered to be a ‘turning point’. See Lewis, 2001, p.42, or R. A. Abou-El-Haj, “Ottoman Diplomacy at Karlowitz”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 87, No.4, 1967, pp.498-512, or, *Idem*, “The Formal Closure of the Ottoman Frontier in Europe: 1699-1703”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 89, No.3, pp.467-475.

⁶ See Henri Pirenne’s classical *Mahomet et Charlemagne* (originally published in 1937), which argues that the so-called Mediterranean unity achieved under Roman rule has been disrupted by the Arab invasions of the 7th century, turning the Mediterranean into an “insuperable barrier”, a battlefield between two incompatible civilizations. For a critical discussion, see Dursteler, E., “On Bazaars and Battlefields: Recent Scholarship on Mediterranean Cultural Contacts”, *Journal of Early Modern History*, 15, 2011, pp. 413-434. In his Introduction to *A Faithful Sea: The Religious Cultures of the Mediterranean, 1200-1700*, Oxford, Oneworld, 2007, p.8, Adnan Husain indicates that “Even for Braudel, who intends to incorporate the Ottomans more fully in his description, the empire remains quite simply an “Anti-Christendom”. Among many others, a few works that successfully argue for an integrative *Eurasian* or *global* early modern history, *Beyond Binary Histories: Re-imagining Eurasia to c. 1830*, ed. Victor Lieberman, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1999; Charles Parker, *Global Interactions in the Early Modern Age*, Cambridge University Press, 2010; Jack Goody, *The Theft of History*, Cambridge University Press, 2006; In his renowned *Venture of Islam*, 1974, Marshall Hodgson, as Palmira Brummett explains, proposes the more purposeful concept of “Afro-Eurasian Oikumene”, which “avoids territorial designations based anachronistically on latter-day nation states, (...) suggests a region that was unified in many ways on the basis of culture and trade, and (...) delineates a territory over which generations of sovereigns could and did imagine sovereignty” in Brummett, “The Ottoman Empire, Venice and the Question of Enduring Rivalries”, in *Great Power Rivalries*, ed. William R. Thompson, footnote 14, p.247. Finally, see Linda Darling conclusion in, “Rethinking Europe and the Islamic World in the Age of Exploration”, *Journal of Early Modern History*, 2, 1998, p.246. Quoted also by Dursteler, 2011, p.418.

⁷ Fatma Müge Göçek’s influential monograph *East Encounters West: France and the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth Century*, Oxford University Press, 1987 is based on this presumption. According to her, change in attitudes arrived in the early eighteenth century: “In all, the era of Ibrahim Pasa’s vezirate (1718-1730) marked the first change in Ottoman attitudes toward the West from haughtiness to reconciliation, from indifference to attention, and from that of a ruler to that of a participant”, p.9. See also the seminal article of M.E. Yapp, “Europe in the Turkish Mirror”, *Past and Present*, Vol. 137, 1992, p.138; Other exemplary works taking “Muslim lack of curiosity” for granted are, among others, Damien Janos, “Panaiotis Nicousios and Alexander Mavrocordat: The Rise of the Phanariots and the Office of Grand Dragoman in the Ottoman Administration in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century”, *Archivum Ottomanicum*, vol. 23, 2005, pp.177-196 or Ali Uzay Peker, “Western Influences on the Ottoman Empire and Occidentalism in the Architecture of Istanbul”, *Eighteenth-Century Life*, Fall 2002, 26, 3, pp.139-163. The same phenomenon has occurred in Persian Studies. See, “Rudi Matthee, Between Aloofness and Fascination: Safavid Views of the West”, *Iranian Studies*, Vol. 31, no.2, 1998, pp.219-246. For an account

lack of scholarly attention on Ottoman mind-sets. Apathetic and disinterested as they were, Ottoman views, attitudes and perceptions of Euro-Christians were correspondingly too easy to apprehend, almost too graspable and self-evident to the modern eye. To Ottomans, we assumed, Europeans were mere ‘infidels’; a suspicious "Other" to be confronted in military fields, occasionally admired and used for their technological prowess, and possibly, to be directed to the rightful path of the true religion. Prisoners of their own identities, Ottomans had for once made it easy on us.

Indeed, contrasted with the growing corpus of European writing in the early modern era (travel accounts, diplomatic reports, chronicles, tales, romances, plays etc.), Ottoman knowledge and documentation of the West might seem all too insignificant and scanty⁸. However, this is not to say that Ottomans did not have opinions, visions or fantasies that included Westerners and their lands of origin⁹. Even if claims of Ottoman indifference to

of Ottoman-Safavid hostility and mutual ignorance or indifference, see, J.R. Walsh, “The Historiography of Ottoman-Safavid Relations in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth centuries”, in B. Lewis and P.M. Holt (eds). *Historians of the Middle East*, Vol. 4, London, Oxford University Press, 1961, pp.197-211.

⁸ For a discussion of the “patchiness” of Ottoman sources in general, see Suraiya Faroqhi, *The Ottoman Empire and the World Around It*, Tauris, 2004, pp.18-19. A cursory survey of travel accounts may be to the point. In his recent overview of Ottoman travels to Europe, Caspar Hillebrand alludes to a “period of exceptional travel accounts”. According to him, travel to Europe was rare, troublesome and developed markedly only during the eighteenth century. See Caspar Hillebrand, “Ottoman Travel Accounts to Europe. An Overview of their Historical Development and a Commented Researchers’ List”, in, *Venturing Beyond Borders: Reflections on genre, function and boundaries in Middle Eastern travel writing*, 2013, pp.56-60. This should be compared with Western European travels to the Ottoman Empire, assembled by Stéphane Yerasimos, *Les Voyageurs dans l’Empire Ottoman: XIVe-XVIIe siècles*, Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1991 or Elizabetta Borromeo, *Voyageurs Occidentaux dans l’Empire Ottoman (1600-1644)*, 2 Vols. Paris, 2007.

⁹ Daniel Goffman, *The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge University Press, 2002, p.229, argues the opposite and maintains that although Ottomans were in touch with Westerners on a personal level, they were mostly uninformed about the broader world these Westerners were part of. The same idea is voiced in Subrahmanyam, “On the Hat-Wearers, their Toilet Practices and Other Curious Usages”, in *Europe Observed: Multiple Gazes in Early Modern Encounters*, (eds.) K. Chatterjee, C. Hawes, Bucknell University Press, pp.56-7. As the editors note in their *Aperçus*, p.23: “South Asian xenology with regard to Europeans in this period was shaped by the actual power and activities of Europeans who were active in that region. But these were “Europeans without Europe” (Subrahmanyam, 47) since there seemed to be little awareness or knowledge about an entity called Europe from which these people originated”.

and ignorance of the West were to be accepted as irrevocable historical facts, the rhetorical devices, stereotypes, literary tropes or even labels that Ottomans employed when referring to *Frenks* would still have to be considered as worthy of scholarly attention. Derogatory images of the West occasionally pictured in Ottoman sources should not be taken for granted as the pure expression of a deep-rooted animosity between the rival civilizations of East and West or Islam and Christianity but need to be studied as parts and bits of a knotty, complex and ever-changing discourse of alterity. The political context as well as the social standing, religious affinities, personal backgrounds, and experiences that might have shaped the ideas and images of each specific account should be taken into consideration. Indeed, Ottomans/Muslims are too often projected as one homogenous unit in opposition to yet another monolithic block composed of Europeans/Christians¹⁰. However, before being taken as intractable givens on which academic or public opinions could rest, the constructed and artificial nature of such designations should be questioned, their origins located, and their evolutions traced¹¹. Just as the cultural boundaries of what is today called “Europe” have never been clear-cut, the limits, nature, and power of Ottoman/Muslim cultural influence were also

¹⁰ Furthermore, as Palmira Brummett rightly observes: “We speak of Ottomans, or Venetians, or Portuguese as if these groups responded to and based their behaviours upon identities which are premised upon the existence of modern nation states with fixed boundaries and relatively homogenous citizenry. These bounded states and identities did not exist in the 16th century. See, Brummett, “The Ottomans as a World Power: What we don’t know about Ottoman Sea-Power”, *Oriente Moderno*, Nuova Serie, Anno 20, 81, no.1, 2001, p.8.

¹¹ A great number of studies have acknowledged and pointed to the constructed and sometimes imaginative character of *European* cultural space. See, Denys Hay, *Europe: The Emergence of an Idea*, Edinburgh, 1986; Robert Bartlett, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization and Cultural Change, 950-1350*, Princeton, 1993; Gerard Delanty, *Inventing Europe: Idea, Identity, Reality*, New York, 1995. Just about all confirm that *Christianitas*, or the *Republica Christiana* was the common denominator that was replaced by *Europe* only by the late seventeenth century. In that sense, the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) is seen as a decisive moment. See, M. Heffernan, “The Changing Political Map: Geography, Geopolitics, and the Idea of Europe since 1500”, in *An Historical Geography of Europe*, (eds) R. A. Butlin, R. A. Dodgshon, Oxford University Press, 1998, pp.145-146; See also the more recent volume edited by Anthony Pagden, *The Idea of Europe: From Antiquity to the European Union*, Cambridge University Press, 2002.

continuously questioned and re-negotiated over time and space.¹² Although oppositional categories such as East vs. West are still influential and perhaps unavoidable, recent studies have considerably changed our perception of a culturally divided early modern world solidly entrenched in disconnected and hostile religious camps. As recent studies suggested, even the presumably most antagonistic societies appear to have been intensely interacting and intermingling not only through military confrontation, but through constant trade and travel as well¹³. Furthermore, similar patterns of evolution and development in economic, administrative and intellectual spheres have apparently been observed amongst European and non-European societies. Although efforts to "locate ... parts of the European road to modernity within Asian trajectories" should be viewed with

¹² An increasing number of scholars tend to emphasize the importance of local identities and the prominence of multiple loyalties in Ottoman provincial lands. In regions both deemed "core" or "peripheral", the degree and importance of Ottoman military or cultural interference are discussed in, *The Frontiers of the Ottoman World*, A.C.S. Peacock, (ed.), Oxford University Press, 2009 (see especially Peacock's "Introduction", p.25); Leslie Peirce, "Becoming Ottoman in Late 16th Century Aintab", *Istanbul as Seen from a Distance: Centre and Provinces in the Ottoman Empire*, (eds) E. Ozdalga, M.S. Ozervarli, F. Tansug, Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, 2011, pp.59-72 or Bruce Masters, "Arab Attitudes towards the Ottoman Sultanate, 1516-1798" in the same volume. In a recent book chapter, Dariusz Kolodziejczyk asks *provocatively*: "what makes a modern historian resolve that Yemen lay inside the Ottoman Empire, while Poland, Venice, and a number of other countries lay outside? If judged according to the intentions of Ottoman propaganda, rulers such as the Yemeni imam, the Venetian doge, the Habsburg emperor (...) the Polish king, and (...) the Russian tsar were all Ottoman vassals, at least for a time. See "What is Inside and What is Outside? Tributary States in Ottoman Politics", in *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, (eds.) G. Karman, L. Kuncevic, Brill, 2013, p.427.

¹³ For a few pioneering and relevant studies emphasizing intensifying intercultural and mercantile relations among supposedly conflicting polities, see for example, *The Early Modern Ottomans: Remapping the Empire*, (ed.) Daniel Goffman, Cambridge University Press, 2007; Eric Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople*, John Hopkins University Press, 2006; Kate Fleet, *European and Islamic Trade in the Early Ottoman State: The Merchants of Genoa and Turkey*, Cambridge University Press, 2006; *Re-Orienting the Renaissance: Cultural Exchanges with the East*, (ed.) Gerard Maclean, Palgrave, Macmillan, 2005; Jerry Brotton, *The Renaissance Bazaar: From the Silk Road to Michelangelo*, Oxford University Press, 2003; Maria Pia Pedani, *In Nome del Gran Signore, Inviati Ottomani a Venezia dalla Caduta di Costantinopoli alla Guerra di Candia*, Venezia, 1994; Palmira Brummett, *Ottoman Seapower and Levantine Diplomacy in the Age of Discovery*, Suny Press, 1993; Sanjay Subrahmanyam, "Connected Histories: Notes towards a Reconfiguration of Early Modern Eurasia", *Modern Asian Studies*, vol.31, No.3, pp.735-762, or *Idem, Mughals and Franks: Explorations in Connected History*, Oxford University Press, 2004; for a recent addition underscoring the role of Armenian merchants in global trade see, S. Aslanian, *From the Indian Ocean to the Mediterranean: The Global Trade Networks of Armenian Merchants from New Julfa*, University of California Press, 2011.

great caution, it has been suggested that intensive bureaucratization and centralization, the hardening of confessional lines (Catholic-Protestant, Shiite-Sunni), the expansion of large-scale trade and the re-discovery and systematic study of a classical body of writing which would ultimately acquire a canonical status are phenomena to be situated not only in European but also in Asian polities¹⁴.

In accordance with such rewritings and revisions, another wave of scholarly publications have powerfully shattered the foundations of the East-West, Muslim-Christian paradigm in modern historiography. Influenced by Edward Said's groundbreaking *Orientalism* which essentially analyses (and denounces) Western discourses which led to the creation and perpetuation of an imaginary 'Orient' during colonial and postcolonial times, many specialists have intended to lay down the foundational roots of European Orientalism, placing it in different periods ranging from Antiquity to the Middle Ages or even, to early modern times¹⁵. This approach, however, had the complementary effect of reinforcing and normalizing the conception of an assumed East-West divide. Reversing the picture illustrated by Lewis, it implied that

¹⁴ Zvi Ben-Dor-Benite, "Modernity: The Sphinx and the Historian," in AHR Forum: "Modernity and the Historian." *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 116, No. 3, June 2011, pp.638-652. For parallel early modern developments in the Ottoman and European realms, see, Joseph Fletcher, "Integrative Histories: Parallels and Interconnections in the Early Modern Period, 1500-1800", *Journal of Turkish Studies*, vol.9, 1985, pp.37-57; Cemal Kafadar, "The Ottomans and Europe, 1450-1600", in *Handbook of European History, 1400-1600*, Vol. II, pp.589-636; Huri Islamoglu, *Ottoman History as World History*, Gorgias Press, 2010; For a more general outlook, see *Comparative Early Modernities: 1100-1800*, (ed.) David Porter, Palgrave, Macmillan, 2011.

¹⁵ Edward Said, *Orientalism*, Vintage Books, New York, 1978. From Homer's *Iliad*, to Aeschylus' *Persians* and Herodotus' *Histories*, Said has attempted to locate the roots of Western forms and processes of othering in different epochs (see especially pp.56-68). A recent monograph following Said's path in detecting "proto-orientalisms" or an "early orientalism" is Ivan Kalmar's *Early Orientalism: Imagined Islam and the Notion of Sublime Power*, Routledge, 2012.

“Westerners/Christians” have been *essentially* unfavorable and perpetually antagonistic to Easterners/Muslims.

In response to this relatively novel viewpoint, an ever-growing number of scholars have compellingly pointed out that Said’s paradigm could not be applied to earlier time periods, since the conditions that brought nineteenth-century Orientalism to light were absent in previous centuries. Noting that Westerners were in no position to militarily or culturally dominate and “possess” Eastern polities, they have argued that Europeans have portrayed Muslims in contradictory ways, expressing their admiration, contempt, wonder or fear in different contexts. Indeed, early modern European visions of the Other were so ambivalent that at times, seemingly contradictory depictions could be encountered in one single narrative. Based on the study of countless accounts, it has thus been suggested that Europeans represented foreign societies in diverse ways, constructing negative as well as positive images depending on the personal experiences, opinions, and impressions of the author, the overall socio-political context, as well as the expectations of the intended audience¹⁶.

¹⁶ See Lucette Valensi, *The Birth of the Despot*, Cornell University Press, 1993 where Valensi traces the transformations of the Venetian views of Ottomans; Ina Baghdiantz McCabe, *Orientalism in Early Modern France: Eurasian Trade, Exoticism and the Ancient Regime*, Bloomsbury Academic, 2008 (see introduction and pp.57-58); Richmond Barbour, *Before Orientalism: London’s Theatre of the East, 1576-1626*, Cambridge University Press, 2003; Katherine Scarf Beckett, *Anglo-Saxon Perceptions of the Islamic World*, Cambridge University Press, 2003, (especially, p.198); *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, (eds) David Blanks and Michael Frassetto, Palgrave, 1999; For a few case studies contesting the hardline Saidian approach, Sharon Kinshita, “The Romance of Miscenegation: Negotiating Identities in La Fille du comte de Pontieu” in *Postcolonial Moves: Medieval through Modern*, (eds) P. C. Ingham and M. R. Warren, Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, pp.111-133 or Peter Burke, “The Philosopher as Traveller: Bernier’s Orient”, in (eds) J. Elsner and J.P. Rubies, *Voyages and Visions: Towards a Cultural History of Travel*, Reaktion, London, 2000, pp.124-37.

The ever-expanding number of works on image literature, and more specifically on early modern *Turcica*, that is, Western renderings of Ottoman realities, have therefore complicated and relativized the picture of the “intolerant”, “prejudiced” and “narrow-minded” Westerner through a conscientious analysis of divergent European representations of alien lands¹⁷. Luckily, a similar trend in the study of Muslim attitudes, representations and visions of European (“Frankish”) lands has seen a recent upsurge, equally modifying the oversimplified vision of the “ignorant”, “indifferent”, “hostile” and “prejudiced” pre-modern Muslim sketched out by Lewis and like-minded scholars. Works by the prolific Nabil Matar on early modern Arabic reconstructions and perceptions of the West or Sanjay Subrahmanyam’s analysis of Indo-Persian portrayals of Europeans have opened new possibilities to build narratives that include the voices of unremarkably “subaltern” Muslims¹⁸. Contributions by Nadia El-Cheikh on Arabic representations of the Byzantines, or Nizar Hermes’ recent monograph *The European Other in Medieval Arabic Literature and Culture*, along with other related articles and book-chapters, have indeed established that Muslims of medieval and early modern times

¹⁷ Recent noteworthy publications include Nancy Bisaha, *Creating East and West: Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks*, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004; Mustafa Soykut, *Italian Perceptions of the Ottomans: Conflict and Politics through Pontifical and Venetian Sources*, Peter Lang International Academic Publishers, Frankfurt and Main, 2011; Andrei Pippidi, *Visions of the Ottoman World in Renaissance Europe*, Columbia University Press, New York, 2013. In her seminal work, *Empires of Islam in Renaissance Historical Thought*, Harvard University Press, 2008, Margaret Meserve (pp.10-11) declares that “detecting an Orientalist discourse in the Early Renaissance is more problematic, for the very basic reason that there was no one Oriental “other” in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Rather, the European states confronted a bewildering geopolitical chessboard of Islamic polities. Some (...) were seen as mortal enemies, while others (...) were potential allies (...). At different times and in different places, European writers can be found saying radically different things about the Islamic East”.

¹⁸ G. C. Spivak, “Can the Subaltern Speak?” in (eds.) C. Nelson and L. Grossberg, *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, University of Illinois Press, 1988, pp.271-317. For a different -and yet, analogous- account, see the stunning contribution by Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*, Beacon Press, 1995.

were capable of creating, sustaining and adjusting (positive or negative) thoughts, impressions, visions and images of Others¹⁹.

Rather disappointingly, however, Ottoman representations of the Western world in the early modern era have not yet come under such systematic scrutiny. Although an increasing number of works emphasize the interconnectedness of the Ottoman world to its direct or indirect neighbors, no serious attempt has been made to delve deeper into Ottoman minds and map out the various different imaginary or realistic tropes they might have produced in relation to alien societies and peoples²⁰. It is true that the last few years have witnessed a significant rise in the number of case studies centering on Ottoman representations of polities and societies surrounding them. Nevertheless, these explorations have been mostly restricted to case studies, such as Evliya Çelebi's perceptions and descriptions of Europe and Cem Sultan's (d.1495) anonymous captivity account in the *Frengistan*, or have limited their scope to peculiar works and their

¹⁹ Besides his numerous articles, the major works by Nabil Matar that are related to the subject are, *Europe Through Arab Eyes, 1578-1727*, Columbia University Press, 2009, and *In the Land of the Christians: Arabic Travel Writing in the Seventeenth Century*, Routledge, 2003; Nizar F. Hermes, *The European Other in Medieval Arabic Literature and Culture*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2013; *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, (eds.) Angeliki Laiou and Roy P. Mottahedeh, Dumbarton Oaks, 2001; Nadia El-Cheikh, *Byzantium Viewed by the Arabs*, Harvard University Press, 2004; M. Tavakoli-Targhi, *Refashioning Iran: Orientalism, Occidentalism and Historiography*, Palgrave, 2001. A few important articles are, S. Subrahmanyam, "Taking Stock of the Franks: South Asian Views of Europeans and Europe", 1500-1800, *The Indian Economic and Social History Review*, vol. 42, no.1, 2005, pp.69-100; idem, "On the Hat-Wearers, their Toilet Practices and Other Curious Usages", in, *Europe Observed: Multiple Gazes in Early Modern Encounters*, (eds.) K. Chatterjee, H. Clement, Bucknell University Press, 2008; Aziz Al-Azmeh, "Mortal Enemies, Invisible Neighbors: Northerners in Andalusian Eyes", in *The Legacy of Muslim Spain*, (ed.) S. Khadra Jayyusi, 1992, Brill, pp.259-272; Julien Loiseau, "Frankish Captives in Cairo", *Al Masaq*, vol. 23, no.1, 2011, pp.37-52; Mario Casari, "Decoding the Labyrinth: Rome in Arabic and Persian Medieval Literature", *Medieval Encounters*, 17, 2011, pp.534-565; B. Martel-Thoumian, Mamlouks et Ifranjan sous les Derniers Circassiens, 1468-1522, in *Centre and Periphery within the Borders of Islam*, (ed.) G. Contu, Peeters, 2012, pp.185-195.

²⁰ Giancarlo Casale's outstanding work, *The Ottoman Age of Exploration*, Oxford University Press, 2010, is a rare exception that deals with the Ottoman geographical, commercial, military and ideological interests in the Indian Ocean.

presentation of *Frenks* within a particular political context²¹. Some works have focused on Ottoman cartographic knowledge²², while others presented the religious and legal framework within which *Frenks* were perceived and accepted in Ottoman society²³.

The present study will therefore be a preliminary attempt to survey and examine the content and extent of Ottoman constructions, visions and imaginations of Westerners and of the Western world in early modern times. In accordance with that, a cross-selection of sources will be treated, ranging from poetry to official and semi-official chronicles, pseudo-historiographic accounts, travelogues, folk tales, archival documents as well as Western accounts and reports which occasionally purport to furnish Ottoman views of Europeans. As Nabil Matar states, “information about Europeans exists, but it has to be sought in a method that is different from the search for information about Muslims in

²¹ For a discussion on Mehmed the Conqueror’s son Cem’s perilous years in Europe, see, besides the now canonical work of Vatin, 1997, or *Idem*, “A Propos de l’exotisme dans les “Vakiat-I Sultan Cem: le regard porté sur l’Europe occidentale a la fin du XVe siècle par un Turc Ottoman”, *Journal Asiatique*, 272, 1984, pp.237-48, Christine Isom-Verhaaren, *Allies with the Infidel: The Ottoman-French alliance in the Sixteenth Century*, Tauris, 2011. Apart from the two volumes of proceedings published in Turkish on Evliya Çelebi which contain multiple articles scrutinizing his worldview, *Çağının Sıradışı Yazarı: Evliya Çelebi*, (ed.) Nuran Tezcan, Yapi Kredi Yayinlari, 2009 and *Evliya Çelebi Konuşmaları*, (ed.) M. Sabri Koz, Yapi Kredi Yayinlari, 2011, see also the recent number of the *Cahiers Balkaniques* entirely consecrated on “Evliya Çelebi and Europe” (2013, number 41). Two issues of the *Journal of Ottoman Studies* in 2012 are entitled, quite tellingly, *Other Places: Ottomans traveling, seeing, writing, drawing the world*. Equally crucial is Baki Tezcan, “The Frank in the Ottoman Eye of 1583”, in, James Harper, (ed.) *The Turk in the Western Eye, 1450-1750: Visual Imagery before Orientalism*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2011, pp.267-96. Another essential study is the recent volume, *Venturing Beyond Borders: Reflections on genre, function and boundaries in Middle Eastern travel writing*, (eds.) B. Agai, O. Akyildiz, C. Hillebrand, Wurzburg, 2013.

²² A good survey of Ottoman cartographic production is Jerry Brotton’s chapter “Disorienting the East: The Geography of the Ottoman Empire”, in *Trading Territories: Mapping the Early Modern World*, Reaktion, 1997, pp.87-118. Recent articles by Casale, Karen Pinto, and Pinar Emiralioğlu as well as the contributions of Thomas Goodrich, Gottfried Hagen and Svat Soucek have been fundamental.

²³ For a few studies focused on the religio-legal framework, see, Halil Inalcik, “Ottoman Galata, 1453-1553”, in, *Essays in Ottoman History*, Eren, Istanbul, 1998, pp.275-376; Mehmet Bulut, “The Ottoman Approach to the Western Europeans in the Levant during the Early Modern Period”, *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol.44, no.2, 2008, pp.259-274; Edhem Eldem, “Foreigners at the Threshold of Felicity: the reception of foreigners in Ottoman Istanbul”, in (eds.) D. Calabi and S.T. Christensen, *Cultural Exchanges in Early Modern Europe*, Vol.2, Cambridge University Press, 2013, pp.114-131. See also articles by Veinstein, 2008, and Faroqhi, 2002, as well as the monograph by Viorel Panaite, *The Ottoman Law of War and Peace: The Ottoman Empire and Tribute Payers*, Columbia University Press, New York, 2000.

European books (...). The information appears in hagiography, epistles and history, in verse as in prose”²⁴.

The work will be organized in three thematic chapters. The purpose of the first chapter will be to elaborate a comprehensive account of the general ways Ottomans mentally confronted and comprehended the entity they vaguely named “*Frangistan*”. It will be argued that Ottomans managed to *make sense* of the Frankish reality by subtly incorporating it into a familiar cosmological order. It will be shown that they have accounted for the existence and origins of the Franks by formulating inventive genesis stories or by re-interpreting older sources, and have forged mythical common genealogies in order to rationalize their presence, recount their past, and legitimize possible alliances with them. Equally important will be to question the extent to which Ottomans thought of the land of the Franks as a potentially or actively unified *Christian* entity and perceived it as a persistent threat. In turn, a third sub-chapter will account for their perception of possible weaknesses and fractures within the so-called *Christianitas*.

Following these primary generic assessments on Ottoman visions of the land of the Franks, Chapter 2 will be devoted to the portrayal of Frankish customs and manners as reflected in a number of Ottoman sources. Ranging from qualities such as “courage”, “intelligence” or “wit”, to negative traits such as “superstitious”, “coward” or “greedy”,

²⁴ Nabil Matar, “Arab Views of Europeans, 1578-1727: The Western Mediterranean”, in, (ed.) G. Maclean, *Re-orienting the Renaissance*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2005, p.132. Given the broad range of sources consulted so as to dig up bits of evidence that do not always add up to a comprehensive picture, our endeavor will be necessarily highly selective. For the same problem see for example Anthony Kaldellis, *Ethnography after Antiquity: Foreign Lands and Peoples in Byzantine Literature*, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013, p.167.

Ottomans found multiple ways to label Franks. While emphasizing the circumstantial use of these characterizations, it will be postulated that some of these stereotypes acquired a nearly canonical status through repetition in various different discourses, while some other denominations were merely used as a means to self-aggrandizement or self-critique. In opposition to Lewisian appraisals, it will be maintained that far from being indifferent to the West, numerous Ottomans have colorfully depicted and envisioned Western life and customs (although not always in positive terms), going as far as imagining and portraying their internal relationships.

The third and last chapter will be consecrated to Ottoman-Frankish partnerships. Through partnerships of trade, partnerships in war or partnerships of love, Ottomans conceived of divergent ways to include and accept Franks among them. From sheer commercial bonds to the most intimate and passionate amorous relationships, they have occasionally forged indissoluble and indispensable connections with their religious and political Other. Taking the Frankish suburb of Galata across Istanbul as its focal point, this chapter will discuss the uses of inclusionary Ottoman narratives, which depict, in varying degrees, cordiality and intimacy among Franks and Ottomans on a more personal level.

Throughout the work, crucial questions such as the role of religion in framing and shaping mentalities will be treated, as well as the relevance of other identity-markers such as ethnic and local loyalties. Although the work will mostly allude to Ottoman-Muslims, it will occasionally refer to non-Muslim Ottomans' contrasting visions of the Franks. The

term “Ottoman” remains disputed and problematic in itself, as it might imply or encompass Ottoman peasants, elites, non-Muslims, small-town dwellers in the provinces and many other social, religious ethnic or professional categories. As a consequence, the scope of the work will regrettably be confined to the Ottoman/Muslim ruling elite and its relatively immediate associates involved directly in the production, dissemination and consumption of the extant sources²⁵.

Finally, it should be made clear that this study will not be *conclusive* in any major sense. As a prefatory study, its main objective is to revise previous assessments by divulging the complexity, plurality and adaptability of Ottoman visions of Euro-Christians. It has not, in any way, any pretensions to equate *Ottoman knowledge* of the West with *Western knowledge* of the East. Its only conclusion may be that qualifying Ottomans (or any other society, for that matter) as “tolerant”, “intolerant”, “indifferent” or “curious” serves no other purpose than simplifying and bringing an illusory, uniform order to an all too complex and multicolored past.

²⁵ For a fruitful discussion on the rather unstable “Ottoman ruling group”, see, Suraiya Faroqhi, “The Ottoman Ruling Group and the Religions of its Subjects in the Early Modern Age: a Survey of Current Research”, *Journal of Early Modern History*, 14, 2010, pp.239-266. See also Emine Fetvacı, *Picturing History at the Ottoman Court*, Indiana University Press, 2013, especially Chapter 1, “Circulation, Audience, and the Creation of a Shared Court Culture”, pp.25-59. In his pioneering monograph *The Crescent and the Rose: Islam and England during the Renaissance*, Oxford University Press, 1937, Samuel Chew distinguishes between elite and popular attitudes. Matar, 2005, points to the same line of division. However, Rhoads Murphey argues that clear-cut distinctions between high/low or popular/learned attitudes can be at times misleading or even counter-productive, and indicates that popular-elite attitudes, views or narratives were occasionally mutually influential. See Rhoads Murphey, “Forms of Differentiation and Expression of Individuality in Ottoman Society”, *Turcica*, 34, 2002, p.152.

Chapter One:

Making Sense of the *Frengistan*

D) A Historical Outline

It has been commonly held that during the Middle Ages, Western European polities and societies first became acquainted with Islam as a religion via the “Spanish connection”²⁶. In a similar fashion, the followers and subjects of the emerging Ottoman principality were informed of Euro-Christians through models, labels, and stock images previously established in various sub-genres of Islamic literature and historiography. From the geographer Ibn Khordadbeh’s (d.912) notes in his *Book of Roads and Kingdoms* to Harun Ibn Yahya’s captivity memoirs alluding to the city of Rome, from Al-Masudi’s historical accounts to epic tales recounting the stories of Muslim struggle against the infidel Byzantine or Frank, the medieval Arabo-Muslim corpus provided the rising Ottoman power with a baggage of accurate or inaccurate information on the *Ifranja*, or ‘Frankland’. Indeed, as Kafadar shows in his extensive study of the formation of the early Ottoman state, as soon as the first quarter of the fourteenth century, the “budding

²⁶ Scarfe Beckett, *Anglo-Saxon Perceptions of the Islamic World*, 2003, p.42.

[Ottoman] *beğlik* had been touched by the so-called higher Islamic, or Persianate ruling traditions”²⁷. However, aside from slowly becoming a new center of intellectual production attracting scholars from diverse regions of the Islamic (and Byzantine) world throughout the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, Ottomans had also acquired a great deal of experience in forging and sustaining relationships with Western or Frankish polities situated in the Eastern Mediterranean. As Cristian Caselli notes, a treaty between the Ottoman Sultan Orhan and Genoa had been sealed in 1352, while it is known that the Anatolian principalities which have been progressively incorporated into the Ottoman realm during the fourteenth century had long been engaged in “trade and crusade” with Venetians, Genoese, Catalans or Hospitallers from Rhodes²⁸. In that sense, both practical knowledge acquired through extensive interaction as well as time-honored narratives stemming from an increasingly dominant Islamic intellectual sphere seem to have nurtured Ottoman views, ideas, knowledge, and visions of Westerners.

Following the devastating Ottoman debacle in Ankara against Timur (28 July 1402), and the subsequent Succession Wars of 1402-1413 during which different princes had dangerously disputed the throne left vacant by Bayezid I (d.1403), the Ottoman state

²⁷ Cemal Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State*, University of California Press, 1996, p.61.

²⁸ Cristian Caselli, “Genoa, Genoese Merchants and the Ottoman Empire in the First Half of the Fifteenth Century: Rumours and Reality”, *Al-Masaq*, 2013, vol.25, no.2, pp.252-263. For early Ottoman-Genoese relations, see also Kate Fleet, *European and Islamic Trade in the Early Ottoman State: The Merchants of Genoa and Turkey*, Cambridge University Press, 2006. For the pre-Ottoman period, see Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade: Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Menteshe and Aydin, 1300-1415*, Library of the Hellenic Institute and Post-Byzantine Studies, no.11, Venice, 1983; Idem, “Holy War in the Aegean”, in *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, eds. B. Arbel, B. Hamilton, D. Jacoby, Routledge, 1989, pp.212-225; Idem, “The Catalans of Athens and the Beginning of the Turkish Expansion in the Aegean Area”, *Studi Medievali*, 31, 1980, pp.821-38. For an early encounter in the Black Sea, Idem, “Gazi Çelebi of Sinope”, in *Oriente e Occidente tra Medioevo ed eta Moderna, Studi in onore di Geo Pistarino*, Cenova, 1997, pp.1271-1275.

resumed its process of expansion and consolidation throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries²⁹. Alongside military success and administrative centralization, the empire equally saw an evident upsurge in intellectual production. New imperial institutions were established in urban centers and a swarm of scholars flooded into the newly conquered and promising Ottoman lands. As a result, historical works, religious treatises, and translations or compilations of legendary folk tales have been systematically penned, patronized by courtly circles or sponsored personally by the Sultan³⁰.

²⁹ For a discussion of early Ottoman sources dealing with the tumultuous first quarter of the 15th century, see, Dimitris Kastritsis, “The Historical Epic Ahval-i Sultan Mehmed (The Tales of Sultan Mehmed) in the Context of Early Ottoman Historiography”, in (eds.), H. E. Çıpa, E. Fetvacı, *Writing History at the Ottoman Court: Editing the Past, Fashioning the Future*, Indiana University Press, pp.1-22. For a traditional narrative of Ottoman extension and rise, see Halil İnalcık, *The Ottoman Empire: the Classical Age, 1300-1600*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973; For a general but remarkable discussion of, among others, recent historiography on Ottoman state-construction and empire-building, see Alan Mikhail and Christine M. Philliou, “The Ottoman Empire and the Imperial Turn”, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 2012, 54, 4, pp.721-745. For an inquiry on the Ottoman state’s longevity, see the review article by Nicholas Doumanis, “Durable Empire: State Virtuosity and Social Accommodation in the Ottoman Mediterranean”, *The Historical Journal*, 49, 3, 2006, pp.953-966.

³⁰ For the appropriation of the Byzantine legacy, see for example, Julian Raby, “Mehmed the Conqueror’s Greek Scriptorium”, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, Vol.37, 1983, pp.15-34; Idem, “A Sultan of Paradox: Mehmed the Conqueror as a Patron of the Arts”, *Oxford Art Journal*, vol.5, No.1, Patronage, 1982, pp.3-8; Maria Mavroudi, “Translations from Greek into Arabic at the Court of Mehmed the Conqueror”, in *The Byzantine Court: Source of Power and Culture, Papers from the Second International Sevgi Gönül Byzantine Studies Symposium*, Koç University Press, 2013. For geographical works translated from Arabic in the sixteenth-century, see, Casale, 2010, pp.156-7 and especially pp.186-192. For the gradual assimilation of the Persianate literary corpus by the Ottoman intelligentsia, see for example, Anja Pistor-Hatam, “The Art of Translation: Rewriting Persian Texts from the Seljuks to the Ottomans”, in *Essays in Ottoman Civilization: Proceedings of the XIIIth Congress of CIEPO*, Prague, 1996, pp.305-16 or Gottfried Hagen, “Translations and Translators in a Multilingual Society: A Case Study of Persian-Ottoman Translations: Late Fifteenth to Early Seventeenth Century”, *Eurasian Studies*, Vol.2, 1, 2003, pp.95-134. For influences in historiography, see Charles Melville, “The Early Persian Historiography of Anatolia”, in *History and Historiography of Post-Mongol Central Asia and the Middle East: Studies in Honor of John E. Woods*, (eds.) J. Pfeiffer and S. A. Quinn, Wiesbaden, 2006, pp.135-167. For artistic contacts, see the article by Fariba Zarinebaf in the same volume. An important article emphasizing the intellectual involvements between the Mughal, Ottoman and Safavid empires, see Frances Robinson, “Ottomans-Safavids-Mughals: Shared Knowledge and Connective Systems”, *Journal of Islamic Studies*, 1997, 8, 2, pp.151-184.

Allusions to *Frenks* (pl. *Efrenç*) or to the *Frengistan* (land of Frenks) appear in these first Ottoman chronicles, epic tales and inscriptions of the fifteenth century³¹. In a seminal article, Baki Tezcan notes that the term *Frenk* is a “blanket expression that refers to a large group that includes people from different countries”³². Indeed, much like the generic term “Turk” used in early modern Europe to identify “Muslims” more than ethnic “Turks”, “Frenk” became the common denominator referring to Western European Christians in Ottoman parlance³³. Other appellations such as *Beni Asfar*, *Asfari* (“Blond Race”) that were originally used to refer to Byzantines and later to eastern European (mostly Slavic) Christians, or more conventional expressions such as *kafir*, (“infidel”) “*nasara*” or “*tersa*” (“Christian”, the latter mostly used in poetry) remained equally popular among the wide gamut of designations alluding to “Western Christians”³⁴. The

³¹ See Inalcik, “The Rise of Ottoman Historiography”, in *The Historians of the Middle East*, 1962, pp.152-167; for a useful discussion of Ottoman sources of the fifteenth-century, see Kafadar, 1995, pp.60-117. According to Alessio Bombaci, *Histoire de la Litterature Turque*, translated by I. Melikoff, Paris, 1968, p.263, Frenks already appear in pre-Ottoman warrior epics commissioned by Seljuk rulers, such as the *Danişmendname* or the *Battalname*, re-appropriated by the Ottomans during Bayezid II’s (d.1512) reign. Ebu’l-Hayr-I Rumi’s *Saltukname*, written down for Prince Cem (d.1495) and recounting the legendary deeds of the dervish-warrior Sari Saltuk in the Balkans, provides an even more comprehensive picture of the Frankish reality. In the *Düsturname* by Enveri, completed in 1465 and relating the military exploits of Umur Bey (d.1348), ruler of the Aydınoğlu principality in Western Anatolia, “the infidels almost appear as three-dimensional characters”. See, Zeynep Aydoğan, “Creating an Ideal Self: Representations of Infidels in the Late Medieval Anatolian Frontier Narratives”, *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 40, 2012, pp.101-119. Quoting Heath Lowry, A. Anooshahr, *The Ghazi Sultans and the Frontiers of Islam: a Comparative Study of the Late Medieval and Early Modern Periods*, Routledge, New York, 2009, p.34, states that “Ottomans were obviously able to differentiate between Byzantine and Balkan Orthodox Christians (...). An Ottoman inscription in the citadel of Thessaloniki had different labels for these groups, calling them “Christians” and “Franks” respectively”.

³² Baki Tezcan, “The Frank in the Ottoman Eye of 1583”, in *The Turk and Islam in the Western Eye, 1450-1750, Visual Imagery Before Orientalism*, ed. J. G. Harper, Ashgate, 2011, pp.269-70. Throughout the work, we will use the terms ‘Frank’, ‘Frenk’, ‘Westerner’ or ‘Euro-Christian’ interchangeably.

³³ It must be noted that Ottoman self-referential designations did not usually include the term “Turk”. Although they knew that Westerners referred to them as Turks, Ottomans preferred to identify themselves with religious (Muslim) or geographical (“Rumi” – from the lands of Rum-Rome) denominations. For a good overview, see Cemal Kafadar, “A Rome of One’s Own: Reflections on Cultural Geography and Identity in the Lands of Rum”, *Muqarnas*, Vol.24, 2007, pp.7-25.

³⁴ Other legally defined labels existed and appeared in judicial or imperial records. A Euro-Christian visitor to Ottoman lands was distinguished from local Christians and was referred to as a “müstemin”, that is, a

generality or vagueness these terms seem to imply, however, should not lead us to believe that Ottomans were unable to recognize divergences among Euro-Christians. It is clear that Ottomans were able to distinguish between distinct groups or “nationalities” within the *Frengistan*, noting the existence of different “Franks” such as the Genoese (*Ceneviz*), Venetians, (*Venedik*), Hungarians (*Üngürüs*), Germans (*Alaman*), Alans (*As*), Poles (*Leh*), Czechs (*Çeh*) and so on. References to Latin countries such as *Frençe* (France), *Milan*, or *Espan* (Spain) appear clearly, even in the earliest sources³⁵. However, it is true that besides the rather value-free terms of *Frengistan* or *Latin Diyarı* (Latin lands), the broader universe which these ethnicities were thought to inhabit had been disapprovingly labeled *Kafiristan* (“the land of infidels”), *dar-ül harb* (“the abode of war”, in opposition to the “abode of Islam”) or *dar-ül küfr* (“the abode of unbelief”)³⁶.

II) Domesticating the Frengistan

In the preface of the 2001 edition of his previously mentioned *Muslim Discovery of Europe*, Bernard Lewis sensitively announces that:

“Christian Europe had compelling reasons to interest itself in the language and culture of the Middle East. (...) For the Christian, even in the far north, the very heart of his religion was in the Holy Land, since the seventh century under Muslim rule. His Bible and the faith that it enshrined had come to him from the Middle East, much of it written in Middle Eastern languages, and

“protected” non-Muslim subject originating from non-Muslim lands. See Ethem Eldem, “Foreigners at the Threshold of Felicity: The Reception of Foreigners in Ottoman Istanbul”, 2013, pp.116-119.

³⁵ Aydoğan, 2012, pp.109-110.

³⁶ Gilles Veinstein, “Osmanlılar ve Avrupa Kavramı” [Ottomans and the Concept of Europe], in, ed. D. Couto, *Harp ve Sulh, Avrupa ve Osmanlılar*, Kitap Yayınevi, İstanbul, 2010, pp.47-55.

recording events in Middle Eastern lands. His places of pilgrimage – Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Nazareth – were all under Muslim rule (...).

The Muslim had no comparable concern with Christian Europe. His religion was born in Arabia; his prophet was an Arab; his scriptures were in Arabic; and his places of pilgrimage, Mecca and Medina, were safely in Muslim lands”³⁷.

That Latin Christians were inextricably bound (or *felt* inextricably bound) to the Near East for religio-historical purposes whereas Muslims had no *spiritual* motivation to direct them to Frankish lands might indeed seem convincing at first glance. After all, from the papal bulls of the High Middle Ages, the *recuperatio* treatises of the Quattrocento, to the irenic or belligerent exhortations of the later humanist discourse, Holy Lands as well as centers such as Constantinople which fell captive to “impure barbarians” have been a relatively major concern for considerable parts of the Western world³⁸. “Marciare verso Constatinopoli” seemed thus a natural, devotional task for Euro-Christians, an almost “rational” attempt to recapture the desecrated lands of Christendom, whereas the motivation behind Muslim invasions of European lands could at best be explained by a

³⁷ Lewis, 2001, p.8. Likewise, Matar, although a prominent critic of Lewis, still partially explains the paucity of Arabic travel in Western Europe by “the absence of Islamic religious sites in Europe”. Furthermore, he adds that “Arab travelers faced the difficulty of having to rely for their transportation on European ships – ships whose crew were not always willing to take “Mahumetans” on board”. See Matar, *In the Lands of Christians*, 2003, p. XXV.

³⁸ James Hankins, “Renaissance Crusaders: Humanist Crusade Literature in the Age of Mehmed II”, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, Vol. 49, 1995, pp.111-207. See also, Soykut, 2011 or Pippidi, 2013. For Greek immigrants and refugees’ calls on Western princes for action in the East, see for example, Aphrodite Papayianni, “He Polis Healo: The Fall of Constantinople in 1453 in Post-Byzantine Popular Literature”, *Al-Masaq*, Vol. 22, 1, 2010, pp. 27-44.

Since Paul Wittek elaborated his famous “Gaza Theory” in *The Rise of the Ottoman Empire*, Royal Asiatic Society, London, 1938, scholars have discussed the extent to which Ottoman expansion could be explained by religious motivations. While Kafadar, 1995, improved and relativized his position, Lowry, *The Nature of the Early Ottoman State*, State University of New York Press, 2003, criticized it. For a recent re-assessment, see Linda Darling, “Reformulating the Gazi Narrative: When Was the Ottoman State a Gazi State?” *Turcica*, 2011, pp.13-53.

senseless, quasi-fanatical urge to convert infidel lands and peoples, along with a more practical drive towards plunder and financial gain³⁹.

Nonetheless, even if the factualness of narratives which somehow rationalize European intellectual and military action opposed to Oriental inaction were to be accepted, one would still need to delve deeper into the intricate processes through which Europeans constructed and ordered their cosmological universe, incorporating oriental lands and peoples into their *mental map*⁴⁰. Geraldine Heng shows in her study of Mandeville's Travels that the work sets down "*Christian marks* for its depictions of faraway regions, so that an audience can see that distant, exotic lands are not as to be wholly foreign, nor so distant as to be untouched by familiar Christian culture"⁴¹. The

³⁹ See Radu Paun, quoting Peter Bartl in, "Enemies Within: Networks of Influence and the Military Revolts against the Ottoman Power, Moldavia and Wallachia, Sixteenth-Seventeenth Centuries", in *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, 2013, p.215.

⁴⁰ For a good study affirming the importance of the use of simplified images and stereotypes to make sense of alien societies see Partha Mitter, "Can we ever understand alien cultures? Some epistemological concerns relating to the perception and understanding of the Other", *Comparative Criticism*, 9, 1987, pp.3-34. See p.13: "stereotypes should not be dismissed as mere prejudice. The stereotyping of the alien is a way of making sense of the unfamiliar".

⁴¹ Geraldine Heng, *Empires of Magic: Medieval Romance and the Politics of Cultural Fantasy*, Columbia University Press, 2003, p.262. Discourses of sameness seem to have been quite useful in attracting the attention, sympathizing (when intended or needed) or making intelligible remote or alien lands to a familiar audience. As such, the famous Jesuit scholar Athanasius Kircher (d.1680) "discovers" and displays intimate religious connections between China and Europe in his *China Illustrata* published in 1667. By the same token, Ali Ekber Khitayi, who composed a travel account on China in 1516 dedicated to Ottoman Sultans, enumerated similarities between the emerging Ottoman Empire and the glorious Ming dynasty. Throughout the volume, China is presented as a mirror image of the Ottoman state and an example to be emulated. Akin to Mandeville's *Christian India*, it possesses a perceivable, familiar and prosperous *Muslim* population. See, Pinar Emiralioğlu, "Relocating the Center of the Universe: China and the Ottoman Imperial Project in the 16th Century", *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 39, 2012, pp.161-187. For the use of a similar process in the case of Euro-Ethiopian relations, see Matteo Salvatore, "The Jesuit Mission to Ethiopia (1555-1634) and the death of Prester John", in *World Building and the Early Modern Imagination*, (ed.) A. Kavey, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2010, pp.141-171. This article is particularly valuable in the sense that it masterfully demonstrates the circumstantial and personal nature of such "sympathetic" depictions. While the first Portuguese accounts on Ethiopia opted for a descriptive and relativist approach, later works produced by Jesuits during the Counter-Reformation transformed the splendid territories of the marvellous Christian King into a land of heresy, barbaric alterity, using an increasingly judgemental, prescriptive and Eurocentric tone.

same effort to *domesticate alterity* can be observed in the use of the legend of Prester John, the mythical Christian king of rather indefinite, faraway lands. Just as the Biblical past has been seen as a justification for Western encroachment in Muslim territories, so too “the cultural myth of Prester John both expressed and urged forward the drive to open up new routes and territories⁴². Beyond the struggles with heathens and countless other difficulties, lay the possessions of a *familiar* and friendly Christian king⁴³.

Accordingly, other fabrications could be used for the purposes of making sense of an unaccustomed situation or to support and legitimize an “unholy” alliance. In Renaissance poetry and popular literature, previously unidentified Turks were marked as Trojans in origin, whereas in historiography, they were mostly classified as Scythians. By calling them Scythians, humanists were all too predictably pitting Turks against the *civilized* world, relegating them to the status of uncouth barbarians. But they were also according them an authoritative ancient pedigree, providing their audience with a convincing explanation of the sudden appearance and rise of an unfamiliar folk. Turks were thus *naturalized* and brought into the mental map of a Western public⁴⁴.

⁴² Heng adds, p.287, that “in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, when Latin Europe desired to reconquer territory in Syria and Palestine, and reestablish its lost crusader colonies, Prester John, “a product of the thought-world of the crusades” (Hamilton, *Continental Drift*, 256), was activated as an ideological and military goal, a spur to martial projects. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, John reemerged to invite and urge on Europe’s peregrinary ambitions around the world outside the Mediterranean, as an icon of ever widening extra-territorial projects of world discovery, trade, and settlement”. See also Parker, 2011, p.190 for the legend of Prester John and the Portuguese explorers.

⁴³ The quest or longing for a distant but presumably friendly and beneficial monarch is equally discernable in Khitayi’s *Book of China* (1516). In fact, “Khitayi maintains that the Chinese emperor, Kin Tay (the Zhengde Emperor) had been very friendly with the Muslims and had Muslim warlords under his service. Khitayi also recounts that the eunuchs of the Chinese palace are all Muslims who can practice their faith without any limitations. He relates a ‘popular story’ that the son of Kin Tay Khan converted to Islam after seeing Muhammad in his dream and finding the *shahada* inscribed on his wall in green letters”. See Emiralioğlu, 2012, p.180.

⁴⁴ Meserve, *Empires of Islam*, 2008, p.16.

Correspondingly, seemingly incomprehensible and appalling characters, such as the enigmatic and dreadful Saladin, Zengi or Mehmed II, could be painlessly domesticated and moulded into a more “Euro-Christian” shape. Rumours that Mehmed’s mother was a Christian, and that he had secretly converted to Christianity circulated in the fifteenth century princely courts of Italy, while much more elaborated stories reported that Ida, the widowed countess of Austria, had been captured and married to a Saracen and gave birth to Zengi who subsequently seized Edessa from the hands of the Franks in 1144. Likewise, some others believed that Saladin was a descendant of the daughter of the Count of Ponthieu, or that he had himself baptized on his deathbed⁴⁵.

In addition to that, Margaret Meserve demonstrates that claims to common genealogies could also serve as a means to justify a religiously or politically unacceptable or immoral alliance. As she points out, “medieval authors had often tried to justify possible alliances with Asian rulers on the grounds that they were already crypto-Christians or might in future be induced to convert (...). [Renaissance] humanists too toyed with these notions but found it equally important to portray the objects of their interest as politically legitimate, often by inventing fantastic dynastic claims that linked these Muslim lords to the ruling houses of ancient Babylon, Persia, and Parthia”⁴⁶. One could thus argue that Western affiliations with the Middle Eastern world were not as

⁴⁵ J.A.H.M. Cruz, “Popular Attitudes Toward Islam in Medieval Europe”, in *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, 1999, p.63. See also Hankins, 1995, p.143. For a close reading of the French nouvelle *La Fille du Comte de Ponthieu*, see Sharon Kinoshita, “The Romance of MiscegeNation: Negotiating Identities in *La Fille du Comte de Pontieu*”, in *Postcolonial Moves: Medieval Through Modern*, (eds.) P.C. Ingham and M. R. Warren, Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, pp.111-133.

⁴⁶ Meserve, 2008, p.17.

natural and unproblematic as Bernard Lewis would have them to be. The “compelling reasons” of Western interest in the East were in reality carefully and progressively constructed religio-political discourses, at times disregarded and sometimes revived, re-interpreted or sustained according to changing circumstances⁴⁷.

Accordingly, the assertion that Ottomans engaged in similar “inventions” becomes all the more convincing and conceivable. Their religion may have been “born in Arabia”, but they might have equally invented and constructed narratives that would have expanded their horizons beyond the Abode of Islam. Just as the myth of Prester John both encouraged and legitimized Western action in different parts of the globe, Ottomans might have created and promoted myths that would have justified their interest in the *Frenghistan*. Furthermore, erecting boundaries and building a discourse of political and religious alterity required one to simultaneously acknowledge another form of reality against which the aforementioned frontiers ought to be drawn⁴⁸. Confronted to the Frankish reality, Ottomans inevitably included the Frenks in their cosmological universe, incorporated them in age-old legends and fables, invented and supported new ones, and created fictional genealogies. More simply put, Ottomans made sense of the Frenks⁴⁹.

⁴⁷ For the ways European Christians constructed otherness, displayed sameness and employed myths and legends to build empires under different circumstances, see the articles in *World Building and the Early Modern Imagination*, (ed.) A. Kavey, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2010.

⁴⁸ In that sense, Georg Simmel’s definition of the stranger as “a member of the group itself, an element whose membership within the group involves being outside it and confronting it” seems appropriate. Quoted in Nathalie Rothman, *Brokering Empire: Trans-Imperial Subjects between Venice and Istanbul*, Cornell University Press, 2011, pp.6-7. Rothman rightfully adds that boundaries are not “pregiven and fixed”. As a consequence, “a priori distinct” social formations do not exist, but are created and re-created over time and space, under different conditions and circumstances. See pp.9-10.

⁴⁹ For the similar ways “Non-Chinese” neighbor estates were incorporated into the discourse of several Ming texts of the 15th and 16th centuries by way forging common genealogies, see, Leo K. Shin, “Thinking about “Non-Chinese” in Ming China, in, *Antiquarianism and Intellectual Life in Europe and China, 1500-1800*, (eds.) P. N. Miller, F. Louis, University of Michigan Press, 2012, pp.289-312.

Recent studies have successfully pointed out the ways in which Ottomans constructed a systematic discourse to enhance their world-wide imperial ambitions⁵⁰. Palace dignitaries, poets, cartographers and bureaucrat/historians all presented the Ottoman ruler with grandiose epithets, emphasizing his power and rule over both East and West⁵¹. In the early sixteenth century, after Selim I's (d.1520) conquests of Arab lands and Süleyman's (d.1566) acquisitions in eastern Europe, Ottomans found themselves actively competing with the ascending Portuguese power in the Indian Ocean while defying Habsburg power in the Mediterranean and in central Europe. Claiming universal leadership, they used appropriate sets of images and designations for Islamic as well as Christian publics respectively. While titles such as *Sahib-kiran-i heft iklim* ("master of the auspicious conjunction in seven climes") or *Mujaddid* (the Renewer) were clearly directed towards a Muslim audience, self-publicizing nominations such as "Caesar" were intended to contest the rule of European lords⁵². As Emiralioglu states, "under the leadership of Suleyman's grand vizier, Ibrahim Pasha, both the military campaigns and the political discourse

⁵⁰ Casale, 2010, p.150, asserts that Ottoman imperial pretensions in South East Asia were negotiated not by force but by the conscious and careful establishment of an Ottoman "soft power", not based on "territorial expansion, but instead on an infrastructure of trade, communication, and religious ideology". Taking the larger Eurasian context into account, Kaya Şahin explores in his recent monograph the ways in which Ottoman imperial visions were articulated in the work of a prominent Ottoman bureaucrat, Celalzade Mustafa (d.1567). See, Kaya Şahin, *Empire and Power in the Reign of Süleyman: Narrating the Sixteenth-Century Ottoman World*, Cambridge University Press, 2013.

⁵¹ Tijana Krstic, "Of Translation and Empire: Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Interpreters (Dragomans) as Renaissance Go-Betweens", (ed.) C. Woodhead, *The Ottoman World*, Routledge, London, 2011, demonstrates skillfully how Ottoman interpreters contributed to the formation of an Ottoman imperial image, especially in times when imperial discourse was more open to, or in need of, non-Muslim modes of legitimization. She affirms that their influence diminished towards the end of Suleyman's reign and its aftermath, as Ottoman Sultans increasingly sought to fashion themselves as Sunni caliphs. For a valuable assessment of the intimate links between imperialism and historiography, see the articles in *Writing History at the Ottoman Court*, especially Fatma Sinem Eryılmaz, "From Adam to Süleyman: Visual Representations of Authority in Arif's *Shahname-yi Al-I Osman*", pp.100-128 which examines the image of the prophet-king attributed to Suleyman in the work of the court eulogist Arifi, completed in 1558.

⁵² See for example Gilles Veinstein, "Charles Quint et Soliman le Magnifique: Le Grand Défi", G. Veinstein, *Autoportrait du Sultan Ottoman En Conquérant*, Isis and Gorgias Press, 2011, pp. 241-255.

conveyed one clear message: Sultan Süleyman was challenging the authority of both the Pope and the Holy Roman Emperor”⁵³. In fact, as Gülru Necipoğlu’s brilliant study reveals, both Suleyman and his favorite and vizier Ibrahim Pasha (born as a Venetian citizen in Parga) were keen to challenge Habsburg power by every possible means. The triumphal spectacles designed for western observers in the Ottoman military campaign of 1532 where Süleyman exceptionally carried an ostentatious western-style helmet crafted specifically in Venice for the occasion were manifestly conceived as a response to Charles V’s recent coronation in Bologna as Holy Roman Emperor⁵⁴.

Accordingly, as their political competitors, military adversaries, or trade partners, Ottomans had to place Frenks somewhere within their cognitive map. In medieval and early modern times, Westerners had often explicated the origins of “Saracens” (or Asians and Jews in general) by linking them to Noah’s son Shem, while they identified themselves with his other son, Japeth⁵⁵. In addition to that, geographic or climatic

⁵³ Pinar Emiralioğlu, Cartography and the Ottoman Imperial Project in the Sixteenth Century, (eds.) S. Bazzaz, D. Angelov, Y. Batsaki, *Imperial Geographies in Byzantine and Ottoman Space*, Harvard University Press, 2013, p.74.

⁵⁴ See Gülru Necipoğlu, *Süleyman the Magnificent and the Representation of Power in the Context of Ottoman-Hapsburg-Papal Rivalry*, *Art Bulletin*, Vol. 71, 3, 1989, pp.401-427. See also O. Kumrular, “La Campana de Alemania: Rito, Arte y Demostracion”, *L’Empire Ottoman dans l’Europe de la Renaissance, El Imperio Otomano en la Europa Renacentista*, (ed.) A. Servantie, Leuven University Press, 2005, pp.214. Equally important are Giancarlo Casale’s articles on the famous “Mappamundi of Tunuslu Hajji Ahmed”. According to Casale, this Western-style Turkish map and its companion text, created in a Venetian workshop in 1559, was a reflection of Ottoman claims to universal sovereignty. Unequivocally placing the Ottoman Empire at the cultural center of Europe, it presented “a picture of the Ottoman state that is defined both geographically and historically through its relationship to the twin legacies of ancient Rome and Alexander the Great”. See Casale, “Seeing the Past: Maps and Ottoman Historical Consciousness”, in *Writing History at the Ottoman Court*, 2013, p.86. See also his “16.yüzyıla ait Türkçe Dünya Haritasında Avrupa Düşüncesi”, [The Concept of Europe in a 16th Century Turkish Mappamundi] in *Harp ve Sulh*, 2010, pp.57-82.

⁵⁵ For the rather erratic and inconsistent attributions of Biblical ancestors to specific groups, see the seminal article of Benjamin Braude, “The Sons of Noah and the Construction of Ethnic and Geographical Identities in the Medieval and Early Modern Periods”, *William and Mary Quarterly*, 54, 1, 1997, pp.104-42. For examples of pictorial representations of a “turban-clad Hagar”, a biblica figure identified mostly as

assertions were thought to elucidate certain – often unintelligible, reprehensible, or simply bizarre - characteristics foreign nations allegedly possessed⁵⁶. In a similar fashion, Ottomans benefited from the classical Arabo-Muslim geographical corpus which had largely been internalized by the end of the sixteenth century to locate and mentally assimilate Frankish lands and people. By using comparable environmental theories, Ottomans illustrated and annotated Franks’ – mostly deviating or strange - manners⁵⁷. A distinguished historian, bureaucrat and poet well-acquainted with the Arabo-Muslim corpus was Mustafa Ali (d. 1600) of Gelibolu⁵⁸. In his highly popular (ninety manuscript copies have survived) and lengthy world history entitled *The Essence of Histories*, Ali referred to authoritative sources such as Al-Masudi (d.956), Al-Biruni, the influential cosmographer Al-Qazwini (d.1283) or Fadlallah Rashid al-Din’s (d. 1318) universal history which contained one of the most detailed accounts of Franks ever produced in the pre-modern Islamic world⁵⁹. In surprising conformity with most Western sources and

the mother of Saracens, see, Nabil Matar, “Renaissance England and the Turban”, in (ed.) D. Blanks, *Images of the Other: Europe and the Muslim World Before 1700*, Cairo Papers in Social Science, Vol.19, no.2, American University in Cairo Press, 1997, p.39.

⁵⁶ From Aristotle’s *Politics* to Montesquieu’s *L’Esprit des Lois*, climatic determinism has served the purposes of “explaining” human (cultural) diversity. For the prominence of racial, social and geographical categorization and hierarchization based on natural-scientific theories, see Bartlett, “Medieval and Modern Concepts of Race and Ethnicity”, *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, Vol.31, no.1, 2001, pp.39-56. As he remarks, p.46, “environmental thinking was rarely value-free. It usually turned out that the best environment (...) was the author’s own”. See also Waldemar Zacharasiewicz’s “The Theory of Climate and the Tableau of Nationalities”, in his collection of essays, *Imagology Revisited*, Rodopi, Amsterdam, New York, 2010 which shows how the practice was carried well into the Enlightenment.

⁵⁷ For similar constructions in medieval Arabic geography see, Aziz Al-Azmeh, “Barbarians in Arab Eyes”, *Past and Present*, No.134, 1992, pp.3-6. As Al-Azmeh states, p.6: “Arabic ethnology, including the ethnography of barbarism, was governed by a natural-scientific ecological determinism mediated through the notions of humoral medicine”.

⁵⁸ Mustafa Ali’s life and career stand out as one among the most studied Ottomans by modern scholars. See Cornell Fleischer’s biography, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The Historian Mustafa Ali (1541-1600)*, Princeton University Press, 1986. For a different approach and study of Mustafa Ali’s most celebrated work, see Jan Schmidt, *Pure Water for Thirsty Muslims: a Study of Mustafa Ali of Gallipoli’s Künhü l-Ahbar*, Leiden, 1991. For a profitable discussion of the two, see, Gabriel Piterberg, *An Ottoman Tragedy: History and Historiography at Play*, University of California Press, 2003, pp.36-42.

⁵⁹ See Schmidt, 1992, *Pure Waters*, p.21.

probably following Al-Masudi's predications, he similarly reported that Franks (*Ifrenj*) were the descendants of Nuh's (Noah) third son *Yafith*, along with the Chinese, Serbians (Sakalib), Turks, Mongols, Tatars, Khazars, Russians (Rus) and Greeks⁶⁰.

However, other possible genealogies could be suggested or insinuated at different occasions or contexts. In yet another history of the world from its creation to contemporary times named '*The Quintessence of Histories*' commissioned by Murad III (d. 1595) himself and authored by the official court historian Seyyid Lokman, the figure of the Frank had been projected back to pre-Islamic times and Franks were thus identified with the people of Ad, a cursed community believed to be Arabian descendants of Noah, which disobeyed God and paid no heed to the Koranic prophet Hud's warnings resulting in its utter destruction⁶¹. Although another set of illustrations depicted the Franks as various different pre-Islamic infidels in the same work, allusions to the people of Ad may be tentatively traced to older Arabic epic narratives in which Franks are represented as

For a discussion of Al-Qazwini's "cosmology of marvels" entitled '*Marvels of Creations and Rarities of Existence*' and its popularity and impact on "Islamic societies", see Travis Zadeh, "The Wiles of Creation: Philosophy, Fiction, and the Aja'ib Tradition", *Middle Eastern Literatures*, Vol. 13, No.1, 2010, pp.21-48. For the Ilkhanid vizier Rashiduddin's *Compendium of Chronicles*, see the recent volume, *Rashid al-Din: Agent and Mediator of Cultural Exchanges in Ilkhanid Iran*, (eds.) A. Akasoy, C. Burnett and R. Yoeli-Tlalim, The Warburg Institute, London-Turin, 2013, especially the chapter by Christopher Atwood, "Mongols, Arabs, Kurds, and Franks: Rashid al-Din's Anthropology of Tribal Society", pp.1-29.

⁶⁰ Schmidt, 1992, pp.140-142. For Al-Masudi's genealogy, see, Bernard Lewis, "Ifrenj", *Encyclopedie de l'Islam*, Nouvelle Edition, pp.1070-1072. See also the work of the distinguished and highly influential historian Al-Tabari (d.923) and his account on Noah's progeny in his *History of the Prophets and Kings*.

⁶¹ Tezcan, "The Frank in the Ottoman Eye of 1583", pp.273-275. For the political context under which the *Quintessence* has been produced, see also Tezcan, "The Many Lives of the First Non-Western History of the Americas: From the New Report to the History of the West Indies", *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, Vol.40, pp.1-39. According to him, the production of the *Quintessence* mainly emphasized the peace established between Spain and the Ottoman Empire. As such, it was a product of the pro-peace faction in the court. For a broader discussion on late sixteenth-century Ottoman historiography see, Idem, "The Politics of Early Modern Ottoman Historiography", in, *The Early Modern Ottomans: Remapping the Empire*, pp.167-198.

huge, clean-shaven men, “like left-overs from the race of Ad”⁶². Likewise, the ill-famed, wretched infidel called Yanko bin Madyan, imaginary founder of the city of Constantinople in a number of Ottoman accounts of the fifteenth century, is also rendered as a direct descendant of the people of Ad⁶³.

In fact, the foundation stories of Constantinople and Hagia Sophia, so extensively scrutinized by Stephane Yerasimos, are fascinating sources which allow us to evaluate the degree to which the Frenks and the Frengistan penetrated the Ottoman psyche as early as the fifteenth century⁶⁴. The first full-fledged narrative of the mythical Constantinopolitan genesis is found in an anonymous chronicle of Ottoman history, dated roughly around 1491, and heavily influenced, among others, by the classical cosmography of Ahmed Yazıcıoğlu entitled *Dürr-i Meknun* (“The Hidden Pearl”) written sometime between 1444 and 1456⁶⁵. As Yerasimos notes, the story is a relatively open critique of Mehmed’s centralizing policies and presents rather cheerlessly the new

⁶² See the first volume by M.C. Lyons, *The Arabian Epic: Heroic and Oral Story-telling*, Cambridge University Press, 2005, p.27. For an analysis of another set of miniatures in an earlier work by Seyyid Lokman and the depiction of the Venetians, see Emine Fetvacı, “Others and Other Geographies in the *Şehname-i Selim Han*”, *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, Vol.40, 2012, pp.81-101. As the author states, p.93, one must bear in mind that “the perception of otherness is also closely correlated to political interests and alliances”. Frenks also appear in Esin Atıl, *The Illustrated History of Süleyman the Magnificent*, National Gallery of Art, 1986, prepared by the famous courtier Nasuh Matrakçı (d. 1564).

⁶³ This character, which appears in the countless copies of the different versions of the fifteenth and sixteenth-century anonymous ‘Histories of the Ottoman Dynasty’ (*Tevarih-i Al-i Osman*), is in fact, as Stephane Yerasimos’ careful analysis has proven, a misreading of *Nicomedia*, which was turned into a mythical founding figure well-known for his haughtiness and misdeeds that will lead to the rightful destruction of the city. See, Stephane Yerasimos, *La Fondation de Constantinople et de Sainte Sophie dans les Traditions Turques*, Maisonneuve, Paris, 1990. Unfortunately, we have only been able to consult the Turkish translation of this work by Şirin Tekeli, *Kostantiniye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, İletişim, İstanbul 1993. References will be made to this version.

⁶⁴ Once more, the idea will not be to assess the level or the quality of Ottoman *knowledge* of the West. Instead, the focus will be on the Ottoman *fantasia* of the Frengistan.

⁶⁵ Yazıcıoğlu Ahmed Bircan, *Dürr-i Meknun*, (ed.) Necdet Sakaoğlu, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999. On the *Hidden Pearl*’s influence in the development of the foundation legends, see, Yerasimos, p.83. On the sources of the *Pearl*, see p.281.

imperial capital as an eternally damned city, abode of incorrigible and incurable infidels and ultimately doomed to destruction⁶⁶. Although this downright pejorative account was not thoroughly followed and was modified by future writers, its impact was decisive and most of the characters mentioned, whether “fictional” or not, were incorporated in subsequent versions of the story. As such, in all divergent accounts, ancient rulers of Constantinople are uniformly presented as world masters, ruling over boundless lands, including the *Frengistan*. Although the critical anonymous version of 1491 links some of these rulers’ origins to “despicable Hungarians”, the pro-imperial variants positively emphasize Constantine or Justinian’s inextricable ties to Rome and as such, domesticate them by tracing a direct genealogical line culminating in the glorious reign of Mehmed II⁶⁷. Although flawed and visibly imperfect Christians, these old and venerable rulers personify, in a sense, a bygone epoch where East and West were ever-more connected and ruled from one center, Constantinople⁶⁸.

⁶⁶ As Yerasimos convincingly observes, pp.301-306, the faction resisting wide-ranging and overwhelming imperial policies was probably based in the customary capital Edirne. Correspondingly, they were voicing the interests of the increasingly alienated *gazi* warriors in the marches of the Empire, rejecting the idea of a central authority revolving around an “infidel” and dilapidated city.

⁶⁷ According to the legend, *Buzantin* is the son of Yanko b. Madyan and has ruled over European lands “bordering the Frengistan” before coming back to Constantinople left in ruins since his father’s disastrous rule. With great effort, he resurrects the city but commits terrible sins such as forcing his subjects to venerate his effigies, which leads yet again to the demolition of the cursed city. See Yerasimos, *Kostantiniye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, p.30: “[Buzantin] fled this province and reached Engürüs and ruled over the Engürüs, Çih (Czech) and Çesar (Austrian?) and Moskov and Bosnian provinces on the fringes of the Frengistan for over forty years”.

⁶⁸ As Yerasimos suggests, p.100, pro-imperial accounts of the legend purposefully emphasized the city’s links to Rome so as to enhance and legitimize their universal and imperial claims. The anti-imperial clan, however, supported age-old myths speaking of an eternal curse that befell upon the three imperial cities of Rome Alexandria and Constantinople. See Yerasimos, *Kostantiniye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, p.92. Significantly, and in direct opposition to the pro-imperial bloc, the anti-imperial faction abstains from associating the ruling dynasty of Constantinople with Rome, choosing a “Hungarian” genealogy instead. As Yerasimos notes, p.180, the decision is no innocent one. In fact, at the end of the fifteenth century, Hungarians were the most serious threat to Ottoman power.

Besides allusions to a *shared past*, another – more subtle - indication that hints to the proportions to which Ottomans myths had been permeated by Western elements is the motif of the “Frenk architect”⁶⁹. The anonymous text of 1491 reports that according to some rumours, the “revered and talented architect” assigned to the construction of Haghia Sophia arrived from the land of Franks. As Yerasimos’ careful dissection reveals, however, the trope of the sage creator (the architect) at the service of the mighty emperor is a directly transposed theme from Ferdowsi’s (d. 1020) grandiose epic poem *The Book of Kings*, highly popular in Ottoman literary circles. According to the story, the mighty Sassanian king Chosroes I (d. 579), after a careful examination of multiple candidates, finally picked an enigmatic “Rumi” (Byzantine) architect for the construction of his new palace near Ctesiphon⁷⁰. Interestingly enough, the Ottoman legend turned the renowned Rumi architect into an ingenious Frenk. This literary displacement as well as previously mentioned elements suggest that Frenks were ever-present constituents of the Ottoman/Muslim cosmos. At times relegated to distant Biblical times and at times presented as valuable and praiseworthy rulers, Frenks were not merely a contemporary reality. They were part of a larger, *common* past. Ottomans imagined them dominating Constantinople, fighting older generations of Muslims and even constructing the Haghia Sophia. To them, Franks had left visible and concrete marks in the lands they now inhabited.

In addition to that, other references seem to indicate that Frenks found their way into Ottoman myths, fables or stories. The above-mentioned sixth-century Sassanian ruler

⁶⁹ See Yerasimos, *Kostantiniye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, p.36.

⁷⁰ Yerasimos, *Kostantiniye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, pp.185-6.

Chosroes (Khusraw) Nushirvan's manipulation and use in several Ottoman texts is a fine case example. As is well known, presumably under the impact of lavish descriptions by Ferdowsi, Chosroes had been traditionally depicted as the supreme example of the just ruler in Muslim historiography. Nasuh Matrakci (d.1564), a court historian and miniature painter commissioned by the Sultan Suleyman to record the military events of the imperial campaigns of 1542-3, produced a work entitled *Tarih-i Feth-i Siklos ve Estergon ve Istulnibelgrad*⁷¹. Included are depictions of Süleyman's march into Hungary and miniature plans of Mediterranean ports such as Toulon, Marseilles, Genoa or Nice. An interesting detail, however, is Matrakci's comparison of François I (d.1547) to the Sassanian Chosroes⁷². Indeed, in a political context in which the Ottoman grand admiral Barbarossa was sent to assist the French fleet in a naval campaign, such an analogy may not seem particularly significant⁷³. But the specific use of a decisively Perso-Muslim image to praise an infidel French king indirectly brings the latter into the core of the Islamic literary tradition. By manipulating the legendary figure of a familiar ruler, a distant and presumably obscure persona such as the French king is made intelligible to the Ottoman reader.

⁷¹ See footnote, 56. Also, *Before and After Piri Reis: Maps at the Topkapi Palace*, Bilkent Kültür Girişimi, Istanbul, 2013, p.44, or Jerry Brotton, 1997, p.115.

⁷² Christine Isom-Verhaaren, "Barbarossa and his Army Who Came to Succor All of Us: Ottoman and French Views of Their Joint Campaign of 1543-1544", *French Historical Studies*, 2007, 30, 3, p.404.

⁷³ For the supposedly "uneasy" Ottoman-French coalition in the sixteenth century, see also, inter alia, Christine Isom-Verhaaren, *Allies with the Infidel: The Ottoman and French Alliance in the Sixteenth Century*, I.B. Tauris, 2013.

A yet more striking example comes from an earlier and much less sophisticated work, the anonymous *Gazavat-i Sultan Murad*⁷⁴. Here, the context is utterly different. The text recounts the painful but successful military campaign of Murad II (d. 1451) at Varna against Christian forces under the leadership of the famous commander Janos Hunyadi in 1443-1444. Accordingly, during the preparation phase of the campaign, while Christian forces correspond with each other, the Byzantine emperor (*tekfur*) writes to the Hungarian king in order to encourage him to fight the Ottomans. As a characteristic of the *gazaname* style, the use of direct speech adds vividness and an aura of authenticity to the text. The Byzantine emperor addresses the Hungarian king, calling him “O king, descendant of the glorious line of Nusirevan”⁷⁵.

⁷⁴ *Gazavat-ı Sultan Murad b. Mehmed Han: İzladi ve Varna Savaşları (1443-1444) Üzerinde Anonim Gazavatname*, eds. H. İnalçık, M. Oğuz, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, Ankara, 1978. The *Gazaname* (pl. *Gazavatname*) is, as Victor Ostapchuk notes, “a writing on holy war”, and is genre that held a prominent place in Ottoman literary culture. Written in prose or composed as lengthy poems, these texts narrate the heroic exploits of a warrior/commander (theoretically) fighting for the expansion of Islam, or recount successful military campaigns in epic tones. As works of *belles-lettres*, their main objective is to extol the military accomplishments of their protagonists, and entertain the readers or the listeners. Consequently, “exaggerations, half-truths, and even inventions are scarcely avoidable in such pieces”. More significantly than rendering concrete historical data, they provide openings to mainstream Ottoman attitudes, mentalities and visions and form, as such, the backbone of our study. Although hard to discern, some *gazavatnames* are very easily traceable to oral traditions, while others are more sophisticated (and official) accounts of a given expedition. See V. Ostapchuk, “An Ottoman Gazaname on Halil Pasha’s Naval Campaign against the Cossacks”, 1621, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol.14, No.3-4, 1990, pp.482-3. See also Christine Woodhead, “The Ottoman Gazaname: Stylistic Influences on the Writing of Campaign Narratives”, in, (ed.) K. Çiçek, *The Great Ottoman Turkish Civilisation*, Vol.III, Yeni Türkiye, Ankara, pp.55-60. For the overall relevance of the *gazaname* and similar folk narratives for Ottoman Studies, see Rhoads Murphey, “Seyyid Muradi’s Prose Biography of Hızır İbn Yakub, Alias Hayreddin Barbarossa: Ottoman Folk Narrative as an Under-Exploited Source for Historical Reconstruction”, *Acta Orientalia*, Vol.54, 4, 2001, pp.519-532. See the canonical work of Agah Sırrı Levend, *Gazavat-nameler ve Mihail-oğlu Ali Bey’in Gazavatnamesi*, Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1956. For another brief but general assessment, Aydoğan’s previously mentioned article, “Creating an İdeal Self”, 2012. For a recent study of the “Ali Bey Gazavatnamesi” published by Levend, see Ezgi Dikici, “Christian Imagery in an Ottoman Poem: The ‘Icons’ of Muslim Holy Warriors in Suzi’s Gazavatname,” *Annual of Medieval Studies at CEU*, 14, 2008, pp.9-22. For a discussion of earlier epic circles such as the *Battalname* as well as an analysis of the *Gazavat-ı Sultan Murad* which directly influenced later works, see Anooshahr, *The Ghazi Sultans and the Frontiers of Islam*, pp.142-152.

⁷⁵ *Gazavat-ı Sultan Murad*, p.39.

Interestingly, awarding an illustrious Persian lineage to a Western king and merging a somewhat “alien” Western world into the Perso-Muslim universe seems to have been quite fashionable. Evliya Çelebi, the renowned Ottoman traveler of the seventeenth century, accommodates the two realms, bringing them closer by elaborating a fictional etymology⁷⁶. According to him, Hungarians, called “Macar” (Magyar) in Ottoman, were originally from Persia, the word “Macar” actually rooted in the Persian “Mençar” (“we are four”). Menuchar, the descendant of Hushang, the second ruler of the legendary Pishdadian dynasty, had migrated in modern-day Hungary, bringing along with him the famous “crown (gorona) of Alexander” which he had inherited from Hushang. After definitively settling in Eastern Europe, Menucahr’s four sons the “Mençar”, mistakenly named “Macar”, had founded important cities in Hungary such as Eger. According to Evliya, the “Crown of Alexander”, meaning the Holy Crown of Hungary (i.e. the Crown of St. Stephen) was unfortunately detained by the “Caesar of Nemçe” (*Nemçe Çasarı*, i.e. the Habsburg Emperor). Sultan Murad IV had desired to get it back but had passed away before even attempting an assault. Finally, Evliya concluded the passage with the hope that Ottomans would eventually succeed in acquiring the guardedly concealed Crown. Again, however, through a fanciful etymological association and a fictive genealogical connection, Hungarians are brought into a comprehensive and familiar Ottoman/Muslim reality⁷⁷.

⁷⁶ See Robert Dankoff, “The Languages of the World according to Evliya Çelebi”, *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 13, 1989, pp.27-28.

⁷⁷ For Evliya’s manipulation and inconsistent rendering of the legendary Pishdadian line and its ultimate connection to Hungary, see also Jean-Louis Bacqué Grammont, “Osmanlı Seyyahı Evliya Çelebi’nin bir Teması Üzerine Çevre, Merkez ve Sebep Sonuç İlişkileri”, [Center, Periphery and Causal Links Based on a Theme by Evliya Çelebi], in *Evliya Çelebi Konuşmaları* [Evliya Çelebi Talks], (ed.) Sabri Koz, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2011, pp.70-79. Interestingly, the study of Eastern and Western depictions of St. George reveals that even in remote Anatolian lands, Ottoman-Muslims were aware of sharing and

On the other hand, claiming related or shared genealogies was not always an innocent effort to grasp the complexity of human diversity. It was also a means to explicate and justify presumably odd or dishonourable political moves⁷⁸. The legitimation process of the much discussed 16th century “Ottoman-French rapprochement” best illustrates this point. Selaniki (d.1600), an Ottoman secretary who kept a diary of the activities of the Ottoman administration from 1563 to 1600, briefly mentions that Mehmed II’s mother had referred to the French king as “our prince, and of our race”⁷⁹. On this basis, he proceeded to acknowledge the traditional and exceptional friendship between France and the Ottoman Empire.

In a similar but more elaborated vein, Ibrahim Peçevi (d.1650), an important Ottoman official-turned-historian, reports in great length the myth of the “French princess”⁸⁰. Accordingly, during Murad II’s reign, corsairs had seized a ship carrying the daughter of the King of France. Being brought into the Ottoman harem, she had then given birth to Murad’s most prominent son, Mehmed II. This, according to Peçevi, explained the uncommon Ottoman-French alliance of the sixteenth century. Shared ancestry clarified the genuine reasons behind François I’s call for Ottoman assistance against Charles V⁸¹.

venerating a common saintly image with Frankish Christians. See Jerry Brotton, “St George between East and West”, in *Re-orienting the Renaissance*, 2005, pp.530-66.

⁷⁸ See Christine Isom-Verhaaren, “Royal French Women in the Ottoman Sultans’ Harem: The Political Uses of Fabricated Accounts from the Sixteenth to the Twenty-First Century”, *Journal of World History*, Vol.17, No.2, 2006, pp.159-196.

⁷⁹ *Tarih-i Selaniki*, 2 Vols, (ed.) Mehmet İpşirli, İstanbul Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 1989. See Vol.II, pp.656-7: “Şehzademüzdür ve ırkımızdandır”.

⁸⁰ See Isom-Verhaaren, 2006, pp.164-5.

⁸¹ For Western inventions of fictional identities as legitimizing and justifying contact and familiarity with hostile but overwhelming powers, see the well-known example of the imposing Sultana Nur Banu (d.1583), wife of Selim II (d.1574) and mother of Murad III (d.1595), associated with a noble Venetian family. In,

Later on, the same story was embellished and reshaped by Evliya Çelebi. According to him, the French princess captured was in reality the mother of Prince Cem (d.1495), son of Mehmed II. As is well known, Cem had lost a succession war to his brother Bayezid (d. 1512) and had subsequently taken refuge in Rhodes, from where he had been transferred to Europe and had been held prisoner by several European rulers until he had finally died while traveling along with the retinue of the French King Charles VIII (d.1498). However, Evliya Çelebi, using similarly fanciful but apparently authoritative sources, argued rather amusingly that Cem did not in fact die but had instead visited his grandmother in France and, faking his death and thus tricking his brother Bayezid, had been later accepted as the ruler of the kingdom. His descendants were still governing France at Evliya's time. Given the fact that the two royal households were intricately related, it was all too natural that the French ambassador had precedence over all foreign representatives, even Muslim ones⁸².

Benjamin Arbel, "Nur Banu: A Venetian Sultana?", *Turcica*, 24, 1992, pp.241-259. For "loyal" Venetian contacts within the Palace and especially the harem see Maria Pia Pedani, "Safiye's Household and Venetian Diplomacy", *Turcica*, 32, 2000, pp.9-32. For another instance where imagined blood relations supported strategical political moves, see the Renaissance King Matthias Corvinus' letter to Mehmed II where he reportedly states that "he would prefer friendly and good-neighbourly connections to hostility with Mehmed "because the same blood is flowing in our veins, and we are seeking to please your majesty our elder brother at any cost", see, Pal Fodor, "The View of the Turk in Hungary: The Apocalyptic Tradition and the Legend of the Red Apple in Ottoman-Hungarian Context", in (eds.) S. Yerasimos and B. Lellouch, *Les Traditions Apocalyptiques au tournant de la chute de Constantinople*, Paris, 1999, p.113. A lesser-known example of similar manipulations is the Portuguese and Jesuit use of Julia Dias da Costa (d.1734), "a Portuguese woman who held enormous power and influence at the court of the Mughal King Bahadur Shah I (d.1712)". As T. Zaman states, "Jesuit sources (...) depict Juliana as a proxy for their spiritual mission in India, just as Portuguese sources portray her as a proxy for their political aspirations during a time when their power was waning". See, T. Zaman, "Visions of Juliana: A Portuguese Woman at the Court of the Mughals", *Journal of World History*, Vol.23, no.4, 2012, pp.762.

⁸² Isom-Verhaaren, 2006, pp.165-168. For a critical examination of the multifaceted story told by Evliya Çelebi see Jean-Louis Bacqué Grammont and Edith G. Ambros, "Cem et la Légende de la Princesse Française selon Evliya Çelebi", *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 39, 2012, pp.121-142. For the legitimizing force and the ever-shifting character of genealogical and dynastic claims in different periods of Ottoman history see, Barbara Flemming, "Political Genealogies in the Sixteenth Century", *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 7-8, 1988, pp.123-137; Baki Tezcan, "The Memory of the Mongols in Early Ottoman

Ottomans may not have had *natural* or *compelling* reasons to be interested in the Euro-Christian world. Yet, as the preceding examples have shown, they had invented them. Through false or fictive genealogies and stories, they had brought the Frenks into a more intelligible and recognizable cognitive locus. They had created and supported apocalyptic myths such as the legend of the *Kizilelma* (“Red Apple”), a fabulous city that increasingly came to be identified as Rome or Vienna, which would have presumably been the last Christian stronghold to fall into Ottoman hands before the world came to a sudden end⁸³. Just as many Europeans had relentlessly manipulated or wholeheartedly believed in the myth of Prester John, some Ottomans of the seventeenth century maintained that a certain Kasim Voyvoda, commander of Ottoman irregular forces in an Ottoman campaign in Habsburg lands in 1532 had been captured and detained “deep into the Red Apple”. Another variant of the story recounted that Kasim Voyvoda and his companions had actually managed to free themselves, founding a well-protected and isolated Muslim city somewhere in the Alps (“Alaman dağı”)⁸⁴. Clearly, the Frengistan

Historiography”, in *Writing History at the Ottoman Court*, pp.23-38. As the latter perceptively postulates, p.33: “Ottomans seem to have creatively aligned themselves with the Mongols by declaring them their cousins in the fourteenth century, when it was in their political interest to do so. Once Mongol power subsided and the Mongols left Anatolia permanently in the early fifteenth century, the Ottomans forgot about their Mongol lords and underlined their supposed loyalty to the Seljuks. Historiography, or the construction of collective memory, thus seems to be just as creative as literary fiction, especially if one considers genesis stories”.

⁸³ For the famous legend of the Red Apple and its treatment in Euro-Christian apocalyptic literature see Kenneth M. Setton, *Western Hostility to Islam and Prophecies of Turkish Doom*, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, 1992, especially the chapter entitled “Bartholomaeus Georgievicz and the Red Apple, pp.29-46; Pal Fodor, “The View of the Turk in Hungary: The Apocalyptic Tradition and the Legend of the Red Apple in Ottoman-Hungarian Context”, in P. Fodor, *In Quest of the Golden Apple: Imperial Ideology, Politics, and Military Administration in the Ottoman Empire*, Gorgias and Isis Press, 2010, pp.73-107; Stephane Yerasimos, “Apocalypses Constantinopolitaines”, *Critique*, XLVIII, 1992, pp.609-24.

⁸⁴ Stephane Yerasimos, “De l’Arbre à la Pomme: La Genealogie d’un Thème Apocalyptique”, in *Les Traditions Apocalyptiques*, (eds.) Benjamin Lellouch and Stephane Yerasimos, Paris, 1999, pp.184-5. Hindi Mahmud, a secretary of Selim II (d.1574) who had been taken prisoner during the battle of Lepanto and was compelled to live in various European cities, claimed that Rome had previously been Ottoman. See

had found a place in Ottoman minds; and via various and different devices, they had made sense of it.

III) A Shady Christian Land

Following a preliminary examination of the delicate ways Ottoman Muslims had assimilated Franks within their world-view and had adjusted to the Frankish reality beyond the borders of Islam, a more thorough exploration of what *Frengistan* actually meant to them is in order. As early as the fourteenth century, Ottomans had Genoese allies and advisors⁸⁵. They had established intimate contacts with Venetian merchants or ambassadors⁸⁶. In the sixteenth century, they had actively cooperated with the French against the Habsburgs, and had exchanged letters with the English Queen Elizabeth I

Ahmet Karataş, Ahmet Karataş, “Bir İnebahtı Gazisinin Esaret Hatıraları: Sergüzeştname-i Hindi Mahmud” [The Prison Memoirs of an Inebahtı Veteran: Sergüzeştname-i Hindi Mahmud], *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 37, 2011, p.33.

⁸⁵ See footnote No.28, and also Kate Fleet, “The Treaty of 1387 between Murad I and the Genoese”, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Vol.56, No.1, 1993, pp.13-33; Idem, “Turkish-Latin Diplomatic Relations in the Fourteenth Century: The Case of the Consul”, *Oriente Moderno*, 22, 83, no.3, 2003, pp.605-611. Colin Imber, “Before the Kapudan Pashas: Sea Power and the Emergence of the Ottoman Empire”, in *War, Law and Pseud-History*, Isis Press, Istanbul, 2012, pp.154-164, states that Ottomans mostly relied on Genoese sea power before the formation of their own fleet in the late 15th century.

⁸⁶ See Dursteler, 2006, or Peter Sebastian, “Ottoman Government Officials and their Relations with the Republic of Venice in the Early 16th Century”, in *Studies in Ottoman History in Honour of Professor V.L. Menage*, (eds.) C. Heywood and C. Imber, Isis Press, 1994, pp.319-338. As Sebastian notes, p.324, the Diarii of the chronicler and archivist Marino Sanuto “provide glimpses of an Ottoman official’s friendship or enmity towards Venice”. For connections between the Ottoman and Venetian ruling elites, see also Robert Finlay, “I am the Servant of the Turkish Sultan: Venice, the Ottoman Empire, and Christendom, 1523-1534”, in *Venice Besieged: Politics and Diplomacy during the Italian Wars, 1494-1534*, Chapter X, Aldershot, Ashgate Variorum, 2008. For a general studies of Ottoman-Venetian diplomatics see Antonio Fabris, “From Adrianople to Constantinople: Venetian-Ottoman Diplomatic Missions, 1360-1453”, *Mediterranean Historical Review*, 7, no.2, 1992, pp.154-200; Hans Theunissen, “Ottoman-Venetian Diplomats: the ‘Ahd-names’”, *Electronic Journal of Oriental Studies*, 1, No.2, 1998, pp.437-69. For a case study see for example, D. G. Wright and P.A. MacKay, “When the Serenissima and the Gran Turco Made Love: The Peace Treaty of 1478”, *Studi Veneziani*, VIII, 2007, pp.261-277.

(d.1603)⁸⁷. Therefore, they were clearly aware of the existence of different Westerners from distinct lands. And yet, they unvaryingly called their lands *Frengistan* and insisted in classifying them wholly as “Frenks”.

The present section will argue that Ottomans perceived the Frengistan first and foremost as a political and military *threat*. Administrative documents directly or indirectly dealing with the Western world as well as frontier narratives and historical chronicles constructed a Christian/Frankish Other which constantly threatened the Ottoman/Muslim Self. From an Ottoman standpoint, the Frankish world was indeed, a fragmented whole. However, despite their apparent differences, Franks’ ultimate goal had always been to achieve political unity to counter Ottoman might. Coordinated and provoked by the “Roman Pope” (Rim-Pap), they constantly plotted against Ottomans, spying, cheating, forging alliances with each other and preparing for unexpected military expeditions. Therefore, each specific *taife* (nation) was only a piece of the larger and

⁸⁷ For French-Ottoman cooperation see the previously mentioned articles and monograph by Isom-Verhaaren, 2006, 2007 and 2011. For an Ottoman perspective of a joint military campaign with France see for example, Gilles Veinstein, “Les Préparatifs de la Campagne Navale Franco-Turque en 1552 à travers les Ordres du Divan Ottoman”, *Revue de l’Occident Musulman et de la Méditerranée*, No.39, 1985, pp.35-67. Prince Cem’s captivity in French territory and the threat it posed to the Ottoman throne seems to have kindled Ottoman interest in France at the turn of the fifteenth century. Accordingly, envoyees such as Hüseyin Bey or Barak Reis have reported the emplacement of Cem and described Frankish lands. See V.L. Menage, “The Mission of an Ottoman Secret Agent in France in 1486,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1965, pp.112-132; Nicolas Vatin, “A propos du voyage en France de Huseyn, ambassadeur de Bajazet II auprès de Louis XI (1483)”, *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, IV, 1984, pp.35-44. See also the classical study by Inalcik, “A Case Study in Renaissance Diplomacy: The Agreement between Innocent VIII and Bayezid II on Djem Sultan”, *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 3, 1979, pp.209-30. For the emergence of Ottoman-English diplomatic relations see the groundbreaking work of S.A. Skilliter, *William Harborne and the Trade with Turkey: 1578-1582: a documentary study of the first Anglo-Ottoman relations*, Oxford University Press, 1977; Idem, “Three Letters from the Ottoman Sultana Safiye to Queen Elizabeth I”, *Documents from Islamic Chanceries*, (ed.) S.M. Stern, Oxford University Press, 1965, pp.119-57.

potentially dangerous puzzle traditionally and rather loosely defined as the *Christianitas*⁸⁸.

Accounting for the military struggles of the fourteenth and fifteenth century between Ottomans/Muslims and their manifold rivals, official or semi-official chronicles and popular frontier narratives did not necessarily draw clear-cut lines between binary categories such as “East” and “West”⁸⁹. Nor did they favour ‘Muslim’ opponents at the expense of ‘Christian’ ones⁹⁰. However, even the earliest accounts had shown an acute

⁸⁸ Once again, one must note that this exclusivist or antagonistic approach determined mostly by political and religious circumstances only partially reflects Ottoman visions and imageries of their Western neighbors. While it seems clear that “some Ottomans” and “some Frenks” constructed their identities in opposition to their supposedly religious or political Other, Fredrik Barth’s insightful statement which asserts that “while some do the boundary imposing, others look for loopholes” must be kept in mind. It thus seems convenient to examine the processes of othering or of *boundary-imposing*, mostly effectuated by specific members of ruling bodies under specific conditions, and to proceed, then, by attempting to locate those who “looked for loopholes” or overlooked the boundaries. See Fredrik Barth, “Boundaries and Connections”, in *Signifying Identities: Anthropological Perspectives on Boundaries and Contested Values*, (ed.) A. P. Cohen, London, p.29, quoted in Keith P. Luria, *Sacred Boundaries: Religious Coexistence and Conflict in Early Modern France*, Catholic University of America Press, 2005, footnote no.33, p. XXVI.

⁸⁹ Although the clear-cut concepts of a culturally, politically and geographically divided “East” and “West” did not exist, as mentioned earlier, theoretical or practical boundaries were still drawn between Euro-Christian and Ottoman/Muslim lands. The *Gazavatname* extolling the military exploits of the Ottoman grand admiral Barbarossa in the Mediterranean refers to “infidel shores” (*kaḫir yakası*) on countless instances. See Seyyid Muradi, *Gazavat-ı Hayreddin Paşa*, (ed.) Mustafa Yıldız, Aachen, 1993, p.173; pp.213-214. Interestingly, another telling example that exposes the early modern belief in a perceptible and rigid border between the *Abode of Islam* and *Christendom* can be found in Busbecq’s *Turkish Letters*, p.74: “I journeyed that day to Komorn. I waited patiently for the recurrence of my fever at the usual interval, but discovered that it had at last left me and, being a Turkish fever, had not ventured to cross the frontier into Christendom”.

⁹⁰ Dimitris Kastritsis, “Religious Affiliations and Political Alliances in the Ottoman Succession Wars of 1402-1413”, *Medieval Encounters*, 13, 2007, pp.222-242, demonstrates that religious loyalties were not necessarily strong enough to build reliable and solid alliances. Anooshahr, *The Ghazi Sultans and the Frontiers of Islam*, records that especially during the formative years of the Ottoman state, the rhetoric of holy war (ghaza) was mostly directed towards fellow Muslim adversaries such as Timur who had invaded Anatolia and challenged Bayezid I. Karamanids were not spared either. They were accused of hindering Ottoman action in infidel lands. Later, Mamluks were blamed with the same offence, while additionally committing the more serious crime of secretly cooperating with the heretical Safavids of Iran. For the mutual accusations of Bayazid and Timur, see, Anooshahr, pp.118-128. For Mamluk “treachery” and “ingratitude”, see Jan Schmidt, *Pure Water for Thirsty Muslims*, p.190. For the much extreme attitudes towards Ottomans’ most serious and long-lasting opponents the Shi’ite Safavids, see Gabor Agoston, “Information, Ideology and Limits of Imperial Policy: Ottoman Grand Strategy in the Context of Ottoman-Habsburg Rivalry”, in *The Early Modern Ottomans*, 2007, p.93: “Ottoman propaganda justified Selim’s campaigns against the Safavids by portraying the Shi’ite enemy and its *kızılbaş* allies in Eastern Anatolia as

awareness of the fact that some of their local foes had wider connections with a much larger, *Christian* world. In fact, while recounting the fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans, an anonymous *Chronicle of the House of Osman* reported that along with local infidels, *Frankish* defenders of the city had also perished⁹¹. Another *History of Ottoman Sultans* blithely announced that when the “Firengistan heard the morbid news of the fall, church bells stopped ringing while priests, lords and commoners mourned for three full years”⁹². The *Kutbname*, a lengthy epic poem composed by Firdevsi-i Rumi which gloriously illustrates the adventures and successes of Ottoman troops facing a powerful Western naval league which had attacked Chios in 1501, follows a similar path. Alluding to the Venetian losses of Lepanto, Modon, and Coron during the Veneto-Turkish wars of 1499-1503 at the introduction of his work, Firdevsi describes the dramatic repercussions of these setbacks in the West. Receiving the grim reports from the East, the *Rim-Pap* (Roman Pope) is downhearted and desperate because of the loss of the vital port of Modon, the last station for pilgrims travelling towards Jerusalem. Nonetheless, pulling himself back together, he writes a threatening letter to the French King, admonishes him because of his past neglect, reminds him of Papal authority and orders him to send gifts

‘heretics’ and even ‘infidels’, whose revolts hindered the Ottomans’ struggle against the Christian adversaries of the Empire”. An account of the Ottoman campaign to Revan in 1635 led by the Sultan Murad IV (d.1640) had been qualified as a *holy war* (gaza). See Sıdkı Paşa, *Gazavat-ı Sultan Murad-ı Rabi*, (ed.) Mehmet Arslan, Kitabevi, Istanbul, 2006. See also Kaya Şahin, 2013, p.198 and p.205: “Despite the bitter tone of the Ottoman-Habsburg ideological competition, European Christians, as the followers of a religion that was supposedly superseded by Islam, do not present a cultural challenge as powerful as the Safavids, whose millenarian ideology and later Twelver Shiism offered powerful intra-Islam critiques of Ottoman Sunnism”. By the same token, European travelers report on myriad occasions that Ottomans presumably preferred Christians to the Safavids. See Busbecq, pp.120-121 or Stephan Gerlach (d.1612), the chaplain of the Habsburg envoy David Ungnad from 1573 to 1578, relates on hearsay: “When the Sultan Suleyman’s son Bayezid defected to Iran, his father reportedly said: ‘Couldn’t he have escaped to the Papal Court, the Spanish King or the Holy Roman Emperor?’ This means that Turks favour us Christians over Persians, even though they belong to the same religion”. See p.315 and also p.336 in Gerlach, *Türkiye Günlüğü*, [The Turkish Diary] (ed.) Kemal Beydilli, Vol.1, Kitap Yayınevi, Istanbul, 2006.

⁹¹ *Anonim Tevarih-i Al-i Osman: F. Giese neşri*, (ed.) N. Azamat, Istanbul, 1992, p.78.

⁹² Kemal, *Selatinname (1299-1490), XV. Yüzyıl tarihçilerinden Kemal*, (ed.) N. Öztürk, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, 2001, p.168.

and riches to the King of Hungary (Üngürüs) as well as to the Czech (“Şah-ı Çih”) Polish (“Şah-ı Lih”) and Genoese (“Ceneviz”) lords so as to organize a joint military campaign⁹³.

The same attitude is reflected in the *Düsturname*, a universal history that also relates the heroic deeds of Umur Pasha (d. 1348, known as *Morbassa* in Western Europe), the Emir of Aydin in Western Anatolia who had achieved fame for his naval raids and continuous struggle with the *infidels* in the Aegean during the fourteenth century. According to the author Enveri, following Umur’s astonishing military victories a coalition of “Albanians, Byzantines, Bulgarians and Franks” bewailed their despair to the “Babos” (Pope) whom, upon hearing their outcry, commanded that the necessary financial means be gathered for military action⁹⁴. Interestingly, in an other frontier epic called *Saltukname* set in the Balkans and narrating the life and deeds of the legendary thirteenth-century dervish-warrior Sarı Saltuk, a passage pictures an unstable alliance between Franks and Byzantines ultimately doomed to failure. Where the Byzantines (here called “Yunan”) quarrel with Geylevan, the ruler of *Frençe*, the latter proudly and furiously reacts:

⁹³ Firdevsi-i Rumi, *Kutbname*, (eds.) I. Olgun and I. Parmaksızoğlu, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara, 1980, pp.52-58. For the author, see Bekir Biçer, *Firdevsi-i Rumi ve Tarihçiliği*, [Firdevsi-i Rumi’s Historiography] Konya, 2006. For an unpublished work related to the same *gazaname* and *fethname* (“book of conquests”) sub-genres and recounting the expeditions against Venetian Lepanto, Modon and Coron, see, Safai, *Fethname-i Inebahtı ve Moton*, Istanbul Topkapı Revan Kütüphanesi, No. 1271, v.131, f.11, b.-13.a. For additional information see M.C. Mengüç, *An Ottoman Historian*, Safai, Angiolello.net, 2008. Accessible online in <http://angiolello.net/Menguc.html>

⁹⁴ *Le Destan d’Umur Pacha: Düsturname-i Enveri*, (ed.) I. Melikoff, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1954, p.110-111. For a rather outdated but still useful study of Umur the Emir of Aydin, see Tuncer Baykara, *Aydinoğlu Gazi Umur Paşa (1309-1348)*, Kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara, 1990.

“I am the descendant of Filyon (Pope). I am the highest of all, I will replace Pap (Pope) and become Pap in Frenk. I will march against the Turks, slaughter them all and make the Christians stronger!”⁹⁵

Another popular account illustrating the Papacy’s prestige and coercive authority is the previously mentioned *Gazavat-i Murad Han*. Whilst preparing for a joint military campaign against Murad II, the Byzantine emperor threatens the reluctant Hungarian ruler to send a letter to the Rim-Pap asking for the excommunication of the former from the “infidel religion”⁹⁶. Close to a century later, Seyyid Muradi, the author of the popular biography recalling the gestic of the Ottoman grand admiral Hayreddin Barbarossa (d. 1546), relates that even the all-powerful “Rey di Ispanya” (Spanish King Charles V) was compelled to periodically travel to Rome in order to “refresh his sins”. Muradi humorously adds that Charles V, delusively thinking that he had finally neutralized Barbarossa after his conquest of Tunis, had kissed the Pope’s hand with respect and asked him to be crowned with the “Crown of Nushirvan”. The Pope replied that he needed to consult the “Nar-ı Nur” (‘the Fire of Light’) a deity which stands as the Christian God or the Holy Spirit and as such, represents the embodiment of some evil in popular Ottoman

⁹⁵ See the translation by Zeynep Aydođan, 2012, pp.112-113. For the Saltukname legend see the facsimile edition, *Saltukname: The legend of Sarı Saltuk: Collected from oral tradition by Ebu’l-Hayr Rumi*, 6 vols. (ed.) F. Iz, Harvard University Press, 1974-84.

⁹⁶ *Gazavat-ı Sultan Murad*, p.40. For additional information on the fifteenth century Ottoman struggle with Hungarians in particular and Latin Christians in general, see John Jefferson, *The holy wars of King Wladislas and Sultan Murad: The Ottoman-Christian conflict from 1438-1444*, Brill, Leiden, 2012. See also the article by Colin Imber, “The Crusade of Varna, 1443-1445: What Motivated the Crusaders?” In *The Religions of the Book: Christian Perceptions, 1400-1660*, (eds.) M. Dimmock and A. Hadfield, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2008, pp.45-65. Imber remarks perceptively that some of the participants were presumably involved in the campaign because Ottomans posed a direct *threat* to their economic or political interests (ex. Hungary or Venice). Others, such as Burgundian knights, may have been primarily driven by the impulses of their cultural milieu, by the act of crusading as a “literary ideal embedded in their chivalric culture”.

literature⁹⁷. After three days of seclusion, the Nar-ı Nur reprimanded the Pope and vehemently rejected Charles V's demand, calling him a liar. Apparently, the "gorona" could have only be awarded to Charles if he had effectively managed to behead Barbarossa and conquer Algiers⁹⁸.

Surely, the *gazavatname* style (i.e. popular warrior epics or frontier narratives) was not the only literary sub-genre that emphasized the danger of a potentially far-reaching unity among Christians under the nearly indisputable supremacy of the Papacy. In fact, the Arabo-Muslim corpus already provided a starting point in understanding the complex power dynamics and political configurations of the Western world. The Pope's might and strength had permeated multiple Muslim accounts, including the work of the famed geographer Al-Bakri (d.1094), who referred to him as *Al-Baba* and noted that he exerted power over all Christian potentates⁹⁹.

In a similar fashion, Mustafa Ali (d. 1600), the previously mentioned Ottoman bureaucrat/historian, had briefly laid out the governing political structures of Europe in his classical *Essence of Histories*. His account was entirely based on the highly influential fourteenth-century universal history by Rashiduddin, and stated likewise that the highest political authority dominating the Western world was the Pope ("Pap"), followed by the

⁹⁷ For an explanation of the term "Nar-ı Nur" which appears in different (but presumably connected) folk tales such as the *Battalname*, the *Gazavat-ı Sultan Murad*, or the geste of Barbarossa, see Anooshahr, p.149. In the *Gazavat-ı Hayreddin Paşa*, recounting the exceptional life of the corsair/admiral Barbarossa, other designations such as "patraman", (from "our father"?) "yandoloz" or "koncolos" are used interchangeably with "Nar-ı Nur" to describe a "Christian" monster or specter which unremittingly leads its Frankish subjects to commit terrible sins and all sorts of wrongdoings.

⁹⁸ *Gazavat-ı Hayreddin Paşa*, 1992, pp.214-17.

⁹⁹ For the Andalusian geographer's views on *Al-Baba* and an anecdote on the Pope's authority over temporal rulers see, Nizar F. Hermes, *The European Other in Medieval Arabic Literature and Culture*, p.60.

Emperor (“Kaysar”, “Anbarur”) and the hereditary King of France (“Rida Frans”) respectively¹⁰⁰. Correspondingly, another bureaucrat of the Ottoman high chancery Selaniki observed rather accurately that even the French, although on excellent terms with Ottomans based on their long-standing feud with the Spaniards, could not be genuinely reliable since “the accursed one they call their Pope intervenes in their business and imposes truces between them. Each time there is a disagreement among the two parties, the Pope intercedes and brings peace according to their superstitious beliefs”¹⁰¹.

A much more animated picture is provided by the *Vakiat-i Sultan Cem*, the anonymous travelogue recounting Prince Cem’s ill-fated years in the *Kafiristan* (Infideldom). Here, the author casts a critical eye on the power attributed to the Pope. “Even though there are princes more powerful than he”, the account remarks, the Pope rules over all of them because he has the ability (!) to impart absolution. Besides mentioning this “scandalous” custom, Cem seems to acknowledge the fact that lords from all around flooded into the Papal States in search of justice and equity. The primacy of the Roman See to all other princes is reflected by the countless ambassadors lining up in his domains and the exorbitant expense associated with his rule¹⁰². On the face of it, the *Frengistan* may have been seen as a politically fragmented and divided assemblage of

¹⁰⁰ Schmidt, *Pure Water For Thirsty Muslims*, p.169. See also p.184 and pp.188-190 for Mustafa Ali’s enumeration of hostile and “plotting” (Muslim or non-Muslim) rulers.

¹⁰¹ See, *Tarih-i Selaniki*, vol. II, p. 777.

¹⁰² In Vatin, 1997, pp.200-1, the narrator enumerates the representatives present at the Papal court: “Parmi les Francs [Efrenc], les ambassadeurs d’Espagne [Ispanya], du roi du Portugal [Riga Portugal], du roi Ferrand [Riga Feranda], du duc de Milan [Duka di Milan], de Genes [Ceneviz], de Florence [Filartin], du duc de Ferrare [Duka di Ferara], du Marquis de Mantoue [Merkez de Montova], de Venise [Venedik], et parmi les autres les ambassadeurs d’Allemagne [Alaman], de Hongrie [Üngürüs], du roi de Poyama [Ri de Poyama], c’est-a-dire du bey de Boheme [Çeh] et de Pologne [Leh], de celui de la Russie [Urus], et d’autres beys semblables”. See also Vatin, 2001, p.164.

Christian nations. Nevertheless, through its unquestionable recognition of Papal leadership, it was also a decidedly unified whole.

As indicated earlier, this *potentially* unified whole might have posed serious problems to Ottomans when *effectively* integrated and coordinated. With the Pope in the picture or not, Ottomans believed and feared that the Frenks were constantly scheming, negotiating among each other, and preparing for a possible invasion of Ottoman/Muslim lands aiming at the utter destruction of the Ottoman state. In this regard, the *Kutbname* presents one of the most imaginative and dramatic portrayals of “Western plotting”. According to Firdevsi-i Rumi, after the recent Ottoman success in the Peloponnese, the Pope and a legion of other Western powers decided to retaliate by launching a joint naval expedition to Mytilene¹⁰³. However, their true ambitions (or hopes) clearly went beyond that. In fact, the *Rim-Pap* had motivated the relatively reluctant Catholic kings by promising them more from a forthcoming Ottoman debacle: through the formation of a huge coalition, the Christians were to strike an ultimate blow to Ottomans and march as far as Jerusalem and Egypt (which were not even under Ottoman control at the time). Upon receiving such enticing news, the King of Hungary had immediately started making enthusiastic plans for a crusade/pilgrimage, dreaming, along with the King of the Poles and the King of the Czechs, that they will at last rule over the Rumili (Ottoman provinces in Europe), Anatolia and the whole Near East¹⁰⁴.

¹⁰³ For a good assessment of the historical developments, see Nicolas Vatin, “Le Siège de Mytilène (1501)”, in *Les Ottomans et l’Occident (XVe-XVI siècles)*, Istanbul, Isis Press, 2001, pp.9-29.

¹⁰⁴ *Kutbname*, pp.77-79. In a similar fashion, the *Gazavat-ı Sultan Murad*, p.52, holds that the ultimate goal of the Christian army was to capture Edirne, then capital of the Ottomans, and to bring an end to the Ottoman Sultanate for once and for all. Other instances, which indicate that Ottomans imagined their enemies to be *spiritually* driven to war against them, can be located in various texts. In an anonymous

Additionally, another way of reinforcing the impression that Muslim armies were facing overzealous and cold-blooded opponents was to exaggerate the number of enemies. In fact, Ottoman frontier narratives had succeeded in picturing gloomy, alarming and even seemingly disheartening situations by amalgamating a cluster of irascible and bloodthirsty Frankish nations opposing the noble “people” (*ehl*) or “soldiers” (*asakir*) of Islam¹⁰⁵.

Evidently, one could convincingly argue that such enumerations were mere rhetorical devices purposefully employed by Ottomans to intensify the dramatic flavor of their work, to overemphasize and magnify a probable victory, or to justify a possible defeat. However, even narratives teeming with seemingly hyperbolic and fanciful segments could occasionally broadcast a more widespread state of mind the author attempted to underline or express. Indeed, a careful consideration of additional (more state-oriented) sources as well as a survey of the politico-religious background reveals much deeper concerns than producing timeworn literary embellishments.

chronicle of the Ottoman dynasty, the author partially explains the overconfident Habsburg move to Hungary after the death of the Ottoman vassal John Zapolya (d.1540) by the reassuring tone of the priests and religious scholars who promisingly announced: “we found out in our book that the Turk’s time has passed. Fate is on our side”. Only such a statement encouraged the pro-Habsburg faction to finally march towards Buda and defy Ottoman might. See, *Anonim Tevarih-i Al-i Osman*, 1992, p.149. In the *Tevarih-I Cedit-I Vilayet-i Ungurus* [The New History of the Province of Hungary], Cafer Iyani confesses, p.73, that during the Long War between the Habsburgs and Ottomans (1591-1606), the enemy was equally engaged in “holy war”, as even women were selling their belongings and were pouring to the front with “the idea of the holy war” (*niyyetü’l gaza*) in their mind. See Cafer Iyani, *Tevarih-I Cedit-I Vilayet-i Ungurus: Osmanlı-Macar Mücadelesi Tarihi, 1585-1595*, (ed.) M. Kirişcioğlu, Kitabevi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2001.

¹⁰⁵ To name but a few examples, see the beginnings of the *Gazavat-i Sultan Murad*, the *Düsturname-i Enveri* or the *Kutbname*, all of which describe the countless nations of the Frengistan marshaling their forces against Ottomans; *The New History of the Province of Hungary*, p.61, where the Austrians send letters to other infidel nations for support against the Muslims; For a revenge campaign directed against the grand admiral Barbarossa by “Ispanya” (Spain) “Papa” (the Pope) and “Venedik” (Venice) probably referring to the upcoming battle of Preveza, see, *Gazavat-ı Hayreddin Paşa*, 1993, p.224.

During the early modern era, the Ottoman *Mühimme Defterleri*, or ‘Registers of Important Affairs’, abounded in material showing deep concern over potential Western cooperation and action against the Ottoman state¹⁰⁶. In various cases, the imperial center ordered provincial governors to monitor and gather intelligence on their Western neighbors while urging them to take the necessary precautions against a possible aggression¹⁰⁷. Reports in archives or in historical accounts bear witness to the movements of Western armies or fleets and trace their alignment with other (Western) powers¹⁰⁸. Even the traditionally neutral Ragusa (Dubrovnik) or a relatively subordinated and defensive Venice, which provided valuable information to Ottomans on Western affairs,

¹⁰⁶ For the use of Ottoman archival resources, especially the *Registers of Important Affairs* that contained shortened versions of outgoing imperial decrees, see Geza David, “The Mühimme Defteri as a Source for Ottoman-Habsburg Rivalry in the Sixteenth-Century”, *Archivum Ottomanicum*, 20, 2002, pp.167-210. For a different case study based on the *MDs*, see for instance Colin Imber, “The Persecution of the Ottoman Shiites according to the Mühimme Defterleri, 1565-1585”, *Der Islam*, 56, 1979, pp.245-73.

¹⁰⁷ In his, “Information, Ideology and Limits of Imperial Policy: Ottoman Grand Strategy in the Context of Ottoman-Habsburg Rivalry”, 2007, Gabor Agoston successfully revises Bernard Lewis’ assumption that Ottomans were ignorant of European affairs. He argues that as a state in constant military, political and economic struggle with Western powers, Ottomans were compelled, whether they liked it or not, to gather information on them. See also the recent work of Agoston’s student Emrah Sefa Gürkan, *Espionage in the 16th Century Mediterranean: Secret Diplomacy, Mediterranean Go-Betweens and the Ottoman Habsburg Rivalry*, Ph.D. Diss., Georgetown University, 2012 or Idem, “The Efficacy of Ottoman Counter-Intelligence in the 16th Century”, *Acta Orientalia*, Vol. 65, 1, 2012, pp.1-38. An example from the 1544-5 *Registers* show that on the January 23rd 1545 the Ottoman capital requests information on the affairs of Ferdinand (d.1564) and “his brother the king of Spain”. See *Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi H. 951-952 Tarihli ve E.12321 Numaralı Mühimme Defteri*, (ed.) H. Sahillioğlu, IRCICA, 2002, pp.141-142; for news from the “Moskof and the Leh” (Russians and Polish), see for example, MD, no.3, p.46 decree no.93. For a preliminary overview on Ottoman archival documents related to Russian affairs, see Chantal Lemerancier-Quellejay, “Une Source Inédite pour l’Histoire de la Russie au XVI^e Siècle: Les Registres des “Mühimme Defterleri” des Archives du Baş Vekalet”, *Cahiers du Monde Russe et Soviétique*, Vol.8, No.2, 1967, pp.335-343.

¹⁰⁸ For an earlier report dating from 1495 and reporting a Venetian and French cooperation, see Gümeç Karamuk, “Hacı Zağanos’un Elçilik Raporu”, *Belleten*, Vol. LVI, 216, 1992, pp.391-403; For similar reports, see also Geza David and Pal Fodor, “Ottoman Spy Reports from Hungary”, in (ed.) U. Marozzi, *Turcica et Islamica. Studi in Memoria di Aldo Gallotta*, Vol. I, Napoli, 2003, pp.121-131. Upon hearing that “the accursed Spanish have assembled a fleet of 92 vessels in Messina and that 40 French galleys are on their way to join them”, the imperial council sends a dispatch to the governor of Algiers to urge him to defend the seashore while informing him that reinforcements are on their way. See MD no.3, p.67, decree no.139; for an inter-European war, probably alluding to the Anglo-Spanish war of 1584-1604, see the diary of Selaniki, Vol.II, p.823. For Western naval formations in the wake of the Battle of Lepanto, see the MD, no.12 that covers the years 1570-2.

were not to be trusted or underestimated¹⁰⁹. In his detailed *Chronicles of the House of Osman*, the celebrated historian and religious scholar Kemalpaşazade (d. 1534), relates that after Prince Cem had died in 1495, the famous sea captain Kemal Reis had resumed his naval raids in Frankish lands. Alluding to his attacks on Venetian possessions, he specifically praised the damage the latter inflicted upon the Venetian “bey” (Doge) who, throughout the years, had planted seeds of sedition¹¹⁰. Interestingly, İbrahim Peçevi (d.1650), a provincial official who later became a prominent chronicler, reflects a similar position of distrust vis-a-vis the Venetians in a more aggressive fashion. While outlining the events related to the Ottoman siege of Corfu, Peçevi takes a detour to summarize his viewpoint on Venice. According to him,

“Venetians are dependent of Muslim trade. As such, they forcibly present themselves as friends of Muslims whereas in reality, they are considerably more hostile to Muslims than other infidels are. According to reliable witnesses, in case they mistakenly encounter a Muslim, some of them go as far as closing themselves off in poky and secluded places to avoid daylight. They believe they will pay for the sins they have committed by punishing their eyes”¹¹¹.

¹⁰⁹ For Ragusa’s prominent role in Ottoman intelligence gathering, see, for instance, Vesna Miovic, “Diplomatic Relations between the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Dubrovnik”, in *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, (ed) G. Karman, L. Kuncevic, Brill, 2013, pp.187-209. See also, *Muhimme Defteri*, no.12 covering the crucial years of 1570-2, decree no.205, which confirms that the news delivered by the Ragusans concerning Venice and Spain had arrived. See also, decree no.266, acknowledging the delivery of news concerning King Philippe’s handing of 100 ships to the Pope in support of Venice as well as other information on Venice, the King of Beç (Vienna), the Frengistan, and the Pope.

¹¹⁰ See Kemalpaşazade, *Tevarih-i Al-i Osman*, Vol.VIII, ed. Ahmet Uğur, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, p.146. However, one must note that these positions were naturally influenced by circumstances. For imperial decrees reflecting a positive attitude towards Venetians and their distinction from hostile Spaniards, see an imperial writ from 1567, *Muhimme Defteri*, No.7, decree no.907, p.436, addressed to the beg of Herzegovina: “New came that the sea captain Kara Hace had captured a ship full of wheat and that the said ship belonged to Venetians. I command you to start an inquiry; if the captured ship is truly Venetian (Venediklu), return it back to them (...). If the ship is Spanish (İspanyalu) do not pay attention”.

¹¹¹ Peçevi İbrahim Efendi, *Tarih-i Peçevi*, vol.1, ed. B.S. Baykal, Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1981, p.143. Venetian dependance on trade is also emphasized by Kemalpaşazade, Vol.VIII, p. 231. Evliya Çelebi

Correspondingly, doubts of Venetian, Ragusan or French loyalty often expanded to include “suspicious” Ottoman subjects or Europeans residents in Ottoman lands. Once again, Kemalpaşazade recalled that the Venetian expedition sent to re-conquer Lefkada (called “Ayamavra” in Ottoman Turkish) in “Albanian lands” (*Arnavud diyarında*), had been openly supported by local infidels: “Since the Frenks had previously ruled over their lands, they took the opportunity to betray the Sultan by helping the evil-doers [Venetians] whenever they could”¹¹². On different occasions, imperial decrees commanded provincial governors to expel the Christians located in strategic castles. The Imperial Register of 1570-2, for instance, contains certain edicts that require “the removal of the infidels who secretly cooperate with Corfu and Venice from the castle of Yanya and their replacement by Muslims”¹¹³.

In this regard, it might seem all too natural that “European Christians” residing in Ottoman lands were irrefutably perceived as part of a larger “Christendom”. The diary of Selaniki (d.1600) covering the years of 1563-1599, provides appropriate examples concerning the “Galata infidels” living in the Frankish Quarter right across from Istanbul. According to him, “some Franks, Croats and Hungarians had escaped from the fort of

vilifies Ragusans and accuses them of secretly supporting the Venetian side during the Cretan War (1645-69): “Despite the fact that they have renewed their treaty with the Ottomans every year since Orhan Gazi, still they are like the great plague under the wing of the Ottoman state, damnable swine who maintain the pretense of truth but whose satanic machinations infect all the infidels. To be specific: it is these Dubrovnik infidels who have led astray those of the great Bundukani Venedik – the Venetians, who are now our enemy – and secretly supply them with grain. They are the wealthiest of all the infidel kings, but make a show of poverty and humility in order to protect their state, and craftily maintain peaceful relations with all other rulers”. Quoted in R. Dankoff, “Did Evliya Çelebi “fall in love” with the Europeans?”, *Cahiers Balkaniques*, 41, 2013, pp.19-20.

¹¹² Kemalpaşazade, vol. VIII, p. 229.

¹¹³ *MD* no. 12, p. XIX.

Boğazkesen with the assistance of Galatan infidels. Dressed in women's clothes, the furtives were kept secretly in Galata for a day after which they lurked in a Venetian vessel that transported them to Venice"¹¹⁴. Besides this show of cooperation and fraternity among Frankish residents, another passage in the diary pointed to their attachment to the Frengistan. Selaniki reported that around the year of 1596, Muslim corsairs (*levends*) had intercepted and destroyed an imposing Spanish ship carrying arms and troops to Hungarian lands then ravaged by an Ottoman-Austrian war. "When the news reached Galata", he pursues, "it caused great pain and mourning among the accursed and debauched infidels"¹¹⁵.

Consequently, from a strictly politico-religious standpoint, one must acknowledge the fact that an aspect of Ottoman/Muslim perceptions of the Euro-Christian cosmos was defined by fear, suspicion, or at best, mistrust. Despite extensive commercial, personal and even political bounds, the "official" Ottoman position reflected by state-oriented sources or fanciful frontier narratives seems to picture a shady and dangerous world separated from the Ottoman realm by unequivocal, unflinching confessional boundaries. Refusing to accept the supremacy of the *Padişah-ı İslam* (Sultan of Islam) and dominated

¹¹⁴ *Tarih-i Selaniki*, Vol.I, p.330. The captivity account of Michael Heberer from Bretten which spans from 1585 to 1588 is a telling case that reveals the careful diplomatic negotiations engaged in by Western envoys to free European slaves. See, Michael Heberer, *Osmanlıda bir Köle, Brettenli Michael Heberer'in Anıları, 1585-1588* [A Slave in the Ottoman Empire, the Memoirs of Michael Heberer from Bretten] (trans.) T. Noyan, Kitap Yayınevi, Istanbul, 2003.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid*, Vol.II, p.619. Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq, the Austrian Habsburg ambassador to the Porte from 1554 to 1562, gives a more lurid account of a similarly dramatic occurrence in his *Turkish Letters*, 1968, p.171, after the Ottomans defeated a Christian fleet near Djerba, in 1559: "They also congregated in crowds round my door and mockingly asked my people whether they had had a brother or relation or friend in the Spanish fleet; for, if so, they would have the pleasure of seeing them shortly. They were also voluble in extravagante praise of their own valour and scorn of our cowardice. 'What foces,' they asked, 'remained to oppose them, now that the Spaniard was conquered?' My men, to their sorrow, had to listen to these taunts".

by a congregation of Kings and lords in turn ruling under the supreme authority of a mysterious and vengeful *Rim-Pap*, this world's undisguised and ultimate objective was apparently the utter dissolution of the Ottoman/Muslim state.

Without doubt, such a *hostile* approach is best seen as a reaction to the openly or covertly belligerent attitudes and aspirations of Euro-Christians. In fact, Ottomans seem to have been quite sensitive to the highly-circulated, idealistic, messianic or more down-to-earth projects laid out by Westerners to counter Ottoman/Muslim expansion¹¹⁶. As has been shown, they were aware of the occasional inter-European coalitions set against them and had confronted the military leagues formed under Papal banner¹¹⁷. They presumably guessed that the *relazioni* dispatched to Venice by the Venetian *balyos* in Istanbul contained information and analyses on Ottoman military and political weaknesses¹¹⁸.

¹¹⁶ The careful analysis of the *Red Apple* legend by S. Yerasimos, 1999, clearly demonstrates the high degree of permeability and manipulation of messianic and apocalyptic traditions between Ottoman and Euro-Christian realms. On the other hand, as has been previously argued, Ottomans were undoubtedly conscious that their victories in South and Eastern Europe had important repercussions in the West. For lamentations or propagandistic and polemical works calling for renewed Crusade movements after Ottoman advances, see the monographs by Soykut, 2011, Pippidi, 2013 or the article by Papayianni, "He Polis Healo: The Fall of Constantinople in 1453 in Post-Byzantine Popular Literature", 2010, p.27-44. See also, for example, James P. Kroker, "New Means to an Old End: Early Modern Maps in the Service of Anti-Ottoman Crusade", *Imago Mundi*, 60, 1, 2008, pp.23-38. For cautious but consistent Rhodian attempts and hopes of an anti-Ottoman crusade, see Nicolas Vatin, "Les Hospitaliers à Rhodes et les Ottomans", 1480-1522, *L'Empire Ottoman dans l'Europe de la Renaissance, El Imperio Otomano en la Europa Renacentista*, (ed.) A. Servantie, Leuven University Press, 2005, pp. 85-102.

¹¹⁷ For such awareness, see especially the previously mentioned *Kutbname* or *Düsturname*. For a remarkable Ottoman re-creation of the council of Florence in 1439 see the *Gazavat-ı Sultan Murad*. A translation of the scene, worth quoting here, is in Anooshahr, 2009, p.149: "Rim Papa [the Pope] said, 'My son, Tekvur [Byzantine Emperor], what is it that you want? Come on and speak. Let's hear'. Tekvur said, 'O master of our faith, the son of Osman has not been content to fit into Anatolia and Bursa, and has now trespassed into Rumeli, capturing Sofia, Filibe, Edirne, and other provinces and kingdoms...I beg of you to admonish all the Christian peoples and kings, saying that let us come regarding these sons of Osman and let us rid ourselves of them'...Rim Papa immediately ordered the King of Hungary, the king named Despot, and others to be invited...having written letters".

¹¹⁸ Gerlach (d.1612) relates countless instances where Ottomans attempted to intercept, confiscate and decipher messages sent by the Habsburg ambassador to Austria. He also reports, p.108, that during the Cyprus War, Ottomans had allegedly impaled a monk accused of sending letters to Candia in front of the

They were concerned about the possibility of an alliance between local and alien Christian forces¹¹⁹. As reflected by the *Gazavat-i Sultan Murad* in the context of the fifteenth century negotiations between the Emir of Karaman and the Crusaders, they were even alarmed by the potential of a Muslim-Christian entente against the House of Osman¹²⁰.

As a result, while formal eulogies, folk tales, epic frontier narratives or even learned historical chronicles patronized by the imperial center ostensibly portrayed a fearless Ottoman/Muslim Self in constant struggle with an occasionally but dangerously unified, scheming, and utterly aggressive Christian Other, an alternative set of (mostly) administrative documents subtly revealed a fragile and rather insecure state apparatus,

St. Franciscus monastery. See also Dursteler, "The Bailo in Constantinople: Crisis and Career in Venice's Early Modern Diplomatic Corps", *Mediterranean Historical Review*, 16, 2, 2001, pp.1-30.

¹¹⁹ Again, considering the manifold attempts or projects to destabilize the empire from within, they seem to have had serious reasons to be anxious or at best, irritated. See Radu Paun's article, "Enemies Within: Networks of Influence and the Military Revolts against the Ottoman Power, Moldavia and Wallachia, Sixteenth-Seventeenth Centuries", 2013. See also Raim Zaimova, p.38, in, *Voyager vers l'"autre" Europe: images francaises des Balkans ottomans, XVIe-XVIIIe siècles*, Isis Press, 2007, where the author affirms that "pendant les 20 premières années du XVIIIe siècle sont enregistrés 11 projets de Croisade, dont 7 émanant du côté français et 4 autres du côté Italien". For some Ottoman-Greek subjects cooperating with the emerging Russian power, see the articles by Vera Tchentsova, "Le Fonds des Documents Grec (F.52, "Relations de la Russie avec la Grèce") de la Collection des Archives Nationales des Actes Anciens de la Russie et leur Valeur pour l'Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman", *Turcica*, 30, 1998, pp.383-396; "Le Coup D'État Constantinopolitain de 1651 d'après la Lettre d'un Métropolitain Grec au Tsar Russe Alexis Michailovich", *Turcica*, 32, 2000, pp.389-423.

¹²⁰ *Gazavat-i Sultan Murad*, p.34. The *Gazavatname* of Barbarossa is equally packed with depictions of "treacherous" and "morally weak" Arabs cooperating with the Spanish against their Ottoman co-religionists. For the portrayal of Arabs in the geste of Barbarossa, see Nicolas Vatin, "Arabes et Turcs au Maghreb dans les années 1513-1520 d'après les *Gazavat-ı Hayrü-d-din Paşa*", *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 40, 2012, pp.365-397. Among many others, a Capuchin friar, Paolo da Lagni, had presented a report to the Pope Innocenzo XI in 1679, attesting to the possibility of mobilizing the supposedly pagan Yezidi communities against the Ottomans. For an optimistic crusade plan scripted by the French ambassador to the Porte, Francois Savary, Comte de Brèves, who maintains that differences between the local Orthodox populations should not be emphasized so as to gain their support and that Janissaries could join a general uprising against the Sultan should their Christian origins be recognized, see, Raim Zaimova, 2007, p.34.

burdened with the threat of coordinated Western expeditions in Ottoman lands and troubled by their Christian subjects' unstable loyalties¹²¹.

IV) "Divide and Contain"

¹²¹ While Ottomans clearly faced, experienced and confronted Euro-Christian ideological, political and military antagonism, the extent to which they were aware of irenic and conciliatory views promoted by certain intellectuals or currents in the West remains decidedly obscure. While it seems unlikely that they had heard of John of Segovia (d.1458) or of Nicholas de Cusa's (d.1464) plea for a universal council that should have ultimately led to a union of Muslims and Christians, they might have caught glimpses of Guillaume Postel's (d.1581) eccentric project of the *Concordia Mundi*. Indeed, while residing in the Ottoman capital during the famous 1547 embassy of Gabriel d'Aramon, Postel's closest informants were a Jewish doctor and an anonymous Turk with whom "Postel made a lasting friendship". See, Ina Baghdiantz McCabe, *Orientalism in Early Modern France*, 2008, p.44. For an interpretation of Nicholas de Cusa's purposefully marginalized views see the delightful article by Boaventura de Sousa, "A Non-Occidental West? Learned Ignorance and Ecology of Knowledge", *Theory, Culture and Society*, Vol. 26, 7-8, 2009, pp.103-125. For a recent volume dedicated to Cusa's views on Islam see *Nicholas of Cusa and Islam: Polemic and Dialogue in the Late Middle Ages*, (eds.) I. C. Ley, R. George-Tvrtkovic and D. Duclow, Brill, 2014. For Juan de Segovia's "conciliatory," but ultimately hostile approach towards Ottoman-Muslims see Anne Marie Wolf's essay, "Pleas for Peace, Problems for Historians: A 1455 Letter from Juan de Segovia to Jean Germain on Countering the Threat of Islam", in *Religious Conflict and Accommodation in the Early Modern World*, (eds.) M. Ragnow and W. D. Phillips, University of Minnesota, 2011, pp.55-68. Scholars have demonstrated that significant religious go-betweens were established among Muslim and Christian populations during the early development of the Ottoman state. Mostly formulated through theological debates, prospects of an ultimate religious union of Christians and Muslims were apparently not inconceivable. The archbishop of Thessaloniki Gregory Palamas (d.1359), captured by Turks in 1354, claimed to have had such discussions with Muslims. During a heated conversation in Nicea, Palamas states that he ended his inspired sermon in a mild tone by saying "had we been able to agree in debate, we might as well have been of one faith" to which a Turk replied "there will be a time when we shall all agree". See George Arnakis, "Gregory Palamas among the Turks and Documents of His Captivity as Historical Sources", *Speculum*, Vol.26, No.1, 1951, p.110. In the 1430s, the neo-Platonic philosopher Plethon (d.1454) prophesized the decline of Islam and Christianity while presaging the genesis of a new religion resembling the ancient religion of Hellenes; his contemporary Georges of Trebizond (d.1473) affirmed around 1453 that a new religion encompassing all nations and beliefs would be heralded by Mehmed II. See Michel Balivet, "Textes de Fin d'Empire, Récits de Fin du Monde: A Propos de Quelques Thèmes Communs aux Groupes de la Zone Byzantine-Turque", in *Les Traditions Apocalyptiques*, 1999, p.12. The only instance of a possible concordance between Ottoman/Muslims and Frenk/Christians seems to have occurred at the beginning of the 15th century. Balivet reports that Sheikh Bedreddin (d.1420), a charismatic preacher who led a rebellion against the Ottomans backed by both Christians and Muslims, had been invited to a Christian-Muslim encounter by monks from Chios. Received by the Genoese governor of the island, he attended the meeting and ceremonies with a few of his disciples. According to the contemporary historian Doukas, followers of Bedreddin visited the island multiple times to preach an agreement (omonia) between Christians and Muslims. See Balivet, "Élites Byzantines, Latines et Musulmanes: Quelques Exemples de Diplomatie Personnalisée (Xe-XVe siècles)", in *Diplomatics in the Eastern Mediterranean, 1000-1500: Aspects of Cross-Cultural Communication*, (eds.) A. D. Beihammer, M. G. Parani and C. D. Schabel, Brill, Leiden, 2008, pp.432-3.

Throughout the centuries of fighting and cooperation, Ottomans established multiple channels through which they acquired objective information which undeniably marked their opinions on and impressions of the politico-religious mindset of their Western partners/enemies. Tacitly or not, they acknowledged, and felt occasionally threatened by the potential strength of the Franks. In the meantime, however, they also distinguished their weak spots. As such, they were aware of the political fragmentation of *Frangistan*. Perhaps even more significantly, they knew that religion, routinely conceived as a unifying factor, could easily turn into becoming a deeply divisive one.

In his previously mentioned chronicle, Kemalpaşazade accounted for the quasi-eternal antagonism between two rulers of the *Abode of War* (dar-ül harb), namely, the lord of Spain and the lord of France. While commenting on the letter the French king sent to the Ottoman Sultan in the aftermath of his defeat by Charles V in 1525, Kemalpaşazade noted that both rulers “wore a crown (*kurune*) and aspired to become Cesars (*Çesar*)”¹²². Mustafa Ali equally glanced at rivalries between a range of European political entities such as the Pope, France, Spain and the Venetian doge “all of which/whom strove for world leadership”¹²³.

In this regard, Ottomans knew that the Frankish world was no harmonious or homogenous entity. Most of the time, political disunity fueled by the disproportionate imperial aspirations of different polities hampered the actualization of lofty ideals such as

¹²² Kemalpaşazade, Vol. X, pp.78-79. Kemalpaşazade also notes Venetians’ dependancy on trade and the difficulties they encounter when they are dragged into a war. See Idem, Vol. VIII, p.231. For Suleyman’s relatively reassuring letter to Francois Ier in 1526, see A. Berthier, “Un Document Retrouvé: La Première Lettre de Soliman au Roi Francois Ier (1526)”, *Turcica*, Vol.27, 1995, pp.263-266.

¹²³ Schmidt, *Pure Water for Thirsty Muslims*, p.182.

union or cooperation within Christendom. In order to further prevent such a potentially disastrous achievement, Ottomans seem to have played their part by conscientiously establishing commercial and political ties with the most profitable, available and attainable Euro-Christian potentates.

Although most Ottoman chronicles characterize the sixteenth-century Ottoman-French rapprochement as a sign of the Sultan's magnanimity towards a poor and destitute infidel king, the shrewd assessment made by a Venetian diplomat seems closer to the genuine intentions of Ottoman policy-makers¹²⁴. In a *relazione* sent to the Serenissima around 1560, the Venetian baylos Marino Cavalli comments on Ottoman assistance to French campaigns against the Habsburgs:

“Chaque fois que les Français iront demander de l'aide pour faire la guerre, ils l'obtiendront a coup sur, meme s'il en sera comme de la nourriture que les médecins donnent aux malades, qui ne leur rend pas vigueur, et ne les laisse pas davantage mourrir, mais les maintient à peine en vie. Les Turcs aideront ainsi les Français pour qu'ils continuent la guerre, car ils ne les veulent ni gros, ni maigres, ni vainqueurs, ni vaincus”¹²⁵.

Indeed, it appears that the main Ottoman strategy in regard to the European (or Eurasian) balance of powers was to apply a variation of the “divide et impera” dictum slightly modified and adjusted to the prevalent political context. Since Ottomans were

¹²⁴ For the rhetorical tropes in Ottoman chronicles attempting to conceal real Ottoman intentions see, Veinstein, “La Politique Hongroise du Sultan Suleyman et d'Ibrahim Pacha”, in *Autoportrait du Sultan Ottoman En Conquérant*, 2011, p.124.

¹²⁵ See Bruno Simon, “Quelques Remarques sur la Relation de Marin Cavalli, Bayle a Constantinople (1560)” in, *Proceedings: Comité International d'études pré-ottomanes et ottomanes, VI. Symposium, Cambridge, 1984*, (eds.) J.L. Bacque-Grammont and E. van Donzel, Istanbul, 1987, pp.147-157.

unable to truly “rule over Franks”, they had adopted an approach one might describe as “divide and contain”. The effective application of this policy seems to be echoed in the selective and unilateral distribution of *ahdnames*, known to the West as “capitulations”. Here too, Ottomans cautiously and brilliantly orchestrated ceremonies and rituals for the purpose of playing one European nation against another while never fully siding with any of them. By according carefully negotiated privileges to one trading community at the expense of the other, they were voluntarily inciting political and economical strife amongst competing European diplomatic missions and merchants operating in Ottoman lands¹²⁶. A number of archival documents indicate that official Ottoman attitudes towards Western nations differed widely depending on the political context. As such, Ottomans were clearly making distinctions between (occasionally) “good” or “bad” Franks¹²⁷. The Porte requested specifically that the interests of *friendly* Christian nations be protected in provinces under Ottoman jurisdiction¹²⁸. When needed, merchants or other subjects

¹²⁶ This point is best illustrated in E. Eldem, “Foreigners at the Thresold of Felicity: the reception of foreigners in Ottoman Istanbul”, 2013, p.123: “The sultan distributed favours with imperceptible differences to rulers and their envoys, giving subtle signs of preference or disdain that never escaped the eyes of attentive observers of the political circles of the capital. The success of these tactics could be clearly seen when two ambassadors were reported to have engaged in a brawl in a church in Galata over a right of precedence based on differing interpretations of the status granted to him by the Porte”. For other instances revealing the importance of acceptance and precedence in the Ottoman court and the bitter rivalry among European envoys, see Stephan Gerlach’s (d.1612) diary, 2006. The chaplain notes perceptively, p.404, that Ottoman dignitaries were purposefully manipulating Christian ambassadors. For an assertive Venetian attempt to achieve further recognition in the court, see Selaniki’s chronicle, vol. II, p.661. For the economic competition between contending European nations and ever-shifting Ottoman attitudes towards them, see D. Goffman’s chapter “The Venetians in Izmir, 1604-1624”, in *Izmir and the Levantine World, 1550-1650*, University of Washington Press, 1990, pp.93-118.

¹²⁷ One must recall that these “friends and foes” were constantly shifting according to given circumstances. During the Cyprus war, Selaniki reports that the “Doges of Venice had allied themselves with the accursed Spanish”. See *Tarih-i Selaniki*, Vol.I, p.81 As has been argued in the previous section, Ottomans never completely trusted their *allies* and knew that they were seeking new openings and agreements with other states. See the *Gazavat-ı Hayreddin Paşa*, p.177, for a possible Spanish-French reconciliation.

¹²⁸ Again, numerous examples are to be found in the *Registers of Important Affairs*. Among others, see for example the register covering the years 1544-45, in which decrees addressed to the governor of Egypt and the judge of Alexandria insist that French merchants or travellers passing through or residing in Egypt are friends and not enemies, and therefore, are not to be harmed. Sahillioğlu, 2002, p.178, decree no.225. In other edicts, pp.323-324, concerning a disorder in the Dalmatian coast, the provincial governors are warned

affiliated to them were to be assisted. In contrast, the same “kindness and generosity” was not to be accorded to non-Muslim communities related to an unyielding or inimical state¹²⁹.

Besides encouraging disunity and conflict among different Western powers on a diplomatic and political basis, Ottoman endeavors to destabilize Frenks included the use of the “religion card”. Just as Westerners envisioned the disintegration of the Ottoman state by formulating crusading projects including the persecuted or disenchanting local Christians into their plans, so too Ottomans considered the possibilities of fomenting internal disturbances that could seriously disrupt and shake the power apparatus of their non-Muslim opponents. In that sense, religious identities, loyalties or aspirations could become weapons both “sides” could use and manipulate.

In a fairly comparable fashion to Euro-Christians, Ottomans exploited religious loyalties in a two-fold manner: Firstly, by agitating and provoking their fellow co-religionists living in *Infideldom*. Secondly, by attempting to make contact with and forge alliances with religiously marginalized and oppressed groups within the rapidly disintegrating *Christendom*.

As is well known, until their final expulsion or assimilation around the first quarter of the seventeenth-century, a considerable number of crypto-Muslims (“Moriscos”) were

not to inflict any harm on the subjects of “our friend Venice”. Orders to the governors of distant provinces such as Tunis or Algiers also demand the release of French subjects as they are protected by the imperial pledges, the *ahdnames*. For a collection of such documents see Idris Bostan, “Garp Ocaklarının Avrupa Ülkeleri ile Siyasi ve Ekonomik İlişkileri”, 1580-1624, *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1988, pp.59-86.

¹²⁹ For a telling example, see the fully translated edict in footnote no.110.

still populating the Iberian Peninsula¹³⁰. Both official and popular accounts testify to the Ottoman interest in their troublesome plight. The biography of the corsair/admiral Hayreddin Barbarossa records many instances of Ottoman assistance and aid, especially by way of evacuating and transferring them to Muslim North Africa¹³¹.

Perhaps more significant, however, is the fact that both Ottomans and Spanish authorities were equally inclined to see the Moriscos as “an Ottoman fifth column in Spain”¹³². Andrew Hess argues that in light of the Ottoman advances in the Mediterranean, the Habsburg officials felt increasingly distraught and perturbed by the possibility of an Ottoman cooperation with the Moriscos and in that sense, they were not completely out of line. As Hess demonstrates, Ottomans were clearly involved in the 1568 Morisco rebellion against Philip II’s hardline measures and religious pressure¹³³. They entrusted the governor of Algiers to send ammunitions, provisions and men in Andalusia to provide help to the insurgents¹³⁴. In 1574, when they set sail to recover Tunis from the Habsburgs, they attempted to revive the motivations of increasingly alienated Moriscos for a new uprising that would distract Spanish troops and force them to deal with an internal crisis¹³⁵.

¹³⁰ After the conquest of Granada in 1492, the Morisco communities of Spain came to be known as the *Mudejares*, i.e. “those who are permitted to remain”. Ottomans called them *müdeccir*, *müdeccel*, or *Ehl-i Endülüs* (“the people of Andalusia”).

¹³¹ See for example, *Gazavat-ı Hayreddin Paşa*, 1993, p.67. The passage gives a rather detailed account of the lives of the victimized and tormented Moriscos before narrating their relocation from “Endülüs” (Andalusia) to the Maghrib.

¹³² See the article by A. Hess, “The Moriscos: An Ottoman Fifth Column in Sixteenth-Century Spain”, *American Historical Review*, Vol. 74, No.1, 1968, pp.1-25. See also the work of A. Temimi, “Le Gouvernement Ottoman Face au Problème Morisque”, *Revue d’Histoire Maghrébine*, 23-24, 1981, pp.249-262.

¹³³ Hess, p.5. The Alpujarras rebellion was only to be contained in 1570.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.* pp.13-14.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp.17-18.

It has been assessed that this move to destabilize the greatest contestant of Ottoman power in the Mediterranean was essentially driven by political motives rather than sincere or strict religious convictions. Not necessarily preoccupied by the Morisco cause, Ottomans merely empowered the hopeless and frustrated rebels when they saw fit, withdrawing their support immediately after the conclusion of a peace treaty between Spain and the Ottoman empire in 1580¹³⁶.

Even so, the Ottoman capacity to exploit disaffected co-religionists' resentment, or instigate and sustain specific dissenting groups within the realms of the Frangistan is clearly discernable. In that sense, perhaps more stunning is the Ottoman interest in the Reformation movement. Again, archival documents and chronicles confirm that Ottomans were aware of a rising *heretical* movement in the West, challenging Papal authority and gathering new followers as time went by¹³⁷. Significantly, in a time of growing tension and clashes with the fiercely Catholic Habsburg Empire, such defecting entities could prove to be useful. To undermine their opponents' influence and power, Ottomans were ready to envisage a cooperation with the so-called "Luterans".

¹³⁶ Hess, p.22. See also Gilles Veinstein, "Autour de la Lettre de Selim II aux Andalous et des Origines de la Guerre de Chypre", in *Autoportrait du Sultan Conquérant*, 2011, pp.213-223.

¹³⁷ For a confused but significant Ottoman report on the newly emerging Lutheran movement, see Isom-Verhaaren, "An Ottoman Report about Martin Luther and the Emperor: New Evidence of the Ottoman Interest in the Protestant Challenge to the Power of Charles V", *Turcica*, 28, 1996, pp.299-318. Most probably written in the summer of 1530, the report affirms that a lord named "Fra Martin Lutru" had challenged the superstitious ways of the accursed Spanish, founded an all-new religion by himself, had gathered 30,000 troops and had defeated the accursed army of the accursed Spanish. Noting the arrival of the second English ambassador Edward Barton to the Porte "from the province of the island of England" in 1593, Selaniki Mustafa Efendi adds an interesting explanatory passage to the event, recalling that a powerful woman whom the "nation of Luteraniyye" obeys was ruling over England. See *Tarih-i Selaniki*, Vol.I, p.334.

As Casale indicates, upon hearing “Philip II of Spain’s ongoing troubles with the Protestant rebellion in the Low Countries”, the energetic grand vizier Sokollu Mehmed Pasha (d.1579) “dispatched a secret agent to Flanders, bearing a message of “friendship, compassion and favour to the 'Lutherans' of that country and vowing assistance in their struggle against 'the Papists' whose religious practices they, like the Muslims, had rejected”. Even more startling is the last part of the letter “urging the Protestants to send representatives as soon as possible and, in the meantime, to coordinate their activities with the Morisco rebels in Spain”¹³⁸. According to Casale, Sokollu Mehmed Pasha’s (d.1579) ascendancy and effective rule stood for the emergence of a “soft empire”, sustained mostly by the propagation of images of a prestigious Ottoman order, the diffusion and spread of Ottoman ideological and political messages along with the creation of strong commercial links all across the Eurasian world¹³⁹. As Green-Mercado has recently argued, Ottoman insistence for a coordinated operation joined by both Lutherans and Moriscos could be placed within the larger framework of Ottoman claims to universal sovereignty. Just as they had employed a persuasive religio-political discourse backed by logistic support to inspire a Muslim reaction that could counter Portuguese ascendancy in the Indian Ocean, so too they aspired to destabilize their major opponents in the Mediterranean by patronizing and inciting their disaffected religious minorities to rebel under the protection of the “compassionate and benevolent” Sultan¹⁴⁰.

¹³⁸ Casale, *Age of Exploration*, p.137. Also noted by Hess, pp.19-21. Casale notes, p.85, that in contrast with the viziership of Rustem Pasha (d.1561) during which an Ottoman-centric mentality prevailed, the viziership of Sokollu Mehmed was characterized by receptivity and broad-mindedness.

¹³⁹ See footnote no.50 for Casale’s description of “Ottoman soft power”.

¹⁴⁰ For Ottoman-Portuguese competition in the Indian Ocean and the Ottoman “grand rhetoric of pan-Islamic unity”, see Casale, *Age of Exploration*, p.145 but also, p.118: “Indeed, to an extent possibly unmatched by any previous period, the 1560s were characterized by a rising tide of resentment toward the Portuguese throughout the Indian Ocean – and by a tangibly if still inchoate yearning among its disparate

As a result, it seems fair to conclude that official Ottoman approaches to divergent Western states were dictated by circumstantial changes occurring in the European balance of power¹⁴¹. As early as the fifteenth century, Ottomans were aware of the destructive potential of unified Christian leagues and as such, had taken the necessary steps to prevent and break such coalitions by offering concessions and forming tacit alliances to play off one opponent against the other. During the sixteenth century, this objective coincided with the urgent task of restraining Habsburg supremacy in Central Europe and the Mediterranean. To that end, they allied themselves to the French, established contacts with the Protestant English crown, and financed and encouraged rebellious movements that plagued Habsburg territories¹⁴². With mixed results, Ottomans tried to “divide and contain” their powerful and intimidating Frankish opponents¹⁴³.

Muslim communities to transcend their differences and forge a grand pan-Islamic alliance”. See the recent chapter by Marya T. Green-Mercado, “The Mahdi in Valencia: Messianism, Apocalypticism and Morisco Rebellions in Late Sixteenth-Century Spain”, in, *Spanning the Strait: Studies in Unity in the Western Mediterranean*, (eds.) Y.G. Liang, A.K. Balbale, A. Devereux and C. Gomez-Rivas, Brill, Leiden, 2013, pp.193-219.

¹⁴¹ For yet another reflection of this phenomenon, see the study of Vera Costantini, “Contemptible Unbelievers” or “Loyal Friends”? Notes on the Many Ways in which the Ottomans Named the Venetians in the 16th Century”, in *Intercultural Aspects in and Around Turkic Literatures*, (ed.) N. Kappler, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, pp.29-35.

¹⁴² For Ottoman official correspondence with the English crown, see I. H. Uzunçarşılı, “On Dokuzuncu Asır Başlarına Kadar Türk-İngiliz Münasebatına Dair Vesikalar” [Documents on Ottoman-English Relations Until the Beginning of the 19th Century], *Belleten*, 51, 1949, pp.573-648.

¹⁴³ It has been argued that Ottomans were carefully observing the disputes and conflicts between Eastern Orthodox and Catholic Christians and as such, by favouring the Eastern Church over the Papacy, were successfully exploiting and deepening the chasm between the two institutions. See Charles Frazee who notes that, “Bayezid followed his father’s policy in keeping the Orthodox Christians of his empire hostile to Catholicism”. In Frazee, *Catholics and Sultans: The Church and the Ottoman Empire, 1453-1923*, Cambridge University Press, 1983, pp.22-23. For a sixteenth-century Western diplomat, René de Lucinge (d.1615), who reflects the same idea in his *De la Naissance, Durée et Chute des Etats* (1588), see A. Pippidi, 2013, p.95.

Chapter Two:

Ill-Mannered Hat Wearers: Ottoman Depictions of ‘Frankishness’

I) A Brief Reassessment

Up until this point, the main concern of the study has been to map out divergent Ottoman/Muslim approaches to the Frankish reality. On the whole, it has been argued that Ottomans confronted an economically, militarily and ideologically combative political formation they vaguely named “Fringistan” based on the overall religious allegiances of its components to Christianity in general and to Roman Catholicism in particular. Incorporated in legends, myths or folk-tales, Frenks inhabiting these lands became a matter of the past, a palpable reality of the present, and a phenomenon of the foreseeable future. On a politico-religious basis, they were perceived as a serious and essential threat to the Ottoman-Muslim establishment while being simultaneously regarded as much-coveted trophies to conquer, annihilate or convert. Where practical socio-political conditions impeded the fulfillment of the latter romantic and colorful desires, a relatively defensive stance of “divide and contain” had been usually taken against them for strategic purposes.

The second chapter of the thesis will deal with a more intimate and intricate dimension of Ottoman images and view-points of Euro-Christians. Beyond broader politico-military considerations, the definition of “Frankishness” as opposed to “Ottomanness” will be scrutinized. The inquiry will focus on the possible reasons and the processes that set out Franks as members of a distant, contrasting and confrontational universe. Despite their acceptance and absorption in the mental (and physical) world of the Ottoman as trade partners, political allies or even lovers, why, and how, did Franks end up as the absolute Other of the Ottomans? In what sense and degree did Ottoman self-understandings contrast with the “Frankish alterity” that they constructed? More simply put, what made the Euro-Christian Other so *different* from the Ottoman-Muslim Self?

In order to propose convincing answers to such ineluctable and fundamental issues regarding Ottoman visions of the “Euro-Christian world”, one must turn to the sources most directly dealing with the Franks and the Frankish cosmos. For the period in concern (15th-17th centuries), texts that most extensively set up full-fledged and vivid sketches of Frankish life are mostly pseudo-historical frontier narratives along with a few travelogues¹⁴⁴. While archival accounts and chronicles occasionally hint at Frankish peculiarities, they do not display (or intend to display) consistent or sophisticated

¹⁴⁴ For a valuable study and overall classification of such narratives see Gottfried Hagen, “Heroes and Saints in Anatolian Turkish Literature”, *Oriente Moderno*, 89, No.2, 2009, pp.349-361. As Arzu Öztürkmen has recently underscored, the texts in question rest on a complex tradition of orality. See, Arzu Öztürkmen, “Orality and Performance in Late Medieval Turkish Texts: Epic Tales, Hagiographies, and Chronicles”, *Text and Performance Quarterly*, 29, 4, 2009, pp.327-345. As such, the performative frames embedded in the larger plots provide great narratological flexibility and permit the creation, re-creation and adaptation of micro-stories, anecdotes and imagined internal dialogues between Franks and Muslims respectively.

portraits of *Frankishness*¹⁴⁵. In order to discern the strategies of exclusion, the formation of autostereotypes juxtaposed to hetero-stereotypes, and other literary conventions that contributed to the erection of borders between a Frankish Other and an Ottoman Self, a careful study of this body of work as well as allusions to other supportive material will be needed¹⁴⁶.

II) Allah vs. the Light of Fire

In the popular epic narratives of the 15th and 16th centuries, the most conspicuous, and typically *Frankish* feature appears to have been conceived as “infidelity”. The articulation of Frankish difference based on confessional conceptualizations seems to have been a high-priority task for Ottoman hagiographers, biographers or historiographers. As has been indicated earlier, Franks coming from or related to a remote land called the *Frengistan* were not merely politically unreliable competitors, but were first and foremost members of a superseded and corrupted religion¹⁴⁷. Before being

¹⁴⁵ A non-negligible part of the Ottoman “corpus captivatis” remains relatively unconcerned with Frankish culture and lifestyle as the main theme is mostly centered on the painful and arduous process of captivity. See Günay Kut’ article presenting the work by an Ottoman captive in “Sarıkoz”/Syracuse, “Esiri, his “Sergüzeşt” and his Other Works”, *Journal of Turkish Studies*, X, 1986, pp.235-244. For the published account of an Ottoman judge who was also taken prisoner by Maltese corsairs, see Fahir İz, “Sergüzeşt-i Esiri-i Malta”, *Bellekten*, 1970, pp.69-121. For the correspondance between a certain Hüseyin residing in Rome, and his friend Yusuf living in Paris, as well as the sorrowful letters of an Ottoman bureaucrat held captive in Messina, see Halil Sahillioğlu, “Akdeniz’de Korsanlara Esir Düşen Abdi Çelebi’nin Mektubu”, *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi*, 18-19, 1963, pp.241-256.

¹⁴⁶ One should note that while the texts under scrutiny draw boundaries between an impure Other and an idealized Self, they occasionally present meaningful openings and as such blur the lines between the supposedly antagonistic Self and Other. These “inclusivist” or “universalist” components will be examined in the final chapter.

¹⁴⁷ For a good overall account see *Muslim Perceptions of Other Religions: a Historical Survey*, (ed.) J. J. Waardenburg, Oxford University Press, 1999. For the appropriation and modification of Jesus in Islamic literature, see the important study by Tarif Khalidi, *The Muslim Jesus: Sayings and Stories in Islamic Literature*, Harvard University Press, 2001. For a brilliant study of the varying approaches to the question

“good”, “bad”, “greedy” or “generous”, Franks were (Catholic) Christians, and as such, pertained to a world imagined to be utterly different from the Ottoman-Muslim one. Consequently, Ottoman warrior epics that colorfully described the cordial or conflicting encounters between Ottomans and Franks simultaneously addressed the question of Frankish “beliefs”. As a result, in many cases comparing the “Ottoman” to the “Frenk” essentially meant confronting “Muslim” beliefs with (Catholic) “Christian” ones¹⁴⁸.

In the *Düsturname* of Enveri, recounting the legendary feats of the Emir of Aydin Umur Bey (d.1348), an intriguing passage reports the presumably fictitious correspondence of Umur with Frankish forces during the First Smyrniote Crusade in 1344. Assured of an imminent victory, Franks dispatch a messenger to Umur wondering why he still insists on fighting a hopeless battle, since “we have three gods and you have only one”, to which Umur proudly responds, “You implore success from an idol. However a simple piece of jewelry [i.e. the cross] shall not help you”. Adding to the vividness of the section, the narrator details the preparation phase of the expedition, and presents one of the leaders of the coalition, the “accursed patriarch” (*batras-ı la'in*) Henri d’Asti (d.1345), “slandorous on the outside and nasty on the inside”. During ceremonies, the latter “carries a silver cross on his neck, while others hold a crucifix with a cadaver on

of non-Muslim salvation in Muslim theology and historiography see, M. Hassan Khalil, *Islam and the Fate of Others: The Salvation Question*, Oxford University Press, 2012.

¹⁴⁸ Quite similarly, from the vantage point of medieval and early modern Euro-Christians, “the Muslim became, in a sense, a photographic negative of the self-perception of an ideal Christian self-image, one that portrayed Europeans as brave, virtuous believers in the one true God and the one true faith”. See D. Blanks and M. Frassetto, “Introduction”, in *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, 1999, p.5. For pre-modern Arabic discourses on Frankish religious externality see Al-Azmeh, “Mortal Enemies, Invisible Neighbors: Northerners in Andalusian Eyes”, 1992, pp.263-5.

it. Gathering in mosques, these deviant and shameless Christians worship this motionless object, calling it God”¹⁴⁹.

Indeed, one of the most frivolous and irritating Frankish customs as presented in several Ottoman accounts seems to have been “idolatry”¹⁵⁰. In that sense, an unsettling anecdote from the biography of Barbarossa is particularly telling. During a raid in a monastery near Barcelona, the captain in charge, Aydın Reis, encourages his men who need to relieve themselves to use the church as a lavatory. Eventually, the holy warriors go as far as tucking human excrement in the mouths of wooden idols, beheading in the meantime a few unyielding monks¹⁵¹.

In the *Kutbname* too, Franks are represented as unreasonable, almost naive, idol-worshippers. Here, the Frankish craze is directed to the “idol of Marco” (*put-ı Marko*), alluding to the veneration of Saint Mark in Venice¹⁵². When the Pope hears of the loss of

¹⁴⁹ *Düsturname-i Enveri*, ed. İ. Melikoff, 1954, pp.111-116. For a study of early modern Moroccan views on the *ehl-i saleeb* (“the people of the cross”) or *salibiyyun* (“cross-bearers”) see Nabil Matar, “Arab Views of Europeans, 1578-1727: The Western Mediterranean”, in, *Re-orienting the Renaissance*, 2005, pp.126-148.

¹⁵⁰ This does not apply exclusively to Franks but could be extended in time and space to nearly all non-Muslims. As Yerasimos shows, 1993, all the old Christian rulers of Constantinople have reportedly erected their own effigies and pressured their own people to venerate them, taking the first step towards the destruction of the eternally damned city. On the other hand, while this “Frankish aberration” is purposefully emphasized in numerous texts, the seventeenth-century traveller Evliya Çelebi recalls a curious conversation held with German priests during his visit to the *Stephansdom* in Vienna. The priests reject the accusations of idolatry and reportedly explains that “when our priests harangue the people, just as your sheikhs do, they have difficulty conveying their message with fine words alone. So we convey the message through images of the prophets and saints and paradise, depictions of of divine glory. And we show hell with demons, flaming fire and boiling water, depictions of divine wrath. When our priests give sermons, they point to these images saying, ‘Fear God!’ But we do not worship them in any way”. See R. Dankoff, “Did Evliya Çelebi “fall in love” with the Europeans?” *Cahiers Balkaniques*, 41, 2013, pp.16-17.

¹⁵¹ See the *Gazavat-i Hayreddin Paşa* edited by E. Düzdağ, 1975, vol. I, p.77.

¹⁵² For a relatively neutral and factual Ottoman account on the patron saint of Venice, see the famous cartographer Piri Reis’ (d.1553) *Kitab-ı Bahriyye*, (“Book of Navigation”) composed around 1521. Piri Reis, *Kitab-ı Bahriye*, Vol.2, (ed.) E. Z. Ökte, Istanbul, 1988, p.893.

Modon in the Peloponnese, he immediately implores the “idol of Marco” and rubs his face on it¹⁵³. Likewise, the Hungarian king prepares his anti-Ottoman campaign by “imploing the idol of Marco and rubbing his face on it”. While exchanging letters with the King of the Czechs, he ceremoniously signs his epistle as “the slave of Jesus and the servant of the idol of Marco, the King of Hungary, the infidel idol-worshipper”¹⁵⁴.

The representation of Euro-Christian irrationality and deviance is corroborated by other stock images that frequently recur in Ottoman texts. The colorful and dramatic depiction of rituals such as the one supposedly experienced by Cem Sultan in Rome, where the captive prince boastfully refuses to bow his head and kiss the Pope’s feet during their first encounter, is perhaps exceptionally melodramatic¹⁵⁵. However, other theatrical displays seem to confirm the image of the delusive Frank foolishly pursuing the spiritual guidance of a treacherous and conniving Pope. As has been partially alluded in the first chapter, initially reluctant rulers are continuously dragged into pointless and hopeless struggles with the Ottomans after giving credit to the false promises of the

¹⁵³ Firdevsi-i Rumi, *Kutbname*, p.54. Later on, pp.74-5, while he urges the Hungarian king to take action, he bitterly reminds him that “the Sultan Bayezid struck the infidels like a thunderbolt, hurled the idol of Marco to the ground”, and burnt the port of Modon.

¹⁵⁴ *Kutbname*, p.93. On his trip to Nicea (Iznik), Busbecq, p.45, records a similar instance of Muslim hostility towards “idols”: “While we were there, they had discovered a fine statue, almost intact, representing an armed soldier, but they quickly mutilated it by blows from their hammers. When we showed our annoyance, the workmen laughed at us and asked whether we wished, in accordance with our custom, to worship it and pray to it”.

¹⁵⁵ Nicolas Vatin, *Sultan Djem*, 1997, pp.198-9. Upon hearing that even the most powerful rulers of Europe kissed the Pope’s feet to ask the remission of their sins, the captive Prince allegedly says: “Ces gens-là fondent leurs espoirs sur le Pape. Pour moi, c’est de Dieu très haut que j’espère la remission des pêchés. Dans cette affaire, je n’ai nul besoin du Pape”. Moreover, the anonymous account vivaciously illustrates the ceremonial inauguration of the new Pope Alexander VI (d.1503). Presumably alluding to the stories of the legendary Pope Joan, it professes to have witnessed an “atypical” ritual during which an “inspector” checks the new Pope’s genitalia and declares merily: “Papa miška” (it. *Papa maschio*), “the Pope is a man!” For other manipulations of the Pope Joan legend, see C. M. Rustici, *The Afterlife of Pope Joan: Deploying the Popess Legend in Early Modern England*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 2006.

Pope¹⁵⁶. The same idea is reflected and further developed in letters presumably written by Ottoman captives in European lands. One of them, dating from 1662, presents an awfully gloomy picture of a vampire-like Pope and the ghastly rites performed by his followers:

“Et dans ce pays, le maudit Rim Papa est toujours en vie. Au temps ou il s’était battu contre notre seigneur ‘Ali, celui-ci l’avait maudit pour l’éternité; il n’est ni vivant ni mort, il est dans un coffre. On le sort une fois par an; il mange trois morceaux de pain, il boit trois coupes de vin et quand on le sort de l’église, cinq cents infidèles ceints marchent (avec lui) et vingt-cinq personnes vont devant lui, lisant le livre conformément à leurs vaines croyances”¹⁵⁷.

Moreover, the image of the crooked and devious Pope deliberately misguiding his credulous and impulsive devotees is further reinforced by the harsh descriptions of his clergy. In that spirit, the warrior epic of Barbarossa provide particularly striking images. Priests or monks that are supposed to guide their flock to the right path are no more than mirror-images of their supreme model, the Pope. As such, priests become mere schemers and manipulators. Out of pure evil, they purposefully spread false rumours announcing that God will favour Christians in the upcoming clash against Muslims and provoke a devastating campaign to Algiers resulting in a crushing defeat for Christians¹⁵⁸. Out of

¹⁵⁶ In the *Kutbname*, pp.54-56, the Pope announces the imminent return of Jesus on earth in a self-assured tone, and vows for the partition of the Near East among Catholic powers. The *Gazavat-ı Sultan Murad* also presents the Pope as one of the primary provocateurs and instigators of the Frankish war effort. In many instances, the Frankish rulers are said to regret their involvement in Ottoman affairs, and as such, are presented as ferociously cursing and blaming the Pope.

¹⁵⁷ See Yerasimos, “De l’Arbre à la Pomme”, 1999, p.184. For an even more extreme portrayal of the “Pope as the Antichrist” see pp.185-6. For another caricaturized depiction of Catholic rituals and Papal inauguration, see the memoirs of a secretary of Selim II (d.1574), Hindi Mahmud, who was detained in Messina, Napoli and Rome after his capture during the Battle of Lepanto (1571), Ahmet Karataş, 2011, pp.33-34.

¹⁵⁸ Seyyid Muradi, *Gazavat-i Hayreddin Paşa*, 1993, pp.88-89. For the regretful infidels after the debacle, see p.90.

self-interest, and using their influence on the Spanish king, they succeed in increasing the funds allocated to their monasteries¹⁵⁹.

Notwithstanding idolatrous crowds, gullible kings or dishonest clerics, a deeper conception seem to have characterized the contrast between supposed Euro-Christian and Ottoman-Muslim “worlds”. In fact, popular frontier narratives reflect a stated or implicit conviction that Muslims and Christians were not worshipping the same (and only) God. Although a few instances suggest that Christians and Muslims were represented as two confessional competitors worshipping the same divinity which mysteriously accorded his will to one or to the other, in most cases Catholic Christians were denied an “authentic” God¹⁶⁰. As such, they were imagined as voluntarily and naturally venerating a deity called under various names and titles, which dramatically reversed the heavenly and divine qualities traditionally attributed to God¹⁶¹.

¹⁵⁹ *Gazavat-ı Hayreddin Paşa*, 1975, pp.78-80. In the *Kutbname*, the Pope and the monks (rahib) are used almost interchangeably to illustrate misleading spiritual *charlatans*. For a medieval Arabic allusion to the *mashahir al-asaqifa wal-qississin*, (“high priests and bishops”) bribed by Ramon Berenguer I count of Barcelona (d.1076), see for example N. Hermes, *The European Other in Medieval Arabic Literature and Culture*, 2013, p.60. However, one must note that Christian monks or priests are not always presented in a pejorative light. In a much different context, Evliya Çelebi professes that the first Ottoman Sultan to hear about the discovery of the New World had been informed by two accomplished Frankish monks called “Padre” and “Kolon”. See Jean-Louis Bacqué Grammont, “Osmanlı Seyyahı Evliya Çelebi’nin Gözünden Yeni Dünya” [The New World According to the Ottoman Traveller Evliya Çelebi], in *Evliya Çelebi Konuşmaları* [Evliya Çelebi Talks], (ed.) Sabri Koz, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2011, pp.84-85.

¹⁶⁰ This rendering is not necessarily consistent. In the previously mentioned episode of Charles V’s move to Rome for his bid to the “Crown of Anushirvan”, an enraged Christian God legitimately accuses Charles of dishonesty and as such, displays a characteristic trait attributed to a righteous and fair God. See the *Gazavat-ı Hayreddin Paşa*, 1993, pp.215-217.

¹⁶¹ For a strikingly parallel pattern of Othering articulated in Euro-Christian literature, see D. Blanks and M. Frassetto, “Introduction”, 1999 p.3: “In both popular and learned literature Muslims were portrayed as cowardly, duplicitous, lustful, self-indulgent pagans who worshipped idols and a trinity of false gods”. By the same token, one could give the example of the forged “letter of Morbisanus”, i.e. Umur Pasha, addressed to the Pope Clement VI (d.1352). Comparable to pre-Ottoman and Ottoman popular narratological techniques in its reliance on the direct speech, the apocryphal letter makes Umur Pasha/Morbisanus speak of his “Gods”.

In the epic narratives under scrutiny, this “evil deity” is posed as the direct oppositional force defying the true, “Muslim God”. As such, its actions are almost always inconclusive and fruitless, and his followers’ operations are equally doomed to failure. In the *Kutbname*, “Marco”, the divinity passionately cherished by Europeans, fails to protect Coron from Ottomans¹⁶². Although Christians rally themselves for a vengeful strike on Mytilene, they are denied a victory by the devout followers of the genuine (and Muslim) God. The poem concludes by stressing that abandoned by Marco, outraged and despairing European rulers “frantically insulted him and set his cross on fire”¹⁶³. In the anonymous *Gazavat-ı Murad* and the geste of Barbarossa penned by his companion Seyyid Muradi, the Muslim God is again faced by the *Nar-ı Nur* (the Fire of Light)¹⁶⁴. The structure of each narrative pits the two divinities against each other, and the result is not hard to guess; although Muslims suffer and endure terrible hardships, they ultimately overcome their Christians adversaries with the help of the compassionate and rightful God¹⁶⁵.

All throughout the *Gazavatname* of Barbarossa, the rivalry between two wrestling divinities and their supporters is taken almost for granted. As the biographer of Barbarossa quite “candidly” states: “Whatever crap the Nar-ı Nur was about to do, they

¹⁶² See, *Kutbname*, pp.58-60, an experienced merchant tries to convince a European ruler not to participate in the Christian coalition and says, “Even Marco did not protect Coron”.

¹⁶³ For various instances of the same reaction by different rulers, see p.219; p.240; p.244; pp.267-8 and p.270. In a similar vein, downhearted Christians target the Pope in, for instance, pp.267-8 and p.271.

¹⁶⁴ See footnote no. 97.

¹⁶⁵ For an important study of the *Gazavat-ı Murad*’s emphasis on Muslim piousness and humility in contrast to Christian aberration and “misbelief” see, Barbara Flemming, “The Sultan’s Prayer before Battle”, in *Studies in Ottoman History in Honour of Professor V.L. Menage*, (eds.) C. Imber and C. Heywood, Isis Press, pp.85-99. In both works, the Muslim God openly supports and assists its subjects. In countless cases, Barbarossa or other Muslim warriors are informed of an upcoming danger in their dreams and their devotion and prayers (*dua ü sena*) lead them to victory.

[the infidels] had to follow him”¹⁶⁶. In that sense, the Ottoman admiral is rather instinctively portrayed as the principal foe of the “subjects of the *Nar-ı Nur*”¹⁶⁷. A startling episode illustrating “Frankish connivance” further exposes the supposedly profound antagonism that characterizes Euro-Christian and Ottoman-Muslim relationships. A sea captain from Mallorca attempts to beguile his co-religionists by pretending to have captured the famous corsair Barbarossa. The fake admiral is dressed appropriately in Muslim clothes, brought to a public place and burnt alive. The infidels, rejoicing at the death of the nemesis of the *Nar-ı Nur*, jeer at the remaining Muslim prisoners and sarcastically question their beliefs: “Have you seen what *our* senseless *Nar-ı Nur* has done to *your* Barbarossa? This is the end that awaits those who challenge the servants of the *Nar-ı Nur*”¹⁶⁸. Perhaps more significantly, another fictional passage recounting the enthronement of Charles V as the new king of Spain in 1516 reports that right after his inauguration, the monarch inquired about the state of Andalusian Muslims. His counsellors immediately replied that Moriscos were the “internal enemies” of the throne and added: “Mahommedans are our enemies since Adam’s time and this enmity shall never be over”¹⁶⁹.

¹⁶⁶ *Gazavat-ı Hayreddin Paşa*, 1993, p.217.

¹⁶⁷ Barbarossa’s animosity towards the subjects of the *Nar-ı Nur* is recalled in correspondence with his enmity towards “Christians” (*Hiristiyan*). See *Ibid*, pp.215-217.

¹⁶⁸ *Gazavat-ı Hayreddin Paşa*, p.214. Again, the infidels qualify their own divinities with pejorative terms. The relative popularity of the idea that Muslims and Christians were worshipping distinct Gods is evidenced by the memoirs of Michael Heberer. As he specifies, during his captivity years (1585-1588) in the Ottoman Empire as a galley slave, some merciful low or middle-class Muslims of Galata had given him money, requesting him to “pray to your God for us”. See the Introduction by S. Faroqhi in Michael Heberer, *Osmanlıda bir Köle*, 2003, p.15.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid*, pp.190-191. The passage obviously reflects the policies of the day. For Spanish fears of cooperation between Moriscos and Ottomans see the third sub-section of Chapter 1.

Continually juxtaposed with Ottoman self-images and perceptions, epic poems, recollected folk tales or official biographies relating the exceptional lives of distinguished individualities regularly represented the Frenk as the absolute Other. As such, the putative difference of the Frenk lay first and foremost in his religious allegiance and by extension, in his beliefs. Superstitious rituals (*ayin-i batıl*), deceitful clerics and a delusory and vindictive Pope surrounded, formed and defined the Euro-Christian¹⁷⁰. Overenthusiastic and child-like, the Frenk stubbornly embarked in hazardous adventures he later regretted. Seemingly irredeemable, he passionately strove to contaminate the *Abode of Islam*, as exemplified in the fanciful letter of the Byzantine Emperor to the King of Hungary:

“Jointly striking from East and West, let’s pressure the Turk and smash him. Let’s get a hold on his villages, take possession of his cities and hang church bells on top of his mosques. As servants of our lord Jesus, let’s worship the Nar-ı Nur”¹⁷¹.

By emphasizing or imagining outstanding discrepancies in religious allegiances and rituals, Ottoman narratives drew clear-cut boundaries that outwardly fixed an Ottoman-Muslim Self against a Euro-Christian Other. As will be demonstrated in the next

¹⁷⁰ It must be stressed that Ottoman-Muslim processes of exclusion were not limited to Euro-Christians. Based on socio-political circumstances or personal considerations, Safavid Shi’ites, or (Muslim or non-Muslim) groups within the empire were occasionally chosen as categories against which Ottomans negotiated their identity and articulated their difference. In that sense, Evliya Çelebi’s travelogue could be highly significant. As a member of the Ottoman ruling group, his definitions, classifications and conceptions of varying social categories are especially indicative of overall Ottoman-Muslim (self) perceptions and visions. For two related studies, see, Robert Dankoff, “Ayıp Değil!” [No Disgrace], in *Çağının Stradişi Yazarı: Evliya Çelebi*, 2009, pp.109-122; Nazlı İpek Üner, “Traveling Within the Empire: Perceptions of the East in the Historical Narratives”, *Venturing Beyond Borders*, 2013, pp.77-101.

¹⁷¹ *Gazavat-ı Sultan Murad*, p.40.

sequence, this antagonistic image of the Frankish Other was further corroborated by divergent confirmatory motifs affixed to it¹⁷².

III) Black-Clothed Wine-Drinkers; Hat-Wearing Pork-Eaters

Recounting the arrival of the Safavid ambassador Şahkulu Han in Istanbul around 1568, Selaniki Mustafa Efendi related a curious event. During a parade involving infidel ambassadorial contingents (“küffar alayları”), the inquisitive Persian ambassador asked the grand vizier Sokollu Mehmed: “Why do these infidels raise their hats when they pass nearby us?” To which the experienced Pasha replied: “It is their customs. Whenever they salute someone and want to show their appreciation, they raise their hats”¹⁷³.

In a similar vein, Emine Fetvacı and Baki Tezcan’s recent researches have shown that sixteenth century Ottoman miniatures systematically pictured Euro-Christians with hats

¹⁷² As Birgit Neumann exposes, the recursive processes of narrative devices, rhetorical features or tropes are crucial to the constant re-creation and perpetuation of images that purport to define the *essential* characteristics of a given identity. Giving the example of the construction of national characters, she establishes that “national stereotyping is an ongoing process in which the same national character traits are represented repeatedly, often over decades and centuries, in diverse genres and media”. See, Birgit Neumann, “Towards a Cultural and Historical Imagology: The Rhetoric of National Character in 18th Century British Literature”, *European Journal of English Studies*, Vol.13, 3, 2009, pp.278-9.

¹⁷³ *Tarih-i Selaniki*, Vol. I, pp.66-71. For another short but curious passage supposedly exhibiting “Frankish manners” see Evliya Çelebi, *Seyahatname* [The Book of Travels], (eds.) R. Dankoff, S. A. Kahraman, Y. Dağlı, Vol.1, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2006, p.118. Evliya recalls an instance where a group of Franks specialized in the “science of geometry” (*hendese ilmi*) went out to examine the mosque of Süleyman in Istanbul. Having thoroughly observed the mosque’s graceful architecture, the Frenks “lifted their hats (...) and bit all their fingers out of amazement. In fact, according to them, putting all ten fingers in one’s mouth is a display of admiration”.

and black clothes¹⁷⁴. Firdevsi-i Rumi stresses the same point in his epic poem, the *Kutbname*. Western soldiers are clearly identified by their “şabka” (hat). Ottoman janisseries, on the other hand, are recognized by their traditional headgear, the “börk”¹⁷⁵. Another distinctive feature of Western and Ottoman attire seems to have been outlandish Euro-Christian military outfits and equipments. In both textual and pictorial sources, Franks are frequently presented as armor-clad fighters with covered faces. In the “Book of Süleyman” (*Süleymanname*) studied by Esin Atıl, Frankish soldiers are vested in heavy armors while Frankish “civilians” wear brimmed hats and black clothes¹⁷⁶.

Perhaps more significant than formal and physical modes of distinction stressed in Ottoman sources, however, is the underlying conviction that Franks retained a distinctive lifestyle at odds with Ottoman-Muslim customs. As such, the inappropriateness and incongruity of Frankish mores is accentuated and placed at the epicenter of discussions of Frankish alterity. By imagining, emphasizing, exaggerating or affixing specific characteristics to Euro-Christians, Ottoman narratives constructed and

¹⁷⁴ For depictions of Venetians and the illustration of the flaying scene of the Venetian commander of Famagusta Marcantonio Bragadin (d.1571), Emine Fetvacı, “Others and Other Geographies in the Şehname-i Selim Han”, *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 40, 2012, pp.81-100. For a more general assessment see Baki Tezcan, “The Frank in the Ottoman Eye of 1583”, pp.267-96. Tezcan refers to Sanjay Subrahmanyam’s work and underscores the similarity between early modern Ottoman and Mughal representations of Westerners. In fact, both societies seem to have been caught by Western clothing habits in the earlier phases of their encounter with Europeans. See Subrahmanyam, “On the Hat-Wearers, their Toilet Practices and Other Curious Usages”, 2005, pp.45-81.

¹⁷⁵ See the *Kutbname*, p.73. Alongside burning their crosses and cursing at the Pope, defeated Franks manifest their anger and regret by “throwing their hats on the floor”. See for example p.137; p.240; p.244; p.267 and pp.270-1.

¹⁷⁶ See Esin Atıl, *Süleymanname: The Illustrated History of Süleyman the Magnificent*, National Gallery of Art, Washington, 1986. In contrast to Westerners, Ottoman fighters are depicted with open faces and more lightly armored. For a few textual references to peculiar European military gear, see for example the anonymous *Gazavat-ı Sultan Murad*, p.62 or the *Düsturname-i Enveri*, pp.76-77. See also Kaya Şahin, *Empire and Power in the Reign of Süleyman*, 2013, p.162 or Faruk Bilici, *La Guerre des Turcs: récits de batailles: extraits du “Livre de Voyages”*, Actes Sud, Sindbad, Arles, 2000. For parallel Byzantine observations, see Anthony Kaldellis, *Ethnography after Antiquity: Foreign Lands and Peoples in Byzantine Literature*, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013, p.176.

sustained a relatively coherent image of *Frankishness*. In parallel with their outward differences and religious aberrations, “Frankish manners” were thus equally conceived as dividing features that amplified and deepened the perceived Frankish-Ottoman divide.

Frontier narratives that typically regard Franks as first and foremost (military) rivals set up an almost caricature-like picture of Frankish daily life. As Sidney Mintz pointed out, “peoples' food preferences are close to the center of their self-definition: people who eat strikingly different foods or similar foods in different ways are thought to be strikingly different, sometimes even less human”¹⁷⁷. As such, Ottoman categorizations and classifications of food habits functioned in “constructing identities and inscribing boundaries”¹⁷⁸.

Indeed, one of the fundamental differences between Euro-Christians and Ottoman-Muslims as envisioned and expressed in Ottoman *gazavatname* literature and travel narratives seems to have been disparate culinary practices and drinking habits. Contrary to sober and devoted Muslims, Franks are portrayed as seemingly irremediable wine-drinkers. Moreover, as reckless and unyielding Christians, they disgracefully consume pork-meat and as such, openly violate normative dietary practices established by Islamic law¹⁷⁹.

¹⁷⁷ Quoted in Dursteler, “Infidel Foods: Food and Identity in Early Modern Ottoman Travel Literature”, *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 39, 2012, p.150.

¹⁷⁸ *Idem*, p.146, or more explicitly stated, p.160: “in the Ottoman Empire, cultural and religious distinctions were essential markers of difference, and foodways were one among a variety of modes by which these differences were articulated”.

¹⁷⁹ Dursteler’s article clearly demonstrates that Euro-Christians were not the single alienated category in that sense. From a capital-based, Ottoman-centric view as exemplified in the writings of Evliya Çelebi or Mustafa Ali, *peripheral* lands, whether under Ottoman control or not, could be externalized or marginalized

In a fascinating passage from the annals of Barbarossa, priests from the “infidel shore” (*kafir yakası*) sacrifice five to six hundred pigs to the evil *Nar-ı Nur* in order to regain his favour and defeat Muslims¹⁸⁰. In Kemalpaşazade’s chronicle of the Ottoman dynasty or Cafer İyani’s account of Ottoman-Habsburg wars, different Frankish infidels are regularly called under highly standardized designations that recall their despicable eating habits. For example, while *küffar-ı gürüz-siret* (“pig-like infidels”) occasionally defines Hungarians, İyani categorizes Austrian soldiers as the *hınzır alayı* (“swine regiment”)¹⁸¹. Similar expressions are to be found in Evliya Çelebi’s illustrations of various Ottoman-Frankish military clashes. Besides labeling Franks as pigs, however, Evliya thoroughly animalizes them by likening their attitudes and manners to pigs. After all, as Edith Gülçin Ambros indicates, “la saleté voire l’impureté, est (...) partie intégrante de la notion du porc pour les Ottomans musulmans” and “le sanglier (...) sert d’objet de comparaison et de métaphore pour l’ennemi, soulignant de ce fait la brutalité sauvage, la ruse et aussi la force”¹⁸².

by observers from the *core* regions. For Kurdish foodways, see Dursteler, 2012, pp.150-154. For Egyptian eating habits as viewed by Mustafa Ali, see *Idem*, p.156-158.

¹⁸⁰ Seyyid Muradi, *Gazavat-ı Hayreddin Paşa*, 1993, pp.88-89. For yet another instance of “hog-sacrifice”, see pp.214-215.

¹⁸¹ Kemalpaşazade, Vol. X, p.49; Cafer İyani, *Tevarih-i Cedid-i Vilayet-i Ungurus* [The New History of the Province of Hungary], p.26. For a curious account of Ottoman interest in pigs, see Busbecq’s *Turkish Letters*, p.96: “Many Asiatics visit my house on his account, in their desire to see this unclean animal, which their sacred writings forbid them to eat and which is banished from their land and, therefore, has never been seen by them; indeed, all the Turks avoid contact with a pig as we avoid a man stricken by the plague”.

¹⁸² Edith Gülçin Ambros, “Langage reflétant une différence culturelle: Le cas du porc/sanglier (domuz/hınzır) dans le Seyahatname d’Evliya Çelebi”, *Cahiers Balkaniques*, 41, 2013, pp.129-144. Among others, see a few allusions translated by Ambros such as “une troupe de sangliers, en tout cent fois plus grande, composée d’Autrichiens, de Bohémiens, de Francs, de Croates et de Hongrois marche”, or “les fantassins mécréants impurs aux chapeaux noirs s’entrelacèrent dos à dos comme une horde de sangliers”, pp.134-6.

Debasing the status of the Frankish Other by relegating it to a beast-like stance facilitated the qualification of any Frankish reaction or behavior as comical, absurd or even irrational. Again, the *gazavatname* of Barbarossa stands out as the perfect example with regard to the rhetorical uses of such associations. In numerous instances, the biographer of the grand admiral ridicules the Frankish side by providing colorful depictions of their tragicomic and hopeless situation. As such, upon hearing the defeat Habsburgs encountered in Hungary, deeply afflicted infidels start “howling like dogs and squeaking like pigs”¹⁸³.

Such analogies, underlining the moral weaknesses of the Franks, are recurrent throughout the narrative¹⁸⁴. In fact, these impressions are further buttressed when combined with charges of excessive alcohol-consumption. Recalling the failed 1541 expedition of Charles V to Algiers, the memoir gives a vivid description of an infidel *feste* (fiesta)¹⁸⁵. Underestimating Ottoman power, “infidels had set up a huge *feste* and had carried wine barrels by boat; that night, they had eaten, drunk and entertained themselves until the morning. The next day, they could not redress themselves and remained drunk, snoring like pigs. It did not occur to them that discovering their lamentable state, Negro Hasan Aga could launch a surprise attack”¹⁸⁶. Indeed, Negro

¹⁸³ *Gazavatname-i Hayreddin Paşa*, 1993, p.231.

¹⁸⁴ See the *Gazavatname-i Hayreddin Paşa* edited by E. Düzdağ, 1975, vol.I, pp.41-42. After yet another Ottoman victory in Algiers, an agitated crowd gathered around the Spanish king in protest, “braying like donkeys and oinking like hogs”.

¹⁸⁵ The biography of Barbarossa is equally worth a serious linguistic study. Countless words or even whole expressions are directly borrowed from Spanish, Italian or Greek. See Emrah Sefa Gürkan, “Batı Akdeniz’de Osmanlı Korsanlığı ve Gaza Meselesi” [Ottoman Piracy in the Western Mediterranean and the Issue of Gaza], *Kebikeç*, 33, 2012, pp.173-204.

¹⁸⁶ *Gazavat-ı Hayreddin Paşa*, 1993, p.237.

Hasan, Barbarossa's "adoptive son", initiated an assault that drove Spanish forces away. To avoid starvation during the debacle, Charles V had to eat his own horse¹⁸⁷.

In yet another case, wine is perceived as a dangerous stimulant leading Franks astray. Cafer Iyani reports that during the Ottoman-Habsburg Long War (1593-1606), the delirious and euphoric Austrian "Ceneral" (general, high commander) made lousy decisions out of wine's "fervour" (*germiyyet*)¹⁸⁸. The same author predicts that the arrogant Habsburg Archduke Matthias (d.1619) would gather the lords of the *Leh* (Poles), *Çeh* (Czechs), *Nemçe* (Austrians) and *Macar* (Hungarians) and would start, under the influence of wine, to boast pretentiously in front of them¹⁸⁹.

By the same token, Firdevsi-i Rumi creates an astonishingly melodramatic scene in his *Kutbname*, not far in scope and depth from a Socratic symposium. Picturing the court of the Venetian Doge (*Tekfur-i Frenk*), the poet imagines a debauched banquet where pork-meat and musicians abound and where the inebriated Doge fabricates one grandiose lie after another in total self-delusion. The twist of the story, however, is enough to change his mood. The sudden arrival of a survivor from the disastrous campaign of Mytilene

¹⁸⁷ For a detailed assessment of the campaign of 1541 and a Spanish translation –from a different manuscript - of the relevant passages from the *Gazavat* of Barbarossa, see Ertuğrul Önalp, "La Campana Militar de Carlos V contra Argel segun las 'Memorias de Barbarroja' (Gazavat-ı Hayreddin Paşa)", *L'Empire Ottoman dans l'Europe de la Renaissance, El Imperio Otomano en la Europa Renacentista*, 2005, pp.215-226. The text ironically states that Charles ate his horse "with great appetite".

¹⁸⁸ Cafer Iyani, *Tevarih-I Cedid-I Vilayet-i Ungurus* [The New History of the Province of Hungary], p.20.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid*, p.77.

reveals the bitter truth: the Doge and his company furiously tear up their hats and quickly pick on the perfidious idol, “Marko”¹⁹⁰.

IV) The Weakest Link: Frankish Women

Frankish abnormality and deviance was not simply consigned to naive religious beliefs or to wine and pork consumption. A perceived (or imagined) distinction among Ottoman-Muslim and Euro-Christian customary approaches to gender relations seem to have equally outlined the overall disparity between an uncontaminated Self and the impure Other. In Ottoman travelogues and frontier narratives, Euro-Christian women were mostly associated with characteristics that epitomized what normative Ottoman-Muslim womanhood was not¹⁹¹. Subtly or indelicately eroticized, Frankish women were represented as mere objects to be possessed or dominated by Ottoman-Muslim travellers or ghazis/warriors of the faith. Pictured as impulsive, excessively passionate, and lustful,

¹⁹⁰ *Kutbname*, pp.270-1. Other instances present the Venetian Doge in drinking sessions. As such, right before giving the final order launching the campaign, the Doge is intoxicated. See, p.153. The same goes for the Hungarian ruler. Firdevsi depicts his court, presuming that “they have formed an assembly, drank the prohibited wine (hamr-ı haram) and joyfully ate pork”. See p.84. Note the eye-catching presence of wine in an Ottoman miniature displaying the defeated and deceased Hungarian King Louis II’s camp before the conclusive confrontation at Mohacs (1526). See Esin Atlı, *The Illustrated History of Süleyman the Magnificent*, p.131.

¹⁹¹ As Palmira Brummett points out, “travel narratives often mark space, and the transitions from one ethno-linguistic frontier to another by means of commentary on women’s roles, dress, beauty (or lack thereof) manners, and transgressions”. See Palmira Brummett, “Introduction: Genre, Witness and Time in the ‘Book’ of Travels”, in (ed.) P. Brummett, *The ‘Book’ of Travels: Genre, Ethnology, and Pilgrimage, 1250-1700*, Leiden, Brill, 2009, p.23. For Euro-Christian perceptions of ‘Eastern’ women, see Pompa Banerjee’s chapter from the same book, “Postcards from the Harem: The Cultural Translation of Niccolao Manucci’s Book of Travels”, pp.241-281. For representations of Ottoman women by three different Western travelers, see Palmira Brummett, Katherine Thompson Newell, “A Young Man’s Fancy Turns to ‘Love’? The Traveler’s Eye and the Narration of Women in Ottoman Space (or The European Male ‘Meets’ the Ottoman Female, 16th-18th Centuries)”, *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 40, 2012, pp.193-220.

Euro-Christian women easily fell prey to the irresistible charms of the devout and pious Muslim male¹⁹². Moreover, their “scandalous accessibility” as portrayed in Ottoman sources, hinted directly at Frankish men’s lack of jealousy and therefore, at their softness and unmanliness¹⁹³.

One such observation can be located in the relatively fair-minded sixteenth-century anonymous chronicle recounting the misadventures of Prince Cem in the *Kafiristan* (Infideldom). According to the report, at some point during his compulsory sojourn in infidel lands, the prized captive Cem had been taken to a small village not far from Nice. There, the Frenks in charge took pains to distract and divert him:

“Ils amusèrent ainsi le défunt [Cem] pendant quatre mois. Ils faisaient venir les plaisantes vierges de la ville et dansaient le horos. Leurs coutumes ne leur imposent pas le port du voile. Au contraire, elles tirent gloire de baiser et d’embrasser. Après la danse, quand elles voulaient se reposer, elles s’asseyaient sur les genoux de leurs amants. Leur cou, leurs oreilles et leur gorge sont nus. Parmi elles, il y en avait une particulièrement charmante avec qui le défunt avait eu des relations marquées d’une certaine affection”¹⁹⁴.

¹⁹² For a valuable study dealing with more contemporary and contrasting discourses of control and domination over women in the Western world and the Arab east, see Laura Nader, “Orientalism, Occidentalism and the Control of Women”, *Cultural Dynamics*, 1989, 2, pp.323-355.

¹⁹³ An early Western European account stressing comparably “the sexual availability of Eastern women to Western male travelers” was Marco Polo’s *Travels*. See Linda Lomperis, “Medieval Travel Writing and the Question of Race”, *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 31, 1, 2001, p.149. Indeed, one must bear in mind that such literary practices were not by all means exclusively “Ottoman”. Mohamad Tavakoli-Targhi attentively reminds us that “misogyny and ethnocentrism were the shared characteristics of both European and Persian narration of the Other. European fascination with the imagined women of harems, seraglios and gynoeceum paralleled the Persianate view of Europe as an eroticized “heaven on earth” and European women as lascivious and licentious. Both Persians and Europeans constituted the body of the “other” women as a site for sexual and political imagination”. See Mohamad Tavakoli-Targhi, *Refashioning Iran: Orientalism, Occidentalism and Historiography*, Palgrave, New York, 2001, p.61.

¹⁹⁴ Nicolas Vatin, *Sultan Djem*, 1997, p.156.

Further on, the text refers to the alleged relationship between Cem and Hélène-Philippine de Sassenage: “Après un ou deux mois de séjour, ils le conduisirent à un fort du nom de Sassenage. Le chatelain du lieu avait une aimable fille sans pareille. Entre celle-ci et le défunt naquit un amour réciproque; leur tendresse et leur affection mutuelles étaient sans limite, et ils échangeaient une correspondance considérable”¹⁹⁵.

Dedicated to an Ottoman audience, the shocking descriptions of the Frankish womenfolk entirely reversed the pre-supposed Ottoman-Muslim moral order. Through explicit illustrations and imageries of *Frankish* femininity, the author subtly transmitted and repeated the normative viewpoint of his own society, marking an ingenious distinction between Ottoman-Muslim and Euro-Christian societies. In turn, the trapped and despairing prince Cem managed, at least symbolically, to overpower this upturned community by dominating and asserting “control” over its apparently debauched womenfolk¹⁹⁶.

Going beyond the captivity memoir of Cem, Evliya Çelebi’s bold remarks on infidel women in his travelogue further cemented the divide between Euro-Christian and Ottoman-Muslim morals. Although not necessarily condescending, Evliya points more

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid*, p.168.

¹⁹⁶ Although it is not always easy to establish explicit links, it is a known fact that the Islamicate literary culture inherited and assimilated by Ottomans presented a wide array of similar representations. Robert Irwin affirmed that “it was a commonplace of Muslim polemic to denounce Christian sexual freedom and lack of sexual jealousy. Medieval authors such as Ibrahim b. Yaqub, or the widely read cosmographer al-Qazwini had made the same claims. According to a twelfth-century anonymous work composed in Syria in Christian lands “unmarried women are allowed to fornicate with whomever they like, but sleeping with priests in churches was regarded as especially meritorious”. Robert Irwin, *For Lust of Knowing: The Orientalists and their Enemies*, Penguin Books, 2007, pp.40-41. For the same point, see also Aziz Al-Azmeh, “Mortal Enemies, Invisible Neighbors: Northerners in Andalusian Eyes”, pp.267-8.

clearly to the “traditional” openness of Frankish women and the laxity of Frankish men. As such, he recounts in amazement that in Vienna, the Habsburg emperor politely stood aside to let a woman pass or respectfully doffed his hat when a woman addressed him. He attributes such unusual manners to the infidels’ reverence for the Virgin Mary¹⁹⁷. Furthermore, he notes that in Dubrovnik, Gingösh and in Muscovy “girls sit in the marketplace and sell their wares”, while “in Peshpehil [Schwehat near Vienna] men and women do not flee from each other (...) and women may go outdoors without their husbands’ permission, and even sit and chat and drink ‘with us Ottomans’”¹⁹⁸. In yet another passage, Evliya makes a lucid and unmistakable distinction between “Ottoman-Muslim” and “Euro-Christian” lifestyles and moral principles. Before going on a duty for ransoming an Ottoman officer held by the Ban of Herzegovina, Evliya warns his men:

“ See here, ghazis! The territory we are about to enter, under a truce, is the land of the infidels, where wine, women and boys are permitted. If I find any of you with a woman or a boy, or befuddled with wine or rakı, I will cook your goose and beat you black and blue. Is that understood?”¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁷ As Evliya asserts, “in this land and in the rest of the *Kafiristan* (land of unbelief), women are preeminent and are held in higher esteem for the love of Mother Mary”. See Robert Dankoff, “Ayıp Değil!” [No Disgrace], p.110.

¹⁹⁸ Translated by Dankoff in “Did Evliya Çelebi “fall in love” with the Europeans?” pp.19-22.

¹⁹⁹ Translation by R. Dankoff in his, “Did Evliya Çelebi “fall in love” with the Europeans?” pp.19-21. It must be noted that Evliya utilized different rhetorical techniques to construct Frankish alterity in juxtaposition to an Ottoman-Muslim Self. One of them was feminizing the Other. During the famous 1665/6 Ottoman embassy to Vienna to which Evliya participated, Austrians offer the Ottoman retinue a ride in glamorous horse-drawn carriages to make their entrance in the city. The Ottoman pasha firmly refuses, declaring: “I don’t travel around in carriages, since we are Ottomans. Our custom dictates us to ride Arabian horses (...) and go to holy wars (ghaza). In Istanbul, such carriages are used by women, we don’t need them”. See Arzu Erekli, “Seyahatname’de “Öteki”ne Bakış” [A Look at the “Other” in the Book of Travels], in *Çağmın Sıradışı Yazarı: Evliya Çelebi*, 2009, p.150.

By the same token, the seventeenth-century memoirs of another prisoner in Christian lands has underscored the distinctions between the “Well-Protected domains” (Ottoman lands) and the “Abode of War” (land of the Franks) through perceived divergences in women’s attitudes and behaviors. Osman Ağa of Temeshvar (Timișoara, in modern day Romania), an Ottoman officer held captive by Habsburgs for eleven years (from 1688 to 1699), left an extensive account of these tumultuous years at the service of Austrian noblemen²⁰⁰. Recounting his stay at a Croatian village, the young man recalls that “les filles pubères me prenaient souvent par la main, l’une à gauche, l’autre à droite, et m’invitaient dans leur chambrette. Elles étaient très gentilles avec moi; nous bavardions pendant une ou deux heures en toute intimité et elles me demandaient continuellement de chanter pour elles des chansons musulmanes et bosniaques”²⁰¹. Another anecdote, worth quoting in length, conveys perhaps the most vivid and dramatic representation of Ottoman representations/visions of Euro-Christian women. During his stay at the residence of his owner in Kapfenberg, Osman Ağa relates the following mind-boggling adventure:

“Un matin, alors que tout le monde dormait, je vis arriver Margot, la camériste de notre maitresse, une fille jolie comme une fleur, dans sa quizième année, avec des yeux noirs, des seins comme des oranges et une taille accorte. Elle entra, grimpa dans mon lit, s’allongea contre moi, m’entoura de ses bras et commença a m’embrasser. J’ouvris les yeux et voila, je me retrouvais

²⁰⁰ Osman Ağa de Temechvar, *Prisonnier des Infidèles: Un Soldat Ottoman dans l’Empire des Habsbourg*, (ed.) Frédéric Hitzel, Actes Sud, Sindbad, 1998. We have used Hitzel’s version. For a German edition, see *Der Gefangene der Giauren: die Abenteuerlichen Schicksale des Dolmetschers ‘Osman Aga aus Temeschwar*, (eds.) R. F. Kreutel, O. Spies, Graz, 1962. For a Turkish edition, *Kendi Kalemiiyle Temeşvarlı Osman Ağa: Bir Osmanlı Türk Sipahisinin Hayatı ve Esirlik Hatıraları*, (ed.) Harun Tolasa, Selçuk Üniversitesi Yayınları, Konya, 1986.

²⁰¹ Ibid, p.81.

dans une situation que je n’aurais jamais osé espérer! (...) je retrouvai enfin la parole et dis: ‘Chère demoiselle, comment est-ce possible que vous soyez descendue pour venir me voir dans ce lieu, moi qui suis un être sans importance?’ (...) Ah mon âme, soupira t-elle, un coeur ne se contrôle pas et se donne a qui il veut! Je suis amoureuse de toi depuis longtemps. Je n’ai jamais pu l’exprimer, mais maintenant que tu veux partir et me laisser, je n’ai pas pu me retenir; il fallait que je t’avoue mon amour et puisque tu le sais, mon Coeur se brisera quand tu partiras! Je t’en prie, je t’en prie, reste ici et ne me quitte pas! Je suis à toi; accepte-moi et fais de moi ce que tu veux (...)’. Elle m’implorait tout en me couvrant de baisers et ses yeux ruisselaient de larmes qui tombaient petit à petit sur moi”²⁰².

Resisting temptation, the then twenty year-old Osman comforts Margot and sends her away, only to see that “les jours suivants elle descendit me voir encore une fois ou deux et recommença ses tentatives; du coup, je donnai un tour de clef à la porte de l’écurie et mis ainsi fin à cette affaire”²⁰³.

In a similar fashion, upon hearing Osman’s eagerness to return to Ottoman lands, the lady of the house falls to pieces and bemoans:

“Pourquoi ne te plais-tu pas à mon service? Je t’ai gardé avec moi parce que je t’aime bien. Te manque-t-il quelque chose? N’as tu pas à manger et à boire comme il faut et manques-tu de vêtements? Ou bien quelqu’un t’aurait-il blessé? Réponds-moi ! Tu n’as pas tant de travail que

²⁰² Another captivity account that similarly mentions the “ease with which French women can be had” is that of an Egyptian janissary’s narrative of his forced stay in France. See Cemal Kafadar, “Self and Others: The Diary of a Dervish in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul and First-Person Narratives in Ottoman Literature,” *Studia Islamica*, 1989, pp.132-133.

²⁰³ Osman Aga, *Prisonnier des Infidèles*, pp.105-6.

cela, dis-moi donc ce qui ne va pas !” Sur ces paroles insistantes, les larmes lui montèrent aux yeux et elle pleura²⁰⁴.

Although expressed by different authors in strikingly different socio-political contexts, the image of the instinctive and desirous Frankish lady fancying or venerating a virtuous Ottoman-Muslim can be located in various different early modern Ottoman narratives²⁰⁵. As such, the *Düsturname* recounting the exploits of the Emir of Aydin, Umur Bey (d.1348), seems to be quite appropriate to the task. On two different occasions, the *gazavatname* of Umur introduces the Emir as the perfect Muslim-warrior, admired and even adored by infidel women.

Umur’s landing at Bodonitsa near the Thermopylae sets the scene for a rather quixotic love-tale between Umur and the marquise of Bodonitsa, unnamed in the *Düsturname* but identified as Guglielma Pallavicini (d.1358), widow of Bartolomeo Zaccaria²⁰⁶. As the text underlines, the marquise (called *hatun*, i.e. “the woman”) was the sole ruler of the Latin fief known as the Marquisate of Bodonitsa. When she meets Umur, she is completely dazzled and carried away by his captivating allure. Immediately and quite straightforwardly, she offers herself to him. Umur, however, acts honorably, and rejects

²⁰⁴ Ibid, p.105. Unlike the precedent anecdote, the text does not imply any sexual implication between Osman and his mistress. For a Moroccan Muslim ambassador recounting his love affairs with a French woman, see the report by Ahmad bin Qasim, an Andalusian Morisco who went to France and Holland in 1611-13. His work is entitled *Nasir al Din ala al-Qawm al-Kafirin* (“The Protector of Religion against the Unbelievers”) and has been translated into English by Nabil Matar in, *In the Land of the Christians: Arabic Travel Writing in the Seventeenth Century*, Routledge, 2003.

²⁰⁵ See the study of Ezgi Dikici on a similar theme in a different warrior epic, “Christian Imagery in an Ottoman Poem: The Icons of Muslim Holy Warriors in Suzi’s *Gazavatname*”, *Annual of Medieval Studies at CEU*, 14, 2008, pp.9-22.

²⁰⁶ For the whole passage, see the *Düsturname-i Enveri*, pp.66-68. After the death of her husband, Guglielma Pallavicini asks Venice for a new husband whereupon she is sent Niccolo Zorzi.

her advances on the grounds that he would be unable to commit to her. Out of desperation, the lonely marquise even attempts to buy his affection, offering him all the riches in the world. Umur declines yet one more time, reminding her stoically that he has no interest in worldly possessions. The closing scene gravely ends with the brokenhearted marquise escorting Umur to his ships²⁰⁷. Casting a last forlorn glance at the ghazi, the “Lady of Thermopylae” waves him goodbye.

In another oft-quoted passage Umur is approached by the daughter of his ally John IV Kantakouzenos (Byzantine Emperor from 1347 to 1354) referred to as *Despina* in the Ottoman text. Again, Umur turns down Despina’s marriage proposal, affirming this time that he could not marry the daughter of his “brother”. Despina, however, does not take no for an answer, and takes a step further by proposing to the “warrior of faith” an extramarital affair. Upon hearing such an illicit suggestion, Umur staunchly rebukes Despina, and returns to Izmir, leaving yet another broken (infidel) heart behind him²⁰⁸.

Later expanded to Ottoman-Frankish encounters, the topos of the infidel princess/mistress desperately falling in love with the Ottoman-Muslim male is a literary commonplace found in narratives describing Muslim-Christian struggles in Anatolia and

²⁰⁷ The text precisely stresses that the Emir was riding his horse, while the marquise was leading the way *on foot*. See Ibid, pp.67-8.

²⁰⁸ *Düsturname-i Enveri*, pp.93-109. For Umur and Despina, see especially pp.106-109. See the travel account of Al-Ghazal (d.864) as transmitted by the chronicler Ibn Dihya (d.1235), which similarly declares that during his embassy in Nordic lands, a “beautiful and coquettish” Viking Queen named Nud had fallen madly in love with him. When the protagonist expressed his reluctance for a serious love affair so as not to offend her religion and the King, the Queen “laughed, saying ‘we do not have such things in our religion, nor do we have such jealousy. Our women are with our men only of their own choice. A woman stays with her husband as long as it pleases her to do so, and leaves him if it no longer pleases her’”. See N. Hermes, *The European Other in Medieval Arabic Literature and Culture*, pp.104-108.

Rumelia²⁰⁹. Besides its obvious entertaining allure, its significance seems to have been twofold: first, it permitted self-promotion and corroborated the image of the pure and infallible Self by picturing it as the center of (Frankish) feminine attraction. Secondly, by imagining and repeatedly underscoring the immoral and excessively lustful traits of Frankish womanliness, it reinforced and externalized the floating and hypothetical divide between Euro-Christians and Ottoman-Muslims on social and moral grounds. Besides their false beliefs, bizarre manners, or extraneous behaviours, Franks were thus construed as morally degenerate, dispassionate and nonchalant individuals, incapable of controlling and disciplining their incontinent and lascivious women²¹⁰.

V) A Tentative Conclusion: A Frankish Pestilence?

²⁰⁹ A parallel case is the story of the Ottoman takeover of the fort of Aydos, not far from Istanbul. Integrated in classical early Ottoman chronicles such as Neşri (d.1520) and Aşıkpaşazade (d.1484), the legend recounts that the daughter of the infidel commander of Aydos betrays her fellow co-religionists by siding with the Ottoman ghazis. In her dream, the young girl sees a “lovely-faced friendly person” raising her out of a pit. The next day, she recognizes the “holy man of her dream” leading the ghazis to the castle: Ghazi Rahman (or Abdurrahman). She immediately dispatches him a letter promising to turn over the castle at an appointed time. After the capture of the fort, she is finally united to her beloved, the ghazi. See Paul Wittek, “The Taking of Aydos Castle: A Ghazi Legend and its Transformation”, in *Arabic and Islamic Studies in Honor of Hamilton A. R. Gibb*, (ed.) George Makdisi, Cambridge, 1965, pp.662-72; William Hickman, “The Taking of Aydos Castle: Further Considerations on a Chapter from Aşıkpaşazade”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 99, No.3, 1979, pp.399-407. Additionally, Hickman, pp.404-5, notes the story of Seyyid Battal (8th century legendary Muslim fighter personified in the *Battalname*) and the daughter of the Christian lord enamored of him.

²¹⁰ Hindi Mahmud, an Ottoman notable held captive in various European cities after the Battle of Lepanto, comments on the moral corruption and sexual depravity in Messina. See Ahmet Karataş, “The Prison Memoirs of an Inebahtı Veteran”, 2011, p.28. It must be acknowledged, however, that Ottomans used similar rhetorical figures during other processes of boundary-building that included Muslims lying both within and outside the Empire. See for example the Egyptian case, as exemplified by Nazlı İpek Üner. According to her study, both Evliya Çelebi and Mustafa Ali took a judgemental approach to the recurrent public visibility and relative liberty of women in Cairo (they were apparently riding donkeys). See Nazlı İpek Üner, “Traveling Within the Empire: Perceptions of the East in the Historical Narratives”, pp.87-91. For an assessment of Safavid mores, see Mustafa Ali’s harsh commentary: “It is generally known that they [the Safavids] are notorious for their total ignominy and adultery, and known by all for bloodshed and murder because it is clear that this bunch of red-heads has strayed from the path of the honourable shari’a and loosened their grip on the women under their authority”, in Jan Schmidt, *Pure Water for Thirsty Muslims*, 1991, p.189.

As has been seen, the discourses of exclusion and alterity supported by strong and effective stock images persistently repeated in different literary accounts created and endorsed the underlying conception of a politically suspicious, religiously threatening, and morally weak Frankish Other. Interestingly, a few testimonies indicate that the use of such an antagonistic and defamatory rhetoric to qualify and account for Franks may have found equivalents in the rhetoric of public discourse. In fact, some textual evidence seems to imply that the culturally ostracized Franks were occasionally and purposefully used as a tool to denigrate, belittle, or isolate local Ottomans that were suspected of establishing cordial relationships with them.

In that respect, the diary of Stephan Gerlach (d.1612), the chaplain of the Habsburg envoy who resided in Istanbul from 1573 to 1578, provides ample examples related mostly to the Ottoman-Greek community. Recounting a dispute between the Greek patriarch Metrophanes III (d.1580) and the notoriously powerful magnate Michael Kantakouzenos (d.1578, nicknamed *Şeytanoğlu*, “the Devil’s son”), Gerlach claims that Cantacuzene called the patriarch a “lackey of the Franks”, accusing him of showing more affection to Westerners than to Greeks, and blames him for having kissed the feet of the Pope²¹¹. Similarly, detailing his close relationship with the patriarchal chaplain Zigomala, Gerlach affirms that the preacher had told him that he was constantly humiliated by Greeks and Perots [residents of the mixed Frankish quarter across from Istanbul] because of his correspondance with the Habsburg agent, since in their eye, “we [Protestants] were

²¹¹ Gerlach, *Türkiye Günlüğü*, [The Turkish Diary], Vol. I, 2006, pp.142-3. For Busbecq’s view on Metrophanes see his *Turkish Letters*, p.189: “He was anxious for the union of the Latin and Greek churches and thus disagreed with the attitude adopted by most men of his race, who shun members of our Church as unclean and profane; so convinced is each man that his own way of thought is the best”.

infidels”²¹². Stressing the fact that Greeks from various lands have great opportunities to go to Italy, Gerlach noted that “when they return, Turks suspect them of having disclosed some great secret about themselves, while their co-religionists fear that they have become apostates”²¹³.

By the same token, Evliya Çelebi recounts that after having “befriended a Muscovite envoy during his travels in southern Russia and [having] expressed reluctance to leave him behind after returning to Azov in 1667 (...) his Crimean host reproached him in the following terms: “You have travelled so much in the land of the infidels that you have fallen in love with the infidels”²¹⁴.

However, a much more relevant document hinting at a similar phenomenon, originated from the upper echelons of the Ottoman ruling class. In a *telhis* (a formal

²¹² *Idem*, pp.417-8. For pro-Latin and Latinophobic attitudes within the Orthodox Church under Ottoman rule see Charles Frazee, *Catholics and Sultans: The Church and the Ottoman Empire, 1453-1923*, Cambridge University Press, 1983; Eric Dursteler, “Education and Identity in Constantinople’s Latin Rite Community, c. 1600”, *Renaissance Studies*, Vol.18, 2, 2004, pp.287-303; Aphrodite Papayianni, “He Polis Healo: The Fall of Constantinople in 1453 in Post-Byzantine Popular Literature”, pp.27-44. For older Byzantine accusations of “Latin-mindedness” see Donald M. Nicol, “The Byzantine View of Western Europe”, *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 1967, 8, 4, pp.315-345; for accusations of introducing “Latin habits” in Byzantium, see Anthony Kaldellis, *Ethnography after Antiquity: Foreign Lands and Peoples in Byzantine Literature*, p.174-5. A similar strand of Europhobic attitudes can be observed in the Ottoman-Jewish community. As Minna Rozen notes, a perceived tension between local Jews and European Jews (some converted to Christianity) had started to arise, especially by the seventeenth century. Ottoman-Jews quickly characterized the “Francos” fleeing to the Ottoman Empire by the intermediary of Europeans as “lapsed Jews”, “desecrators of the Sabbath and outright heretics”. Quite similar to Ottoman-Muslim attitudes, “two customs that elicited particularly harsh reactions were the custom of Franco women walking alone in public, and the habit of Francos to go out in the company of their wives and daughters”. See Minna Rozen, “The Ottoman Jews”, in *The Cambridge History of Turkey: Volume 3: The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839*, (ed.) S. Faroqhi, Cambridge University Press, 2006, p.263 and p.271. See also the article by the same author, “Contest and Rivalry in Mediterranean Maritime Commerce in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century: The Jews of Salonika and the European Presence”, *Revue des Etudes Juives*, Vol. CXLVII, 3-4, 1988, pp.309-352.

²¹³ Gerlach, p.144.

²¹⁴ For the comment and translation see Robert Dankoff, *An Ottoman Mentality, The World of Evliya Çelebi*, Brill, Leiden, 2000, pp.64-5. See also *Idem*, “Did Ottomans “fall in love” with the Europeans?”, p.15.

memorandum written to the sultan by the grand vizier), the experienced late sixteenth-century vizier Koca Sinan Pasha (d.1596) addressed a complaint to the Sultan Murad III (d.1595) with regard to the influential Jewish courtier David Passi. Although Koca Sinan's enmity towards Passi was related to courtly intrigues, as both actors positioned themselves in competing political factions, the rhetoric and the arguments the former deployed to bring about the dismissal of the latter are quite telling²¹⁵. Besides reminding the Quranic verses that prohibited Muslims to befriend Jews, Koca Sinan shrewdly questioned Passi's loyalty as "he was constantly eating and drinking with Frenks". Rejecting the idea that a Jew could assist the "People of Islam", the grand vizier recalled Passi's past and commented harshly:

"How unfortunate it is to presume that someone who has grown and flourished in the Abode of War and who has then migrated to this land would be of assistance to the religion of Islam and to its people"²¹⁶.

Although thoroughly hypothetical, such accounts may testify to the existence of a more general trend of anti-Frankishness in early modern Ottoman society and culture. As it appears, real or alleged connections to Frankish Christians could have been profitably used to blacklist or denigrate other local Ottomans as "sycophants", or "collaborators" of the Frenks. A more profound study of the demonization of Franks and of *Frankishness* in

²¹⁵ For a good assessment of the political context and rivalry between the two characters, see the recent article by Elif Özgen, "The Connected World of Intrigues: The Disgrace of Murad III's Favorite David Passi in 1591", *Leidschrift*, 1, 2012, pp.75-100. For a brief commentary on the politically ambivalent status of Passi and other Marranos see Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople*, pp.111-2.

²¹⁶ For the transcribed and published documents, see Halil Sahillioğlu, *Koca Sinan Paşa'nın Telhisleri* [The Memorandums of Koca Sinan Pasha], IRCICA, Istanbul, 2004, p.16.

local political discourses might therefore shed further light on more abstruse and subtle manipulations of the pejorative image of the Euro-Christian Other²¹⁷.

Chapter Three

A Shared Destiny: Ottoman-Frankish Confrontation, Friendship and

Love

I) Flexible and Durable Identities

Depending on the viewpoint, the following chapter could be interpreted as a response or as a complement to the previous two sections. The main purpose will be to demonstrate that alongside overwhelmingly negative or exclusivist imageries of *Frankishness*, the travelogues, epics, or folk-tales hitherto scrutinized generated positive images of the Franks, conveyed via particular all-inclusive narratological structures²¹⁸. The reasons that could account for the seemingly incompatible balance between unflattering and depreciative illustrations and more flexible or unbiased depictions of Franks within the same body of work are manifold and need to be clarified.

²¹⁷ Although referring to a different time period and society, see for instance Jonathan Spencer, "Occidentalism in the East: The Uses of the West in the Politics and Anthropology of South Asia", in *Occidentalism: Images of the West*, (ed.) James Carrier, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995, pp.234-58.

²¹⁸ The chapter will also introduce additional sources, mostly in poetic form, that, in contrast with the previously analyzed material, did not intend to construct a politico-religious Frankish Other but envisioned and conceptualized Franks and Frankishness in very different ways, thus exhibiting other forms of "implicit ethnographies". See *Implicit Understandings: Observing, Reporting, and Reflecting on the Encounters Between Europeans and Other Peoples in the Early Modern Era*, (ed.) S.B. Schwartz, Cambridge University Press, 1994, pp.3-4.

As Cemal Kafadar observes, even blatantly aggressive and religiously-motivated Ottoman frontier narratives simultaneously resorted to a milder tone and appealing register while illustrating models of *Frankishness*. After all, “it is always possible that the pure-hearted infidel will join your fold. He or she is not necessarily an enemy to the bitter end”²¹⁹. As such, accounts that seemed to display a consistent and fervent “anti-Frankish” stance actually incorporated more accommodationist views that balanced the deep-rooted dichotomy they were concurrently constructing²²⁰. The potential of conversion of the “pure-hearted infidel” urged these narratives to adjust their plot accordingly and thus limit the caricaturizing and denigrating features found in the overall narration.

Consequently, such texts were confronted with the double task of creating and sustaining the image of an idealized and pure (Ottoman-Muslim) Self against a devious and impure (Euro-Christian) Other while synchronously according positive and commendable traits to the same Other so as to establish a convincing framework coextensive with the real-world experiences, hopeful expectations, and fantasies of their purported audiences²²¹.

²¹⁹ Cemal Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, p.82. In pp.67-8 Kafadar gives examples of earlier Anatolian frontier narratives such as the *Danismendname* or the *Battalname* in which a central motif is the hope of inclusion of Christians in the Islamic world upon their conversion.

²²⁰ Kafadar remarks that “even in gazavatnames produced much more self-consciously and knowledgeably in later orthodox environments, to develop a friendly relation with an infidel was not frowned upon”. *Idem*, p.83.

²²¹ For an analysis of the *gazavatname* sub-genre in the light of exclusivist and inclusivist discourses, see also Zeynep Aydoğan, “Creating an Ideal Self: Representations of Infidels in the Late Medieval Anatolian Frontier Narratives”, 2012, pp.101-119. For inclusivist strands in Western romances or epics, see for example J.A.H.M. Cruz, “Popular Attitudes Toward Islam in Medieval Europe”, pp.58-59. Cruz stresses the importance of an epic piece composed by Wolfram von Eschenbach (d.1220). “Despite his negative portrayal of the Saracens, in an eloquent speech placed in the mouth of the female heroine, Wolfram writes: “The first man whom God created was a heathen. (...) The heathens are not all destined for damnation. “We know it to be true that all children born of mothers since the time of Eve were born incontestably heathens, even though baptism surrounds the child. Baptized women carry heathen children even though the child is surrounded by baptism...we are all formerly heathens””.

Besides the auspicious possibility of merging the Other into the Self, however, one must remember that binary categories such as the “Self” and the “Other” were equally under constant construction, negotiation and modification²²². This fluidity or plasticity of religio-political identities and loyalties encourages one to further investigate and question the ultimate relevance of such conceptualizations for the processes of alienating and boundary-making²²³. Although identity rested on some basis of durability, individuals belonged essentially to “multiple reference groups”. As such, while retaining religious identifiers such as “Christianity” or “Islam”, people were also “poets” and “merchants” or “daily laborers” and “artisans” and so on. As such, they could “do business with certain individuals, socialize with others, and worship with still others, defining themselves differently in the various contexts”²²⁴. As Baki Tezcan underlined, by evoking different facets of their multi-faceted identities, people were able to relate to multiple collectives. This, in turn, did not mean that religious or national sentiments and loyalties were absent or irrelevant, but simply that they were not, nor could they be, essentialized²²⁵. As suggested in the first two chapters, the “Ottoman” could easily conceive of the “Frank” as the member of “a rival social group who cherishes contradictory values and pursues

²²² As Bartlett skillfully phrases, “people label themselves, and are labeled, by many different things at different times for different purposes”. See Bartlett, “Medieval and Modern Concepts of Race and Ethnicity”, 2001, p.54. See also Irvin Cemil Schick, “Self and Other, Here and There: Travel Writing and the Construction of Identity and Place”, in *Venturing Beyond Borders*, 2013, pp.13-29.

²²³ For the limits and impact of religious worldviews on the perception and construction of Otherness in the Ottoman context see Bekim Agai, “Religion as a Determining Factor of the Self and the Other in Travel Literature: How Islamic is the Muslim Worldview? Evliya Çelebi and his Successors Reconsidered”, in *Venturing Beyond Borders*, 2013, pp.101-131.

²²⁴ Benjamin Kaplan, *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe*, Harvard University Press, 2007, p.51.

²²⁵ Baki Tezcan, “Ethnicity, Race, Religion and Social Class: Ottoman-Markers of Difference”, in *The Ottoman World*, ed. Christine Woodhead, Routledge, London, 2012, pp.162. Tezcan gives the brilliant example of Eremya Çelebi (d.1695), an Ottoman Armenian intellectual of the seventeenth century. Alluding to the multiples identities of Eremya, (an orthodox Armenian layman, a tax-farmer, a writer etc.) Tezcan notes that, “Eremya Çelebi was a Christian like Yorgo, Armenian like Garo, a state contractor like Ali, and a writer in Turkish like Hasan”.

overlapping or potentially conflicting interests”; however, he could also conveniently fraternize with him based on professional, occupational or local identities²²⁶. Indeed, it will be argued that belonging to the same profession, sharing the same occupation, or originating from the same locality permitted Ottomans to cooperate, relate to, and even emphasize with Franks at different levels and times.

Beyond more intimate and personal affinities, equally significant and influential is the overall politico-religious context dominating Ottoman-Frankish relations. Based on the reliability and effectiveness of the diplomatic and political bounds established at a given time, descriptions, depictions and visions of the Franks could alter drastically. After all, as Emine Fetvacı observed, “the perception of otherness is also closely correlated to political interests and alliances”²²⁷.

Consequently, the picture of the unreliable, fanatical, threatening and morally weak Frank appears to be a mere facet of the all-too-complex and perplexing Ottoman vision of the Euro-Christian. A monolithic conception of the Frank simply did not – and could not - exist. As will be seen, the same texts that persistently diffused derogatory and degrading

²²⁶ Rhoads Murphey, “Forms of Differentiation and Expression of Individuality in Ottoman Society”, *Turcica*, Vol.34, 2002, pp.134-5. This is to say that both *acquired* (i.e. subjective) identities such as “being/becoming a carpenter” or *objective* identities such as being from a specific locality (Venice, Istanbul or Corfu Island) could unite individuals pertaining to such broader categories as *Ottoman-Muslim* or *Euro-Christian* and influence their perceptions of one another. For subjective and objective identities, see Akeel Bilgrami, “Notes Toward the Definition of ‘Identity’”, *Daedalus*, Vol.135, No.4, 2006, pp.5-14.

²²⁷ Emine Fetvacı, “Others and Other Geographies in the *Şehname-i Selim Han*”, 2012, p.93. For the importance of internal (factional) political considerations, manipulations and distortions in the construction of Otherness in the early modern Ottoman context, see the recent articles by Baki Tezcan, “The Many Lives of the First Non-Western History of the Americas: From the New Report to the History of the West Indies”, *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 40, 12, 2012, pp.1-38 or “Law in China or Conquest in the Americas: Competing Constructions of Political Space in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire”, *Journal of World History*, 24, 2013, pp.107-34.

stereotypes of the Franks simultaneously included material that contradicted, counterbalanced and relativized their seemingly unsympathetic and belligerent stance towards the same Euro-Christians. The miscellaneous ways in which Ottomans from different backgrounds, social strata, and epochs confronted the Frankish reality explains the overall multiplicity and complexity of Ottoman perspectives and their visions of the Franks²²⁸.

II) The Wise Frank

Alongside their distinguishing, bizarre or even reprehensible manners, Euro-Christians were equally endowed with profitable and valuable attributes that matched with and conformed to Ottoman self-images and perceptions. Reading between the lines, one could comfortably identify the recurrent literary motifs employed by Ottoman narratives in order to ease the apparent tension between the Euro-Christian and Ottoman-Muslim entities.

In that sense, a closer look at the narratological structure of the *gazavatname* sub-genre clearly indicates that the repeated portrayal of the unreasonably single-minded and fanatical Frankish flock is nearly always coterminous with the image of a wise, experienced, and vigilant Frank. Hence, competing throughout the story are two antagonistic Frankish figures, one representing reason and circumspection and the other

²²⁸ This “diversity in opinion” is equally valid for Western perceptions of Muslim lands. As David Blanks claims, “one’s view of Islam depended upon class, region, denomination, level of contact and, of course, level of personal interest”. See David Blanks, “Western Views of Islam in the Pre-Modern Period: A Brief History of Past Approaches”, in *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, 1999, p.35.

symbolizing irrational and frenzied religious fervor. While the latter Frankish model is relegated to the position of the absolute Other via the use of imaginative details enriched by a wide repertoire of derogatory qualifications, the former is depicted almost as a literal alter ego of the Ottoman-Muslim Self, blurring the putative line between Franks and Ottomans.

Much as the name, position and influence of what could be termed “wise Frank” varies from one account to the other, its utility and leverage as a literary device is indisputable in all of them. Within the structure of the epic poem by Firdevsi-i Rumi, the *Kutbname*, the “wise Frank” is personified by the mysterious vizier of the Frankish ruler *Kızhan* (“the Lady Khan”), not definitively identified as Isabella I of Castile (d.1504)²²⁹. When a letter from Venice reached the *Kızhan* inciting her to join the war effort against the Turk, the *müdebbir* (“prudent”, “foresighted”) vizier advised his Queen to tread carefully. The “intelligent” (*akil*) and “seasoned” (*cihandide*) right-hand man had visited the fort of Mytilene as a young merchant; he knew the fort was impregnable. As such, he shrewdly opposed the Queen’s involvement, and asked her not to heed the clergy’s exhortations and disregard the Franks’ (i.e. Venetians’) incitations. Giving a lavish description of the island’s fortifications, he urged the monarch “not to step on the dragon’s tail” unnecessarily. Despite such enlightened warnings, however, the Queen eventually decided to send a flotilla which then met its disastrous end along with other Frankish forces²³⁰.

²²⁹ Even though the Spanish and the Portuguese did not eventually participate in the Crusading effort, the poem seems to include Isabella’s forces in the Euro-Christian coalition.

²³⁰ *Kutbname*, pp.58-67.

In a similar vein, the voice of “Frankish rationality” appears elsewhere in the text, again not to be heard by the ruler too engaged in his mischievous and unsound projects. Refusing to heed the dark premonitions of a few members of his own clergy advising him not to get enmeshed in a hopeless conflict, the king of the “Blond Race” (*Beni Asfar*, i.e. Hungarians) places confidence in the Pope’s delirious projections, only to be terribly disappointed in the long run²³¹.

Correspondingly, such a figure can be also discerned in the annals of Barbarossa. While the King of Spain, the perfidious Pope, devilish priests, and lecherous courtiers are always ready to impulsively and senselessly attack Muslims, the narrative supplements them by introducing several levelheaded and peaceful characters opposing their plans. As such, the distinction between a hawkish, “bad Frank” and an almost sympathetic, “good Frank” is created and carefully maintained throughout the biography²³².

From an Ottoman standpoint, the aftermath of the fall of the Spanish fortress “El Penon de Argel” off the port of Algiers (1529) provides a good example of the dramatic rift between a rather mild and restrained Frankish faction opposed to a dangerously overzealous and frantic counterpart. While the King Charles V incarnates the latter, the anonymous “Ceneral” (admiral of the navy) exemplifies the former.

²³¹ *Ibid*, pp.142-46. Note the ambivalent position of the clergy. Depending on the context, monks and priests are pictured as troublemakers or as symbols of common sense.

²³² The same pattern can be perceived, although to a minor extent, in the anonymous *Gazavatname* recounting the events related to the Crusade of Varna. Here too, the narrative marks a distinction between a reluctant, “wiser” Frank, personified by the King of Hungary Vladislav (d.1440), and his senior commander the aggressive and mindless Janos Hunyadi (d.1456). For a few passages illustrating this contrast, see the *Gazavat-i Sultan Murad*, pp.53-4 or p.60. After the capture of a fort named Bedric, the narrator recounts that while the King was deeply saddened by the reprehensible way in which the war had been conducted, the faithless Janos Hunyadi kept his pretentious and haughty air. *Gazavat-i Sultan Murad*, p.55.

Upon hearing of the military fiasco in the Maghreb, the Spanish monarch loses his temper and brutally executes the unfortunate message-bearer who delivered the disturbing news. Later on, he summons his advisors, among whom the *Ceneral*, for an appraisal. Fearing his sovereign's unquenchable anger, the naval commander guarantees his safety by demanding that the monarch vows to leave him unharmed should he utter a word that eventually displeases him. Charles gives his word. The Ceneral then courageously speaks his mind, praising Barbarossa's abilities and military skills and suggests moderation and self-control before anything else²³³. Outraged by such unexpectedly irritating commentaries, the King violently dismisses the admiral and adds: "You would have been slain right here had I not sworn by the filthy head of our Father the demon [the "Christian God"]!"

Such a cataclysmic turn of events eventually leads to the slow and painful death of the ill-fated and disfavored commander. Meanwhile, underestimating his opponent, Charles insists on sending an ill-equipped flotilla quickly defeated by Barbarossa's captain Aydin²³⁴. Regretting his careless move, however, the King recognizes the late Ceneral's foresight, claiming in a self-accusatory tone that he would have listened to him had he not passed away. Nonetheless, despite such a powerful and self-condemning speech delivered by the monarch himself, the hoped-for modification in Frankish attitudes towards Muslims never materializes. The overall framework of the story never allows reason to

²³³ Quite fascinatingly, the exact word used by the narrator to describe the admiral's "reasonable" arguments is "rozon", a probable distortion of the Spanish "razon".

²³⁴ With the dismissal of the general, the remaining courtiers falseheartedly support Charles' frivolous actions out of fear and lack of determination.

reign over the Frankish world. In fact, the newly-appointed admiral Andrea Doria rekindles the King's puerile arrogance by maliciously promising him the impossible: Algiers²³⁵.

The *muffled* “wise Frank”'s influence is therefore relatively limited, but extremely functional in Ottoman pseudo-historiography²³⁶. The stifled voice of wisdom underscores the irrational, vicious and rather homicidal nature of the Franks driven by their passions and incapable of moderation and sagacity. But it synchronously reminds the audience of the existence of more approachable and/or “reasonable” Euro-Christians. Blessed with similar qualities, the “wise Frank” thus resembles the Ottoman-Muslim in his rationality and integrity. While the Self-Other demarcation is maintained in appearance, the character's mental and moral closeness to the (ideal) Ottoman-Muslim Self allows the intended audience to identify and empathize with a valuable and praiseworthy Other on a much deeper level²³⁷.

Besides such “out of range” fondness and affection for distant and inaccessible Franks, numerous cases expose much closer connection and cooperation between warring Ottoman and Frankish parties. Depending on the context, the Muslim Emir of Aydin and Christian infidels could feast together in the island of Salamina or in Constantinople and

²³⁵ For the whole passage see *Gazavat-ı Hayrettin Paşa*, 1993, pp.163-76. See also Ertuğrul Düzdağ's edition, 1975, vol.II, p.56-63.

²³⁶ Similar techniques of distinction between morally reprehensible and more amicable and benevolent Franks can be observed in the anonymous travelogue of the Prince Cem (d.1495). Although not set in a military environment, here too the narrative framework distinguishes between “bad” Franks (Knights of Saint John) and “good” ones (the French King Charles VIII or even the young Charles I, Duke of Savoy). See Nicolas Vatin, *Sultan Djem*, 1997 pp.81-82.

²³⁷ One must note that Barbarossa explicitly mentions and appreciates the General's intervention and judgement.

even Frankish women could be occasionally endorsed with highly acclaimed, warlike qualities²³⁸. As such, Isabella Jagiellon (d.1559), the mother of the young inheritor of the crown of Hungary (d.1540) who resisted Habsburg offensives on Buda, is eulogized in the chronicle of the high-bureaucrat/historian Şemsi Ahmed Paşa (d.1580) as a loyal ally of the Sublime Porte. According to him, “the Woman”, as the Queen dowager is named, “had acted like a man” (*erlik yapmışdur*)²³⁹. Another significant anecdote in Hayreddin Barbarossa’s biography tells the story of a “Mallorcan frigate-builder”. An unnamed “master” (*üstad*) shipwright, taken prisoner after a skirmish with a Mallorcan pirate ship, presents his services to Barbarossa and vows to build him a “mezzagalera” in exchange for his freedom. What starts as a strictly professional and pragmatic partnership then expands to become a more cordial one. Held in high esteem by the Muslim corsair, the Mallorcan master decides to build an additional ship to further cement their new friendship, after which he peacefully returns to his “province”²⁴⁰.

By the same token, other features in the same Ottoman texts further confuse the apparently clear-cut line between the Ottoman-Muslim Self and Euro-Christian Other. As Cemal Kafadar underlines, “beyond inclusivity, a code of honour (...) serves as a kind of

²³⁸ *Düsturname-i Enveri*, p.76 and pp.90-91.

²³⁹ See Şemsi Ahmed Paşa, *Şehname-i Sultan Murad*, (eds.) G. Kut, and N. Bayraktar, Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University, 2003, p.180. Another important sixteenth-century historian Celalzade Mustafa (d.1567) similarly called Isabella’s husband and Ottoman vassal John Szapolyai (d.1540) “friend of the mücahids” (holy warriors). See Kaya Şahin, *Empire and Power in the Reign of Süleyman*, 2013, pp.81-82. For Celalzade’s celebration of the military successes achieved by the European powers allied to Ottomans see also pp.131-132 and pp.203-4.

²⁴⁰ *Gazavat-ı Hayreddin Paşa*, 1993, pp.142-3. For the importance of non-Muslim (mostly Greek or Italian) shipbuilders in Ottoman service, see the example of Andrea Dere, an Italian shipwright mentioned in the *relazioni* of Venetian ambassadors in Constantinople such as Andrea Gritti or Leonardo Loredano. See Palmira Brummett, *Ottoman Seapower and Levantine Diplomacy in the Age of Discovery*, 1993, pp.92-3.

lingua franca for the frontier peoples”²⁴¹. In that sense, Ottoman *gazavatnames* concede to yet another opening within the larger setting of Ottoman-Frankish military, religious and moral confrontation. A few passages curiously reveal that despite the sensational and electrifying spirit of the struggle, the protagonists acknowledge their opponents’ likeness and resemblance to them. This profound sense of empathy occasionally crops up in times of hardship. In the *Düsturname* of Enveri, the Emir of Aydın. Umur strongly admonishes his companion Ibrahim after he mercilessly sets fire to an infidel ship and leaves the miserable crew in a helpless state²⁴². Similarly, when Umur is expected to rejoice over the death of the *tekfur* (governor) of Adrianople who had attacked him, the veteran Pasha surprisingly claims in a mourning tone: “A glorious Shah has passed away, and the same fate awaits us”²⁴³.

The same sympathetic approach and sense of parity can be detected elsewhere. As Kafadar reports, “in the annals of Hayreddin Pasha (Barbarossa), (...) the gazi seaman captures a large number of Christian ships and their captains, including the renowned Captain Ferando. When he sees that the brave infidel is wounded, the pasha orders that “a building complex [of Algiers] be vacated and reserved for Ferando and that surgeons visit him and serve him all day” until he is cured²⁴⁴.

²⁴¹ Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, p.84. Kafadar refers here to older Byzantine and (pre) Ottoman narratives that, beyond sheer antagonism, reflect the conception of an accepted and internalized set of rules and customs shared by all (warring) parties. For such a frontier narrative from the Byzantine “side”, see the famous epic poem telling the exploits of a heroic Christian warrior between Byzantine and Arab territory in Asia Minor around the ninth and tenth centuries, Elizabeth Jeffreys, *Digenis Akritis: The Grottaferrata and Escorial Versions*, Cambridge University Press, 1998.

²⁴² *Düsturname-i Enveri*, p.72. The infidel ship was presumably Genoese since the author explicitly mentions its provenance from Crimea.

²⁴³ *Ibid*, p.105.

²⁴⁴ Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, p.83. The same idea of mutual respect between Ottomans and Franks is reflected in the same work, when the narrator relates in one occasion that the Christians acknowledged the

Going beyond that, a seventeenth-century Ottoman pirate novella entitled *The discourse on Warden Captain Mahmud, on [his] victories over the damned dwellers of Hell, the Maltese*, illustrates the adventures of a crew of Muslims and Christians sharing a common destiny in the Mediterranean²⁴⁵. Although confessional categorizations such as “Muslim” and “Christian” are formally preserved, the structure of the story constantly overlooks them by emphasizing the common fate of Muslim and Christian sailors.

Briefly stated, the protagonist of the story, the “warden” (*zindancı*) of a Christian pirate galleon, takes over the ship with the assistance of Muslim prisoners and a few faithful Christian pirates. Soon after, the religiously mixed crew under the direction of this *dilaver* (fearless, valiant) new captain/warden engages in a series of adventures, affronting along the way Ottoman authorities in Cyprus and Maltese corsairs alike. Although the Captain eventually converts to Islam during a battle against a Maltese pirate ship, shouting: “Hey community of the Muslims! Brothers! My name is Mahmud!”, no apparent tension arises between the two faiths, and political and strategic considerations clearly prevail over religious affinities²⁴⁶. In fact, the primacy of ethno-religious

fact that the defeated Barbarossa nonetheless merited respect (the word “respet” is used in the original text) for his exceptional command (“komanda”) on his army. See the *Gazavat-ı Hayreddin Paşa*, 1993, p.210.

²⁴⁵ For two editions of the work, see Andreas Tietze, “Die Geschichte von Kerkermeister-Kapitan, ein türkischer Seerauberromane aus dem 17. Jarhundert,” *Acta Orientalia*, 19, 1942, pp.152-210; Fahir İz, “Makale-i Zindancı Mahmud Kapudan”, *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, 14, 1964, pp.111-150. The latter version has been consulted.

²⁴⁶ See the recent article by Marinos Sariyannis, “Images of the Mediterranean in an Ottoman Pirate Novel from the Late Seventeenth Century”, *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 39, 2012, pp.189-204. Sariyannis skillfully notes that a variant of the same story can be found in Ottoman folk tales recorded around the 18th century. See Özdemir Nutku, *Meddah ve Meddahlık Hikayeleri*, Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, İstanbul, 1976, pp.126-7. See also pp.144-6 for a popular story involving Maltese corsairs. For earlier Ottoman or pre-Ottoman gazi epics that display instances of cooperation between Muslims and Christians at varying degrees, see Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds*, pp.66-68.

categories seem to be substituted with a different set of values, a “corsair ethos” so to speak, which pinpoints the prominence of a code of bravery and comradeship over other (larger) identity-markers²⁴⁷.

In that sense, even a manifestly confrontational narrative seems to have offered various forms of openings that challenged the authority and appeal of the dominant meta-narrative based on the articulation of unambiguous binary divisions. Indeed, a careful examination of the extant Ottoman folk literature and historical chronicles echoes the co-existence of two - conflicting but interdependent – narratological patterns serving different purposes: an essentializing, derogatory and offensive strand of thought competing with a more conciliatory and emphatic approach. Both expressed the intricate reality of the Ottoman-Muslim and Euro-Christian encounter: “connectivity and continuity in the midst of endemic conflict”²⁴⁸. In that sense, while the former layer delineated a clear borderline between the Ottoman Self and the Frankish Other, the latter persistently and subtly questioned it, giving the impression that the Self and Other could occasionally merge into one another.

²⁴⁷ For this common set of values that transpassed ethno-religious categories see Rhoads Murphey, “Seyyid Muradi’s Prose Biography of Hızır İbn Yakub, Alias Hayreddin Barbarossa: Ottoman Folk Narrative as an Under-Exploited Source for Historical Reconstruction”, 2001, pp.519-532 or Emrah Sefa Gürkan, Emrah Sefa Gürkan, “Batı Akdeniz’de Osmanlı Korsanlığı ve Gaza Meselesi” [Ottoman Piracy in the Western Mediterranean and the Issue of Gaza], 2012, pp.173-204. For the mixed composition of Ottoman crews, see for example Giancarlo Casale, “The Ethnic Composition of Ottoman Ship Crews and the ‘Rumi Challenge’ to Portuguese Identity”, *Medieval Encounters*, 13, 2007, pp.122-144. For the multiethnic mix in Mediterranean ports and the multiple and shifting identities retained by merchants/pirates see for example, Kathryn Reyerson, “Identity in the Medieval Mediterranean World of Merchants and Pirates”, *Mediterranean Studies*, Vol.20, 2, 2012, pp.129-146.

²⁴⁸ David Coleman, “Of Corsairs, Converts and Renegades: Forms and Functions of Coastal Raiding on Both Sides of the Far Western Mediterranean, 1490-1540”, *Medieval Encounters*, 19, 2013, p.192.

III) Ottoman-Frankish *Amicizia*

Any serious attempt to chart the divergent ways Ottoman-Muslims approached and envisioned the Euro-Christian world could not be limited to a study of travelogues, official or semi-official chronicles and pseudo-historiographical accounts, all loosely or tightly linked to Ottoman centres of power and primarily concerned with the ideological rivalry between Ottomans and Franks. Although it has been demonstrated in the previous chapters that this source material exhibited remarkably multicolored and multilayered depictions of Franks, they need to be corroborated and supported by supplementary historical data that might highlight more intricate nuances which might have been obscured or previously undisclosed. Further attention will therefore be given to more segmentary sources that are not essentially concerned with constructing an infidel Other juxtaposed to the image of the impure and rightful Self.

As the recent studies by scholars such as Eric Dursteler or Maria Pia Pedani underline, Ottoman-Frankish relations were not necessarily crystallized around purely antagonistic terms²⁴⁹. Similarly, from an Ottoman standpoint, even a cursory look at Ottoman tax registers (*'tahrir defterleri'*) or judicial court records (*'sicil registers'*) suffice to exhibit the level to which Ottomans and Franks intermingled on a daily basis, sealing trading partnerships, working in the same industries, and exchanging ambassadors both in urban

²⁴⁹ Eric Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople*, 2006, p.152: "Venetians and Ottomans did not exist in isolation from each other but in fact had regular and meaningful interactions across a wide spectrum. These relations were similar to those of most complex societies: at times they were characterized by cooperation, support, and even amity, at times by controversy and disagreement".

centers such as Venice, Istanbul, Ragusa or Aleppo or in Ottoman and Habsburg rural areas and Venetian colonies²⁵⁰. The simple case of a Venetian interpreter's inheritance and debt as documented in the court of Galata reveals the extent to which Euro-Franks interacted with locals²⁵¹. The court records that "Corci Tomazo" (Giorgio Tommaso?) was indebted to Armenians, Jews, Greeks, a Frenchman ("Fransız Kapiro") but also, to Muslims. Surprisingly, among the many different individuals and foundations with which Corci seems to have been involved, one can equally locate Muslim women, to whom the Venetian official appears to have owed money²⁵². Although the exact nature of Corci's relationship with local Christians or Muslim women remains obscure, such notices and countless others found in Ottoman judicial archives clearly show that Ottomans and Franks freely cooperated and communicated with each other, openly trespassing the

²⁵⁰ See for example the 1455 tax registers of Istanbul. The register of Pera/Galata, the traditional Euro-Christian quarter of Constantinople right across the Golden Horn, clearly establishes the presence of Frankish non-Muslims among the newly arrived Muslim populations. See Halil Inalcık, *The Survey of Istanbul, 1455: The Text, English Translation, Analysis of the Text, Documents*, Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, Istanbul, 2012. For an older work similarly alluding to Frankish merchants, this time in a provincial town, see Heath Lowry, *The Ottoman Tahrir Defters as a Source for Urban Demographic History: The Case Study of Trabzon (ca. 1486-1583)*, University of California Press, 1977. For Frankish non-Muslims as they appear in the court registers of the 17th century Galata see for example *Social and Economic Life in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul: Glimpses from Court Records*, Volume I, (ed.) Timur Kuran, Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010. See for example the registers pp.133-37 that record the Muslim sea captain Şaban Reis' professional involvement with non-Muslims, Greeks and Franks alike. For the countless transactions and registrations of "protected" (müstemin) Franks allowed to trade in Ottoman lands with local Muslims and non-Muslims, see the chapter on foreigners, pp.767-920. For the uses and misuses of court records, see Dror Zeevi, "The Use of Ottoman Shari'a Court Records as a Source for Middle Eastern Social History: A Reappraisal," *Islamic Law and Society*, 5, 1995, pp.35-56. Suraiya Faroqhi equally stresses the importance of the *ecnebi defterleri* ('registers of foreign nations'), kept from the early seventeenth century onward. See S. Faroqhi, "The Venetian Presence in the Ottoman Empire (1600-1630)", *The Journal of European Economic History*, 15, 2, 1986, pp.345-384.

²⁵¹ For the transcription of the Ottoman text, see Metin Ziya Köse, "Being an Interpreter in Ottoman Galata: Estate and Debts of a Venetian Dragoman", *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 6, 3, 2011, pp.1065-1074.

²⁵² See p.1072, the female Muslim names such as "Ümmühan Hatun", "Elveda Hatun" or "Gülistan Hatun".

boundaries so commonly emphasized in both Ottoman-Muslim and Euro-Christian polemical literature²⁵³.

As a result of the manifest intensification of diplomatic and commercial ties between Westerners and Ottomans during the early modern era, the question of a possible rise in cultural and intellectual correspondence between the two realms has become all the more intriguing. As has been shown in the past few decades, Ottoman envoys and merchants frequently visited Venice²⁵⁴. The idea that Ottoman-Muslims were inherently disinterested in trading with non-Muslims or in stepping on non-Muslim soil has thus been seriously undercut²⁵⁵. Maria Pia Pedani's recent articles and monographs have shown that from 1384 to 1797, more than one hundred and fifty Ottoman envoys were sent to Venice to carry the Sultan's words, and Eric Dursteler's monograph documented the length of Venetian diplomacy at the Porte²⁵⁶. "During the sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth, an Ottoman diplomatic envoy came to the city almost every

²⁵³ For the study of Ottoman court records with regard to Ottoman-Frankish relations, Europeans' status in Ottoman lands, and the dynamics and balance of power, see the curious study of two incidents that occurred in 18th century Aleppo in Maurits van den Boogert, "Provocative Wealth: Non-Muslim Elites in Eighteenth-Century Aleppo", *Journal of Early Modern History*, 14, 2010, 219-237.

²⁵⁴ Perhaps the first scholar to have powerfully emphasized and documented the active presence of Ottoman-Muslim traders in Venice has been Cemal Kafadar, "A Death in Venice (1575): Anatolian Muslim Merchants Trading in the Serenissima", *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 10, 1986, pp.191-217.

²⁵⁵ For useful outlines of Muslim jurists varying positions on travel to non-Muslim lands see Frédéric Hitzel, "Réflexions Juridiques et Historiques sur le Voyage des Ottomans en Terre Infidèle", in (ed.) A. El Moudden and A. Benhadda, *Le Voyage dans le Monde Arabo-Musulman, échange et modernité*, Rabat, 2003, pp.13-34 or Gilles Veinstein, "Les Fondements Juridiques de la Diplomatie Ottomane en Europe", *Oriente Moderno*, 88, No.2, 2008, pp.509-522. For both contemporary and modern European accounts on the alleged Ottoman-Muslim reluctance to trade or interact with non-Muslims, see Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople*, pp.158-9.

²⁵⁶ Maria Pia Pedani, *Osmanlı Padişahının Adına: İstanbul'un Fethinden Girit Savaşı'na Venedik'e Gönderilen Osmanlılar*, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, 2011, p.9. A recent translation of the author's *In Nome del Gran Signore. Inviati Ottomani a Venezia dalla Caduta di Costantinopoli alla Guerra di Candia*, Venezia, 1994. See Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople*, 2006. For further bibliographical information on Ottoman-Venetian relations see footnote No.86.

year,” and with the permanent establishment of French (1535), Habsburg (1547) and English (1587) embassies in Pera, Ottoman-European relations were further buttressed²⁵⁷.

Naturally, one could expect that the Ottoman bureaucratic personnel or merchants in close proximity to Euro-Christians might have possessed extensive knowledge, or even rather unorthodox visions of the *Frengistan*²⁵⁸. Unfortunately, the inconsistency and patchiness of archival sources does not always permit us to evaluate the degree to which Ottoman-Muslims residing or passing through commercial hubs such as Venice participated in the cultural life of Frankish cities²⁵⁹. Pedani and Ortega both remark that official Ottoman envoys as well as more low-profile individuals originating from Ottoman lands were deliberately sequestered and closely supervised by Venetian authorities during their stay²⁶⁰. This, however, did not prevent some of them from visiting old friends or making new ones. As such, Venetian records assert that Ottoman-Muslim officials gladly tasted the sweet Malvasia wine offered to them, attended dining and dancing parties, or contemplated the sunset from rooftops around San Marco. In 1514, the chief interpreter of the Ottoman chancellery Ali Bey (d.1525) made his appearance in a reception organized in his honor by Pietro Guistinian and danced with a certain Miss

²⁵⁷ Maria Pia Pedani, “Between Diplomacy and Trade: Ottoman Merchants in Venice”, in *Merchants in the Ottoman Empire* (eds.) S. Faroqhi and G. Veinstein, Peeters, Louvain-Paris-Dudley MA, 2008, p.4.

²⁵⁸ The pioneering studies of Metin Kunt have shown that these entrepreneurs and bureaucrats were mostly the one and same persons. See for example his “Derviş Mehmed Paşa: Vezir and Entrepreneur: A Study in Ottoman Political-Economic Theory and Practice,” *Turcica*, 9, 1977, pp.197-214.

²⁵⁹ Even when it comes to commercial transactions, documents can be problematic. As Maria Pedani notes, “it is difficult to find documents reflecting the everyday lives and dealings of Ottoman traders. News about their businesses is scattered here and there, mostly in notarial deeds”. Maria Pia Pedani, “Between Diplomacy and Trade: Ottoman Merchants in Venice”, p.19. See also Eric Dursteler, “Commerce and Coexistence: Veneto-Ottoman Trade in the Early Modern Era”, *Turcica*, 34, 2002, pp.105-134.

²⁶⁰ Maria Pia Pedani, *Osmanlı Padişahının Adına*, 2011, pp.71-72, Stephen Ortega, “Across Religious and Ethnic Boundaries: Ottoman Networks and Spaces in Early Modern Venice”, *Mediterranean Studies*, Vol.18, 1, 2009, pp.66-89.

Lucia and other invitees²⁶¹. Yunus Bey (d.1551), the following chief “dragoman” (interpreter) who visited Venice six times was hosted by a Venetian dignitary, Giovanni Francesco Mocenigo²⁶².

Quite accurately, individuals such as the dragoman Yunus have been called “trans-imperial subjects”²⁶³. Mostly of Euro-Christian origin, these inter-imperial intermediaries or middlemen, could be recent captives, new converts (Christian renegades) at the service of the Ottoman bureaucracy, or “old” recruits integrated in the Ottoman state machine through the famous *devşirme* (child-levy) system²⁶⁴. In any case, however, evidence seems to point that these “old Christians” and “new Muslims” did not completely break with their past and maintained intimate relations with their homelands, or “older Self”²⁶⁵. In fact, the previously mentioned Yunus was born in the old Venetian colony of Modon, spoke Italian and Greek, and was proficient in Latin²⁶⁶. Venetian sources reported that he had marked his affection for Venice during Ottoman-Venetian peace negotiations in

²⁶¹ Maria Pia Pedani, *Osmanlı Padişahının Adına*, pp.68-70.

²⁶² Tijana Krstic, “Of Translation and Empire: Sixteenth Century Ottoman Interpreters as Renaissance Go-Betweens”, in *The Ottoman World*, (ed.) Christine Woodhead, 2010, p.133.

²⁶³ See Nathalie Rothman, “Interpreting Dragomans: Boundaries and Crossings in the Early Modern Mediterranean”, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 51, 4, 2009, pp.771-800. Rothman here refers mostly to the *dragomans* at the service of Venice. See also her more recent monograph, *Brokering Empire: Trans-Imperial Subjects between Venice and Istanbul*, Cornell University Press, 2011.

²⁶⁴ For a short but useful summary of the integration and assimilation of non-Muslim slaves or young boys to the Palace system see Cemal Kafadar, “The Ottomans and Europe”, 1993, pp.603-6.

²⁶⁵ See the groundbreaking article by Metin Kunt, “Ethnic-Regional (Cins) Solidarity in the Seventeenth-Century Ottoman Establishment”, *Journal of Middle East Studies*, 1974, 5, pp.233-239.

²⁶⁶ For Ottoman sources treating with Yunus’ diplomatic actions, see the records kept in Venetian archives and published by Tayyip Gökbilgin, “Venedik Devlet Arşivindeki Vesikalar Külliyyatından Kanuni Sultan Süleyman Devri Belgeleri”, *Belgeler*, I/2, 1964, pp.119-220. For Yunus, see for example Jean-Louis Bacqué-Grammont, “À Propos de Yunus Beg, Baş Tercüman de Soliman le Magnifique”, in *Istanbul et les Langues Orientales*, (ed.) Frédéric Hitzel, Paris, 1997, pp.23-39.

1539²⁶⁷. Other interpreters such as Mahmud Bey (d.1575) or Murad Bey (d. Late 1580s) came from Hungary and Austria, and both had studied in Vienna and were equally well-versed in Latin²⁶⁸. Another prominent translator and mediator was Ibrahim Bey (d.1571, born Joachim Stasz). A Polish convert, Ibrahim/Joachim is recorded to have visited numerous European towns and countries such as Frankfurt (1562), Austria (1568), France, and Poland (1569) on behalf of the Sultan²⁶⁹.

Interpreters/diplomats, however, were not the only Ottoman functionaries to have established privileged connections with Euro-Christians. As Ottoman or Western sources regularly testify, a substantial number of well-positioned Ottoman administrators were closely affiliated to *Frangistan*²⁷⁰. In most cases, these were high-ranked Ottoman bureaucrats, soldiers or admirals of “Frankish origin” (*Efrençiyü'l asl*) who had retained strong relationships with their old *patria*. Prosopographic studies have clearly established the links between such Ottomans and their relatives who had remained in the “Abode of

²⁶⁷ Klemen Pust, “Migrations from the Venetian to the Ottoman Territory and Conversions of Venetian Subjects to Islam in the Eastern Adriatic in the Sixteenth Century”, *Povijesni Prilozi*, 40, 2011, p.155.

²⁶⁸ Krstic, 2011, pp.134-139. For Murad and Mahmud, see also the chapter by Pal Acs, “Tarjumans Mahmud and Murad: Austrian and Hungarian Renegades as Sultan’s Interpreters”, *Europa and die Türken in der Renaissance*, (ed.) W. Köhlmann and B. Guthmüller, Tübingen, 2000, pp.307-316.

²⁶⁹ Maria Pia Pedani, 2011, pp.35-36. See also Bilgin Aydın, “Divan-ı Hümayun Tercümanları ve Osmanlı Kültür Diplomasisindeki Yerleri” [The Interpreters of the Sublime Porte and their Place in Ottoman Cultural Diplomacy], *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 29, 2007, pp.41-86.

²⁷⁰ One must bear in mind that this was probably not exclusive to the Ottoman ruling group. In his captivity account, Michael Heberer reports to have met countless renegades with whom he conversed in European languages, mostly Italian. Michael Heberer, *Osmanlıda bir Köle* [A Slave in the Ottoman Empire], 2003. As such, old Christians or crypto-Christians could appear anywhere, anytime. See Gerlach, *Türkiye Günlüğü*, [The Turkish Diary], 2006, Vol.I, p.308 for the detailed description of a state-orchestrated conversion ritual. A Spanish renegade named Franciscus “turns Turk” and is henceforth called “Meimet Bey from Aragon”. For a “Muslim” tailor from Cyprus and a “Muslim” German hairdresser secretly baptizing his children, see also Gerlach, p.422. For an insightful study of the motivations and implications of conversion, see Marc David Baer, *Honored by the Glory of Islam: Conversion and Conquest in Ottoman Europe*, Oxford University Press, 2008. See also Tijana Krstic, *Contested Conversions to Islam: Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire*, Stanford University Press, 2011.

War”. In that sense, the one time grand vizier and admiral Ciğalazade Sinan Paşa’s case is quite revelatory (d.1605). Son of the Genoese Visconte Cigala, Scipione Cigala had been captured in a raid conducted by the Ottoman corsair Piyale Paşa (d.1578) and had entered the Ottoman Palace. Becoming a Muslim and adopting the name of Sinan, he had climbed the echelons of the Ottoman civil service and served the Ottoman Sultan in various military and administrative positions until his death in 1605. While it is beyond doubt that he remained loyal to the Sultan, the Ottoman statesman was equally fond of his kin back in the Italian Peninsula²⁷¹. In 1594, he tried to secure the Duchy of Naxos for his brother Carolo Cicala, and had brought his mother and sister from Messina to Istanbul²⁷².

Cigalazade was certainly not the sole Ottoman bureaucrat to retain multiple, or hybrid identities. In fact, the grand vizier and pasha was part of a larger network of Ottoman civil servants who favored and promoted one another based on kinship and ethno-regional affinities. In fact, in a recent book chapter, Gülru Necipoğlu points to this general trend in the highly polarized and intimidating atmosphere surrounding Ottoman politics:

“The 16th-century historian Mustafa Ali noted the widespread sense of kinship that grandees felt for their own groups, which did not contradict their official identity as Ottomans within the multicultural framework of a polyglot empire. Observing that no vizier failed to ‘fully incline towards his own people,’ Ali wrote, ‘And whenever a grand vizier or vizier is Bosnian, it is for certain that the prestige of imperial council members belonging to that group will daily increase

²⁷¹ See Frazee, *Catholics and Sultans*, pp.78-79, for the Pope Clement VIII’s (d.1605) elaborate but ultimately unsuccessful plans to win over Cigala to Catholicism.

²⁷² Tayyip Gökbilgin, “Ciğalazade Sinan Paşa”, *TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi* [Encyclopedia of Islam], Vol. VII, pp.525-526.

through advancement and promotion to higher posts. If he is Albanian, his own group becomes fortunate, for he is likely to promote his relatives and siblings, appointing to reputable positions those from his own city and hometown”²⁷³.

Eric Dursteler’s investigations have unraveled the means by which Ottoman courtiers of Frankish origin emphasized their common ethno-religious backgrounds to protect, stabilize, and enlarge their spheres of influence within the Seraglio. Focusing on the outstanding career of the chief eunuch of the imperial harem Gazanfer Ağa (d.1603), Dursteler analyzed the personal background and interrelations of several high-ranked Ottoman statesmen²⁷⁴. As a result, he unfolded the intricate relations of patronage and promotion between Gazanfer, born in Chioggia, the governor of Algiers and later Kapudan Pasha (grand-admiral) and Hasan Pasha “the Venetian” (*Venedikli*, born Andrea Celeste), himself connected to “Frenk” Cafer Pasha, the governor of Tripoli and Cyprus²⁷⁵. He further noted that Gazanfer, just like Cigalazade, had brought his relatives from Venice to integrate them into his patronage system. As a result, his sister Beatrice

²⁷³ Gülru Necipoğlu, “Connectivity, Mobility, and Mediterranean “Portable Archaeology”: Pashas from the Dalmatian Hinterland as Cultural Mediators”, in *Dalmatia and the Mediterranean: Portable Archaeology and the Poetics of Influence*, (ed.) Alina Payne, Brill, Leiden, 2014, pp.315-7.

²⁷⁴ Eric Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople*, p.120: “At the height of his influence, Gazanfer was part of an important network of influence in the bosom of the leadership elite in the Porte. (...) Gazanfer was one of the champions of Çigalazade’s attempts, temporarily successful, to obtain the grand vizierate”.

²⁷⁵ Hasan Pasha was the favorite of yet another renegade corsair, Uluç Ali Pasha (d.1587, known as “Occhiali” in the West), of Calabrese origin. See Antonio Fabris, “Hasan “Il Veneziano” tra Algeri e Costantinopoli”, *Quaderni di Studi Arabi*, 5, 1997, pp.52. Dursteler quotes a Venetian diplomat who encountered Hasan Pasha and remarked that “he spoke for a bit in Turkish for appearance’ sake, in which language it appears he is not very prepared, then spoke in Frankish [Italian] very comfortably, inserting many Spanish words”. See Dursteler, “Speaking in Tongues: Language and Communication in the Early Modern Mediterranean”, *Past and Present*, No.217, 2012, p.55. For Uluç Ali, see Orhan Koloğlu, “Renegades and the Case Uluç/Kılıç Ali”, in *Mediterraneo in Armi (secc. XV-XVIII)*, (ed.) Rossella Cancila, Vol.II, pp.513-531.

Michel took the name of Fatima while his nephew Mehmed (born Giacomo Bianchi) was to become a boon companion of the Sultan Murad IV (d.1640) in the years to come²⁷⁶.

Interestingly, the largesse and affection of the high-ranked “Ottoman-Franks” were not only reserved to the privileged few that stood inside the rather closed circle of slave-servants or renegades in the Palace. It clearly extended to Euro-Christians from outside the Porte. In fact, Western diplomatic sources abound in notices that regularly affirm the *amicizia* shown by Ottoman dignitaries to Western diplomats based on ethno-regional affinities. Taking the Venetian case for example, Eric Dursteler rightly claims that, “while there is no question that a functional side to friendship existed, we cannot dismiss these relationships entirely as political manipulations”. Indeed, “both the pragmatic and the personal elements of *amicizia* are present in the experiences of numerous baili and Ottoman grandees”²⁷⁷. Both Venedikli Hasan Paşa and Gazanfer Ağa interfered with Western affairs and used their influence to acquire favors for their relatives residing in the *Frengistan*. Beyond such pragmatic and personal considerations however, they also appeared to have nurtured sincere and strong bonds of affection to their native lands. After firmly consolidating his authority in the Seraglio, Gazanfer Ağa had reportedly declared his affinity to his old *patria*, favoring Venetian merchants and warmly receiving

²⁷⁶ See Dursteler, “Fatima Hatun née Beatrice Michiel: Renegade Women in the Early Modern Mediterranean”, *The Medieval History Journal*, 12, 2, 2009, pp.355-382. For other examples of women transgressing religio-cultural boundaries see also the recent monograph by the same author, *Renegade Women: Gender, Identity, and Boundaries in the Early Modern Mediterranean*, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011. For the wider network of fellow “Ottoman-Venetians” favored by Gazanfer, see Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople*, pp.125-6.

²⁷⁷ Eric Dursteler, “Neighbors: Venetians and Ottomans in Early Modern Galata”, in, *Multicultural Europe and Cultural Exchange*, (ed.) James P. Helfers, Brepols, 2005, p.35.

Venetian diplomats²⁷⁸. Süleyman's favorite and grand vizier Ibrahim Paşa (d.1536), born in the Venetian island of Parga off the Dalmatian coast, "had not forgotten his origins, and (...) frequently said he 'greatly loved the Signoria [of Venice] since he was born under its dominion'"²⁷⁹. Furthermore, he and his previously mentioned interpreter Yunus had developed and maintained a strong friendship with Alvise Gritti (d.1534)²⁸⁰ the illegitimate son of the Venetian doge Andrea Gritti (d.1538) who had lived in Istanbul. Before running for the highest administrative position in his homeland, Andrea Gritti had been operating as the Venetian *balyos* and as a grain merchant in Istanbul, and had befriended both the Sultan Bayezid II and his grand vizier Ahmed Pasha²⁸¹. Similarly, another Venetian bailo, Simon Contarini (1633), had established a long-lasting friendship with the Grand vizier and Kapudanpaşa Halil Paşa (d.1629) with whom he maintained an active correspondence even after completing his diplomatic mission in Istanbul²⁸².

²⁷⁸ Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople*, pp.123-128. In a similar sense, Gülru Necipoğlu remarked that the 16th century Ottoman grand vizier Rüstem Paşa (d.1561) of Dalmatian origin was perceived by Ragusans as "our protector and kinsman, a man who speaks our language". See Necipoğlu, "Connectivity, Mobility, and Mediterranean "Portable Archaeology", 2014, p.318.

²⁷⁹ Robert Finlay, "I am the Servant of the Turkish Sultan": Venice, the Ottoman Empire, and Christendom, 1523-1534", 2008, pp.5-6; Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople*, p.128. For further details, see the important article by Peter Sebastian, "Ottoman Government Officials and their Relations with the Republic of Venice in the Early 16th Century", 1994, pp.319-338.

²⁸⁰ Finlay, 2008 and Dursteler, 2006, p.128. For Yunus' rather "shaky" relationship with Gritti, see Bacqué-Grammont, "À Propos de Yunus Beg, Baş Tercüman de Soliman le Magnifique", 1997, p.27.

²⁸¹ Dursteler, "Neighbors: Venetians and Ottomans in Early Modern Galata", p.37.

²⁸² Ibid, pp.37-39. In a letter to Contarini, Halil Paşa wrote: "God knows that if distance and separation of our persons has been necessary, the love and affection of our heart towards you has never ever wavered or moved apart, but always we remember your optimal condition and good friendship". This is not to say that Halil took a similar stance towards all non-Muslim individuals or powers. As Dursteler notes, 2005, p.39, he was known to have favored an anti-Spanish position. For the numerous naval operations he conducted against Euro-Christians, especially against Maltese "corsairs", see for example Mikail Acipinar, "The Mediterranean Expeditions of the Grand Admiral Halil Paşa in the Light of Ottoman Chronicles", *Tarih Incelemeleri Dergisi*, 28, 1, 2013, pp.5-35. For the visit and rewards given to a certain *Ceneviz Cafer* (Cafer the Genoese), sea captain from Algiers, see p.9. For Halil's good relations with the newly-emerging Dutch power and its representative Cornelius Haga (d.1654), see Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople*, pp.132-33.

Evidently, such tokens of appreciation and affection could easily be multiplied. From the amicable relations between the Venetian ambassador Marcantonio Barbaro (d.1595) and the grand vizier Sokollu Mehmed Paşa (d.1579), to the Austrian envoy Busbecq's (d.1592) fondness for Süleyman's grand vizier Semiz Ali Pasha (d.1565), "Ottoman" and "European" individuals seem to have been closer than one might presume at first glance²⁸³. Daily diplomatic and commercial transactions as well as shared backgrounds could lead the path to mutually beneficial as well as genuinely cordial relationships²⁸⁴.

Perhaps more significantly than that, however, is the evidence that seems to indicate that this *amicizia* occasionally fostered a more refined form of cooperation on a cultural and intellectual plane. Long before the famous Ottoman ambassador to France Yirmisekiz Mehmed Çelebi (d.1720) lavishly described his first Opera experience, the grand vizier Ibrahim Paşa had been regularly crossing over to the Frankish quarter of Pera to attend ballets or comic plays based on classical themes staged in the palace of his friend Alvise Gritti²⁸⁵. Moreover, sources attest to various instances of intellectual exchange between Ottoman officials and Western diplomats. As such, Francesco

²⁸³ For Sokollu's relations with Barbaro and other "trans-imperial" subjects, see for example Casale, *The Ottoman Age of Exploration*, pp.119-120. For Busbecq's positive description of Semiz Ali Pasha, see his *Turkish Letters*, p.190.

²⁸⁴ For Ottoman-Venetian commercial partnerships and mixed companies see Pedani, "Between Diplomacy and Trade: Ottoman Merchants in Venice", pp.13-14. See the example of a certain Hasan Çelebi and Pietro Bevilacqua who had jointly bought a vessel called "Tre Lune".

²⁸⁵ Finlay, 2008, and Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople*, 2006, p.128. For Yirmisekiz Mehmed Çelebi, see Fatma Müge Göçek, *East Encounters West: France and the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth Century*, Oxford University Press, 1987. For a French translation of his lengthy ambassadorial report, see Gilles Veinstein, *Le Paradis des Infidèles*, Maspero, Paris, 1981. See also Bekim Agai's comments in his book chapter, "Religion as a Determining Factor of the Self and the Other in Travel Literature: How Islamic is the Muslim Worldview?", 2013, pp.117-119. Nabil Matar notes that in 1682, the Moroccan ambassador Mohammad Temim had attended a production of Lully's *Atys* in Paris. Matar, *In the Lands of the Christians*, p.XXI. For a well-trained Ottoman eye who greatly appreciated and admired Frankish culture and arts see, Nuran Tezcan, "Love for Painting in *Freng-pesend* Style in Evliya Çelebi" [in Turkish], *Cahiers Balkaniques*, 41, 2013, pp.27-42.

Contarini, the future Doge of Venice (d.1623), reports to have discussed astrology and medicine during a visit to an Ottoman friend. Philosophical and theological deliberations occurred in banquets or dining parties held at the residences of Euro-Christian representatives²⁸⁶.

Following the personal paths of some Ottoman converts, Tijana Krstic has underscored the participation of the previously-mentioned interpreters in the intellectual life of the *Frangistan*. As such, Yunus Bey (d.1551) had co-authored a pamphlet on the Ottoman Empire with Alvise Gritti. This local contribution to the *Turcica* literature was published in Venice. Likewise, another prolific dragoman, Murad Bey (d. late 1580s), effectuated a loose translation of Cicero's *De Senectute* into Ottoman Turkish in cooperation with the Venetian envoy Marino Cavalli (d.1573), to be presented to the Sultan Süleyman. He also translated the world-chronicle (*Cihannüma*) of Neşri (d.1520) into Latin for European audiences²⁸⁷. While it still seems far-fetched to admit the Ottomans into a Western "Republic of Letters", it is clear that the continuous intensification of contacts with Europe as well as the double identity of numerous

²⁸⁶ See Dursteler, "Neighbors", 2005, pp.40-41. As he notes, "erudite Europeans often met with their Ottoman counterparts for philosophical colloquies, discussions of current affairs, politics, religion, and books, not unlike what one might find in any important European city". Gerlach records heated theological debates between the Austrian ambassador David Ungnad and the renegade Ottoman-Muslim interpreter Ali Bey "from Frankfurt" who frequented the Habsburg embassy. See Gerlach, *Türkiye Günlüğü*, [The Turkish Diary], Vol. I, p.400.

²⁸⁷ Tijana Krstic, "Of Translation and Empire: Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Interpreters (Dragomans) as Renaissance Go-Betweens", 2011, pp.133-140. G. Hazai, "The Image of Europe in Ottoman Historiography", p.71. See also the "History of Hungary" (*Tarih-i Ungurus*) written by another dragoman Mahmud Bey using Western historiographical sources. See "the History of the Kings of France" commissioned by the Ottoman chancellor Feridun Bey (d.1583) in 1572 and produced by two unnamed "converts". See Jean Louis Bacqué-Grammont, *La Première Histoire de France en Turc Ottoman: Chroniques des Padichahs de France*, l'Harmattan, Paris, 1997.

Ottoman dignitaries encouraged a certain degree of permeability in cultural and intellectual spheres²⁸⁸.

As has been suggested, the tidbits of information derived from Ottoman archives, Venetian *relazioni* or anecdotal passages from travelogues further complicate the definition and demarcation of the Self and Other. The malleable and multilayered nature of early modern identity blurs the line between what and who is “Ottoman” or “Frankish”. Beyond essentializing discourses found in epic tales, frontier narratives or official chronicles, emerges therefore a mobile and colorful realm where identities seem to float or at least, co-habit. For the first time, profound emotions such as nostalgia appear as meaningful and motivating forces that drive, rather inevitably, some Ottomans towards the *Frengistan*. Perhaps the case of the janissary officer Mehmet Frenkbeyoğlu (d.1602, born Marcantonio Querini), protégé of Gazanfer Ağa, best illustrates the astounding experience, perspectives and fantasies of these “Ottoman-Franks”. Born into the patrician family of the Querini, Marcantonio was captured while serving on the galley of his uncle, and taken to Constantinople. Sources report that he embraced Islam wholeheartedly. Dursteler notes that as a devout Muslim, “he corresponded with family

²⁸⁸ For a related article, see Palmira Brummett, “Placing the Ottomans in the Mediterranean World: The Question of Notables and Households”, *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 36, 2010, pp.77-96. For a good overview of the intellectual circles in contact with Europeans see Gottfried Hagen, “Afterword: Ottoman Understandings of the World in the Seventeenth Century”, in Robert Dankoff, *An Ottoman Mentality, The World of Evliya Çelebi*, 2006, pp.249-256. Cemal Kafadar conceptualizes the 17th century as “the Age of Çelebis” [Learned Gentlemen]. See Kafadar, “Sohbete Çelebi, Çelebiye Mecmua”, in *Mecmua: Osmanlı Edebiyatının Kırkambarı*, (eds.) H. Aynur, M. Çakır, S. Kuru and A.E. Özyıldırım, Turkuaz Yayınları, İstanbul, 2012, p.45. Indeed, the apparent visibility, connectivity, and productivity of intellectuals such as Katip Çelebi (d.1657), Evliya Çelebi and Hezarfen Hüseyin Çelebi (d.1692) seem to hint at the broadening of the traditional Ottoman worldview. The same goes for the Armenian scholar Eremya Çelebi (d.1695), who had, *inter alli*, translated a French romance from Armenian to Turkish. See Robert Dankoff, “The Story of Faris and Vena: Eremya Çelebi’s Turkish Version of an Old French Romance”, *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 26, I, 2002, pp.107-61.

members in Venice and claimed to have convinced his mother ‘to embrace the light of salvation that God had given him’²⁸⁹. As an *old* Euro-Christian and *new* Ottoman-Muslim, Marcantonio, alias Mehmed, found an astute way to combine the supposedly contradictory elements of his protean identity: he desired the capture of his old *patria* by his new *patria*. As Pedani remarks, “he dreamt that the Turks invaded Venice and that his sisters married some important Muslims”²⁹⁰.

²⁸⁹ Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople*, p.137.

²⁹⁰ Maria Pia Pedani, “Safiye’s Household and Venetian Diplomacy”, 2000, p.22. As particular as Marcantonio Querini’s story might seem, it must be recalled that one did not need to enjoy a specific relationship with the Frangistan to wish its conquest. Selim II’s secretary Hindi Mahmud who forcefully resided in Rome as a prisoner, hoped to see the city brought to the Abode of Islam (*Dâr-ı Islâm ola Roma şehri*). Ahmet Karataş, 2011, p.33.

IV) Ottoman Sentimentalism: The “Frankish Beloved” in Galata and Beyond

Commercial partnerships, shared ethno-religious backgrounds, or intense diplomatic interactions were not the only means by which Ottomans fraternized or sympathized with Franks. The main thrust of the following section will be to argue that beyond everything else, Ottoman-Muslims were capable of fancying, admiring, and even, *loving* Euro-Christians.

In the *Theft of History*, Jack Goody underscored the fact that, “some forms of love, sometimes the idea of love itself, have been seen as a purely western phenomenon. (...) Love, romantic love, is frequently believed to go hand in hand with individualism, with freedom (of choice of partner, as distinct from arranged marriage), and with modernization in general”²⁹¹. Indeed, in the midst of glorious tales of conquest, gloomy romances of domination, religious struggle or bitter economic rivalry, the historiography on “Ottoman sentimentalism” seems to be circumscribed to Sultan Süleyman’s outrageous infatuation for his favorite consort and later wife, Roxalana (d.1558). Despite a few exceptions, the “mechanistic and unidimensional view of Ottomans as so immersed in their social roles and engulfed by their religious beliefs as to be incapable to experience hesitation, disbelief, despair or temporary loss, or confusion of identity” appears to be still in vogue²⁹². Undeniably, this partly stems from the rather irregular or

²⁹¹ Jack Goody, *The Theft of History*, Cambridge University Press, 2006, p.267. See the whole chapter entitled “Stolen Love: European claims to the emotions”, pp.267-286.

²⁹² Rhoads Murphey, “Forms of Differentiation and Expression of Individuality in Ottoman Society”, 2002, p.159. For a few specific case studies which highlight the significance of “human emotions” in

sketchy nature of Ottoman sources. Court records, imperial registers, historical or pseudo-historical accounts do not necessarily dwell upon the sentimental lives of their subject matter²⁹³. On the other hand, Ottoman literary forms that might have codified sexuality or sensuality have equally been dismissed and rejected as reliable source material upon which historical reality could be constructed. As Selim Kuru has underlined, Ottoman lyrical poetry, traditionally held as the central form of Ottoman literature, has been routinely described as a “synchronic system that repeats itself constantly, resists change, and eventually turns into mere word play”²⁹⁴. Modern interpretations of the controversial theme of *boy-love* that looms large in Ottoman belles-lettres are a case in point. According to specialists, Ottoman love of poetry was a mere vestige of older, (superior) Perso-Islamic literary models and could not, or did not reflect real-life events or sentiments. It was not concerned with “human love (...) but only with allegorical, mystic infatuation”²⁹⁵. As such, the repeated and multicolored depictions of the love of beardless boys in Ottoman prose or poetry could not be representative of genuine Ottoman tastes, mental states or behaviors. The passionate and desperate longing for the unreachable young male beloved so commonly and lavishly described in Ottoman literature simply worked as a metaphor that alluded to the craving and aspiration of the

Ottoman history see for example Suraiya Faroqhi, “Honour and Hurt Feelings: Complaints Addressed to an Ottoman Merchant Trading in Venice”, in *Merchants in the Ottoman Empire*, (ed.) Suraiya Faroqhi and Gilles Veinstein, Peeters, Leuven, 2008, pp.63-78; Nicolas Vatin, “Une Histoire d’Amour, de Mort et de Mer à Rhodes en 1573”, *Archivum Ottomanicum*, 23, 2005/6, pp.309-33.

²⁹³ Marinos Sariyannis skillfully notes that the interpretation of court registers that occasionally hint at (rather scandalous or illicit) “love affairs” can be quite burdensome and inconsequential. Whether the episodes in question are to be classified as passionate extra-marital love stories or as mere prostitution cases could remain indistinct and shadowy. See Marinos Sariyannis, “Prostitution in Ottoman Istanbul, Late Sixteenth-Early Eighteenth Century”, *Turcica*, 40, 2008, pp.37-65.

²⁹⁴ Selim Kuru, “Sex in the Text: Deli Birader’s *Dafîü’l-gumum ve Rafîü’l-humum* and the Ottoman Literary Canon”, *Middle Eastern Literatures*, Vol.10, No.2, 2007, p.161.

²⁹⁵ *Ibid*, p.159.

poet to attain an idealized, higher form of beauty externalized in none other than God himself²⁹⁶.

While such readings of Ottoman literature cannot be easily discarded, recent studies have tended to revise these commonly held assumptions, restoring Ottoman poetry as a credible source for understanding real-life attitudes²⁹⁷. Indeed, numerous scholars have pointed out the degree to which Ottoman literary texts were embedded into larger historical, social, and religious contexts. “City-thrillers” (called *şehrengiz*), that is, extended poetic catalogues of the beloveds or beautiful people of a city, as well as other poem recollections, indicate that literary creations could provide substantial information on real-life experiences or demeanors while synchronously contributing to the exegesis of marginalized or normative discourses on love and sexuality that were commonly accepted or rejected by Ottoman intellectual circles²⁹⁸. Stressing the inexorable influence of Persian literary conventions and styles, Hatice Aynur notes that “Ottoman poetry is also a mirror of Ottoman society and culture. From the seventeenth century onwards in

²⁹⁶ See the cautionary approach of Dror Ze’evi, in *Producing Desire: Changing Sexual Discourse in the Ottoman Middle East, 1500-1900*, University of California Press, 2006, pp.7-8: “Praise for the beauty of young boys was a common trope, at which poets were expected to excel regardless of their own sexual inclinations. Descriptions of male love were sometimes used as a metaphor for religious devotion or even as an attempt to criticize strict moralists in society. Tropes and poetic license, style and convention, all serve to obfuscate social reality and to produce a discourse that distorts as much as it reveals”. (...) One should therefore take precautions when trying to reconstruct a historical reality based on such texts”.

²⁹⁷ For a very useful discussion, see Khaled El-Rouayheb, *Before Homosexuality in the Arab-Islamic World, 1500-1800*, pp.75-85. Against the idea that “love poems and disputations should be understood as time-honored literary exercises which belletrists participated in simply with the aim of displaying their erudition and poetic skills”, El-Rouayheb argues that “it would indeed be difficult to understand the apparent popularity of love poetry if its portrayals of passionate love were completely unrelated to what its audience thought it was like to fall in love, or if its descriptions of the beloved were completely unrelated to its audience’s beauty-ideal or sense of what was a likely object of passionate love”. See pp.76-77.

²⁹⁸ For the *şehrengiz* genre and its origins in Persian literature, see Walter Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı, *The Ottoman Age of Beloveds: Love and the Beloved in Early Modern European Culture and Society*, Duke University Press, 2005, p.40. See also the still relevant work by Agah Sırrı Levend, *Türk Edebiyatında Şehrengizler ve Şehrengizlerde İstanbul* [City Thrillers in Turkish Literature and İstanbul in City Thrillers], İstanbul, 1957.

particular, poets tended to increase the number of references to situations which they had experienced, and we can thus say that poetry in Turkish acquired a local flavour”²⁹⁹.

As previously noted, Ottoman-Muslims from various backgrounds obtained countless opportunities to frequent Euro-Christians. Both locals and travelers who had the occasion to cross over the Golden Horn from Constantinople almost universally qualified the suburb they called *Galata* as a “Frankish city”³⁰⁰. Copiously listing and lavishly describing each quarter of Istanbul, the prominent Ottoman bureaucrat Celalzade Mustafa (d.1567) observed that Galata “resembles the Frengistan and can be compared to a soul which inhabits a beautiful body”³⁰¹. The French traveler, geographer, and near contemporary of Celalzade, Nicolas de Nicolay (d.1583), indicated that,

“Se tiennent ordinairement dedans la ville [de Galata] les ambassadeurs de France et les bayles des Vénitiens et Florentins, qui font la résidence tant pour entretenir les ligues et confédérations

²⁹⁹ Hatice Aynur, “Ottoman Literature”, in *The Cambridge History of Turkey, Volume 3, The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839*, (ed.) Suraiya Faroqhi, Cambridge University Press, 2006, p.496. Selim Kuru enumerates the names of a few poets such as Nedim (d.1730) or Sabit (d.1714), who clearly include scenes from their local and social environment into their poems. He goes on to add that much earlier poets could be incorporated in such a list. Selim Kuru, “Biçimin Kıskacında bir “Tarih-i Nev-icad”: Enderunlu Fazıl Bey ve *Defter-i Aşk* adlı Mesnevisi”, in *Şinasi Tekin’in Anısına: Uygurlardan Osmanlıya*, ed. G. Kut and F.B. Yılmaz, Simurg, Istanbul, 2005, p.477. For an example of “freshness” and originality, see the love romance composed by Tacizade Cafer Çelebi (d.1515) in 1493 and set in Istanbul. For an analysis, see Selim Kuru, “Mesnevi Biçiminde Aşk Hali: Birinci Tekil Şahıs Anlatılar Olarak *Fürkat-name, Heves-name* Üzerinden bir Değerlendirme”, in *Nazımdan Nesire: Edebi Türler*, (eds.) H. Aynur, M. Çakır, H. Koncu, S. Kuru and A.E. Özyıldırım, Turkuaz, Istanbul, 2009, pp.168-183.

³⁰⁰ For a good topographical assessment providing information on different parts of the suburb and their ethno-religious character, see Stéphane Yerasimos, “Galata à Travers les Récits de Voyage (1453-1600)”, *Varia Turcica*, 13, 1991, pp.117-30. One must note that Galata was not the only “middle ground” that permitted high-level “intra-urban interaction”, as Dursteler stresses in, *Venetians in Constantinople*, p.180. For other early modern urban centers, see E. Eldem, D. Goffman and B. Masters, *The Ottoman City Between East and West: Aleppo, Izmir and Istanbul*, Cambridge University Press, 1999, pp.207-213.

³⁰¹ Celalzade Mustafa Çelebi, *Selimname*, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, Istanbul, 1997, pp.92-93 and pp.436-7.

d'amitié qu'ils ont avec le grand Seigneur, que pour le trafic et commerce de marchandise qu'ils exercent là, et par toutes les autres parties du Levant³⁰².

Indeed, along with the more residential “Vigne di Pera” which lay right above, Galata had refashioned itself as the hub of international trade and diplomatics after the very brief disruption generated by the fall of Constantinople³⁰³. Among the differing functions, images or qualities the city was perceived to retain, one had proven to be exceptionally long-lasting and deep-rooted. As Robert Mantran summarizes:

“Les narrateurs font de Galata une ville distincte d'Istanbul: c'est une ville “chrétienne” et même, à certains points de vue, une cité “franque” (...). Mais Galata, c'est également la “ville des cabarets”³⁰⁴.

Indeed, despite the growing number of Muslim residents, Galata seems to have kept its “bad” reputation as the ultimate locus of “vice and depravity”³⁰⁵. Both Muslims and Christians attested to the rather exceptional, foreign or even “unnatural” character of the city in contrast to Constantinople, and this image seems to have survived until modern times³⁰⁶. Upon his arrival in Istanbul, Stephan Gerlach (d.1612) asserted that Galata

³⁰² Nicolas de Nicolay, *Dans l'Empire de Soliman le Magnifique*, (eds.) M.C. Gomez-Géraud and Stéphane Yérasimos, Presses du CNRS, Paris, 1989, p.144.

³⁰³ See Inalcik, “Ottoman Galata, 1453-1553”, in, *Essays in Ottoman History*, Eren, Istanbul, 1998, pp.275-376; Louis Mitler, “The Genoese in Galata: 1453-1682”, *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 10, pp.71-91; Geo Pistorino, “The Genoese in Pera – Turkish Galata”, *Mediterranean Historical Review*, Vol.1, 1, 1986, pp.63-85.

³⁰⁴ Robert Mantran, “Images de Galata au XVIIe siècle”, *Varia Turcica*, 9, 1987, pp.196.

³⁰⁵ Eric Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople*, p.154.

³⁰⁶ For the image of Galata/Pera in 19th-20th century literature, see for example Arus Yumul, “A Prostitute Lodging in the Bosom of Turkishness”: Istanbul's Pera and its Representation”, *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, Vol.30, 1, 2009, pp.57-72. For an early republican example of the treatment of Galata/Pera (called

“offered many entertaining avenues for those affected by some pain or agony”³⁰⁷. In a more condemning tone, however, Evliya Çelebi counted two hundred taverns and houses of debauchery in the city and concluded that, “to say Galata is to say taverns – may God pardon us!”³⁰⁸

Disapproving and disparaging descriptions of the “Frankish” city went hand in hand with more balanced and nuanced approaches³⁰⁹. As such, numerous literary accounts witnessed the interest, fondness or penchant of Ottoman-Muslims for Galata. In an exalting work enumerating the beauties and pleasures of Istanbul, the sixteenth-century poet Latifi noted positively that the Franks of Galata “ne lâchent pas la coupe de leurs mains et, comme ils ont toujours un verre à la main, les ennuis ne risquent pas de leur tomber sur la tête”³¹⁰. Affirming that large numbers of Muslims regularly visited the place and drank immoderately, surrendering to the joys of sumptuous and tumultuous banquets, he referred to Galata as “the biggest tavern in the world”. After praising the “moon-faced statues”, fashioned in the “Frankish style”, he professed that drinking excessively and reaching a heavy state of intoxication in company of friends should be considered a sin – if carried out outside Galata³¹¹.

Beyoğlu) as a place of marginality and otherness, see Peyami Safa’s novels. In a work entitled *Fatih-Harbiye* (1931), Safa, p.32, alludes to the distinction between Pera and the traditional suburb of Fatih in Istanbul and notes that “one could encounter all the differences between New York and Kabul in these two suburbs”. See Peyami Safa, *Fatih-Harbiye*, Ötüken Yayınları, Istanbul.

³⁰⁷ Stephan Gerlach, *Türkiye Günlüğü*, [The Turkish Diary], p.79.

³⁰⁸ Quoted in Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople*, p.183.

³⁰⁹ As Dursteler observes, even the pious Evliya Çelebi, “despite his alarm, (...) seems to have known the area well and described its various wines and culinary offerings in detail”. Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople*, p.183.

³¹⁰ Latifi, *Elôge d’Istanbul, suivi du Traité de l’Invective (anonyme)*, (ed.) Stéphane Yerasimos, Sindbad, Actes Sud, 2001, p.115.

³¹¹ *Ibid*, pp.115-6. For Galata’s invigorating and “restorative” qualities, see also the verses, p.117: “Echansons insouciants n’ayez crainte des armées du chagrin/Galata est pour vous une forteresse

Interestingly, the image of Galata as the hotbed of extravagance, dissipation, and joyous entertainment seems to have been combined with other literary tropes that reinforced the city's appeal and attractiveness. As will be shown, the topos of the bewitching and alluring "Frankish beloved" admired and almost idolized by an agonizing Muslim lover appears to be closely associated with Galata, and comes out recurrently in Ottoman belles-lettres³¹².

Fragments from the poetry of Yahya Bey (d. around 1582) clearly attest to the emergence and popularity of this literary commonplace³¹³. In his "city-thriller" (şehrengiz) of Istanbul, Yahya Bey lists fifty-eight beguiling boys of the capital from

imprenable". For Galata's fame as the focal point of alcohol-consumption, see also the anecdote in a biography of poets (*Tezkiretü'ş Şuara*) composed by Aşık Çelebi (d.1572). Relating the life of the poet Nihali (d.1543) also known as "Galata Caferi", (Cafer from Galata) the biographer reports that when Nihali was informed that his friend Mehmed Bey, a famous ghazi (holy warrior), was banned from conducting any raids into enemy territory, he responded with a witty banter, acknowledging that "placing Mehmet Bey in the frontier and preventing him to launch military operations is like offering me Galata and requesting me to quit wine-drinking". Quoted in Agah Sırrı Levend, *Gazavat-nameler ve Mihail-oğlu Ali Bey'in Gazavatnamesi*, 1956, p.196.

³¹² It must be recalled that Ottoman fascination for "Frankish" Galata did not exclusively stem from the quarter's highly-acclaimed glittering nightlife. Evidence seems to reveal that many Ottoman-Muslims visited Galata out of curiosity. A poet named Tatavlı Mahremi who worked in Galata mentioned two Ottoman notables who went to Galata in order to witness the Easter ceremony: "One or two religious masters came to Galata from Istanbul to look on idols". In a similar fashion, another poem divulged the identities of two poets, Mesihî and Şemî, who entered a church in Galata "to look on the beautiful youth" and to "light prayer candles". See Hatice Aynur, "Istanbul in Divan Poetry: 1453-1600", in *Acta Viennensia Ottomanica: Akten des 13. CIEPO Symposiums von 21. bis 25. September 1998*, Vienna, 1999, p.48, footnote no.25. For Ottoman interest in Frankish religious ceremonies see Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople*, pp.180-3. See also Elisabetta Borromeo, "Les Catholiques à Constantinople. Galata et les Églises de Rite Latin au XVIIe Siècle", *Revue des Mondes Musulmans et de la Méditerranée*, 107-110, 2005, pp.227-243.

³¹³ For a recent study of the uses of stereotyped images of religious otherness and cultural clichés in Ottoman lyrics see, Matthias Kappler, "The Beloved and his Otherness: Reflections on "Ethnic" and Religious Stereotypes in Ottoman Love Poetry", in *Intercultural Aspects in and Around Turkic Literatures*, (ed.) M. Kappler, Wiesbaden, 2006, pp.37-48.

different social backgrounds³¹⁴. Except for two beloveds, all are almost certainly Muslims, as can be deduced from their appellations. The first exception to this is an unnamed “infidel”. Much alike his “Muslim” counterparts, the Christian boy’s description fits perfectly the traditional poetic imagery of the cruel and unattainable lover that forms the backbone of the popular *gazel* genre in the Ottoman poetic repertoire³¹⁵. Even though his religious affinity is clearly pointed out via allusions to Jesus and Mary and also to idolatry, nothing seems to indicate that he was a “Frankish” boy. For all we know, he might have been a local Greek Orthodox or Armenian Christian, as both were categories that regularly appeared in Ottoman love poetry³¹⁶. However, the next portrait displays a more lucid and distinctly “Frankish” profile. Yahya Bey passionately lauds the grace and charm of his unapproachable beloved in the following terms:

Et une idole aussi dedans Galata

Un garçon franc aux yeux pervers.

Resplendis vêtue de noir lune brillante,

Qu’elle apparaisse dans les ténèbres la source de vie.

³¹⁴ For the Turkish transcription of the text, see Mehmet Çavuşoğlu, “Taşlıcalı Dukakin-Zade Yahya Bey’in İstanbul Şehr-engizi”, *Istanbul Üniversitesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi*, c. XVII, 1969, pp.73-108. For additional information on the poet, see Walter Andrews, Najaat Black and Mehmet Kalpaklı, *Ottoman Lyric Poetry: An Anthology*, University of Washington Press, 2006, pp.241-244. For a sample of his poetry in English translation, see pp.100-103.

³¹⁵ For the standard symbols and tropes as well as the changing aspects of the most basic lyric form of Ottoman poetry, the *gazel*, see the critical overview by Walter Andrews, “A Critical-Interpretive Approach to the Ottoman Turkish Gazel”, *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol.4, No.1, 1973, pp.97-111. To trace the definition, transmission, transformation and classification processes of the lyric-panegyric genre called *gazel* or *ghazal*, see also Franklin Lewis, “The Transformation of the Persian Ghazal: From Amatory Mood to Fixed Form”, in *Ghazal as World Literature II: From a Literary Genre to a Great Tradition. The Ottoman Gazel in Context*, (eds.) A. Neuwirth, M. Hess, J. Pfeiffer and B. Sagaster, Würzburg, 2006, pp.121-139.

³¹⁶ For various uses of the image of the “infidel” in Ottoman poetry, see Recep Demir, “Osmanlı Şiirinde Öteki ve Başkası Olarak Kafir İmgesi” [The Image of the Infidel as the Other in Ottoman Poetry], *Turkish Studies*, Vol.8, 2013, pp.431-445.

*Et au-dessus cet accroche-coeur frais,
Étoffe précieuse franque couleur de musc*³¹⁷.

Galata's association with wine, entertainment/debauchery, and especially, with blooming and seductive non-Muslim youth seems to go back at least as far as the time of the Conquest of Istanbul. The poetry collection (divan) of Mehmed the Conqueror (d.1481) contains two stunning *gazels* that further support this point. As Hatice Aynur indicates, "Mehmed the Conqueror praised Galata and its beauties (...) and wrote that those who visited Galata would not pine for Heaven, and those who saw its cypress-like beauties would even forget the beauty of a real cypress. (...)"³¹⁸.

Besides Mehmed the Conqueror or Yahya Bey, other Ottoman poets had daringly declared their fondness for the Frankish youth of Galata. Perhaps more significant, however, is the fact that the age-old topos of the devious and charming infidel who leads faithful Muslims to the wrong path is nearly always accompanied with the utterance of deep concern and unease in Ottoman poetry³¹⁹. As such, the sixteenth-century poet Ravzi

³¹⁷ For the French translation see the "Introduction" by Stéphane Yerasimos in Latifi, *Éloge d'Istanbul*, Sindbad, 2001, p.23.

³¹⁸ See Hatice Aynur, "Istanbul in Divan Poetry: 1453-1600", 1999, p.48. For the poems which could not be included here, see Kemal Edip Ünsel, *Fatih'in Şiirleri* [Mehmed the Conqueror's Poems], Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, 1946, pp.66-7. It must be noted that Mehmed wrote his poems under the penname "Avni". In another poem, p.18, in which Mehmed/Avni extolled the grace and finesse of a "sun-faced", "angel-like" Frankish boy, he ends his poem by bitterly reminding himself the unattainability of his beloved, since "You are the Shah (king) of Istanbul and he is the Shah of Galata". For an English translation, see Walter Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı, *The Age of Beloveds*, pp.2-3.

³¹⁹ From the 9th century poet Abu Nuwas' (d.814) verses on, Islamicate literatures abound in imageries of homoeroticism that included Christian beloveds. See James E. Montgomery, "For the Love of a Christian Boy: A Song by Abu Nuwas", *Journal of Arabic Literature*, Vol.27, No.2, 1996, pp.115-124. The motif of the unrequited love of an impervious and deviant Christian beloved can equally be found in a heterosexual context. See the famous story of Shaykh San'an as recounted by the prolific Persian Sufi author Farid ud-

(d. after 1600) expresses his fear over the arrival of “a new head turner from the Frengistan, who desires to lead the community of Muhammad astray”³²⁰. In a similar fashion, Helaki (d.1575) “equated and contrasted Istanbul and Galata, associating Istanbul with the symbols of Islam, and Galata with the symbols of other religions”. As Hatice Aynur stressed, the sixteenth century poet compared the features of Istanbul and Galata, and asserted that youthful janissaries raged and tormented people in Istanbul whereas infidel youths threatened the lives of Muslims in Galata³²¹.

Interestingly, however, the same author seems to have overcome his fear of decadence and perversion as attested in yet another wistful gazel which exhibits his bewilderment and perplexity. Aware of the fact that Galata would lead Muslims away from the straight path, he nonetheless confesses that he would prefer to dwell in Galata as a poverty-stricken, humble man instead of becoming the “Shah of the World”. In the last couplet of the poem, he beseeches God not to take away the pleasures of wine-drinking and boy-loving in Galata³²².

An even closer look at both archival and literary sources reveals that interfaith homoeroticism was not solely confined to the grounds of Galata/Pera. Indeed, Maria Pia Pedani noted that the first traces of Ottoman merchant activity in Venice was marked by a

Din Attar (d.1221). For an analysis, see Franklin Lewis, “Sexual Occidentation: The Politics of Conversion, Christian-love and Boy-love in ‘Attar’”, *Iranian Studies*, Vol.42, No.5, 2009, pp.693-723. For similar discourses in Ottoman literature, see the quotations by Recep Demir, 2013, pp.434-6.

³²⁰ See Recep Demir, 2013, p.434.

³²¹ Hatice Aynur, “Istanbul in Divan Poetry”, p.49. See also Revani who “warned” his audience in these terms: “O pious one, should you see those Frank boys but once/ You would never cast an eye on the houris in paradise”. Quoted in Joseph A. Boone, *The Homoerotics of Orientalism*, Columbia University Press, 2014, p.63.

³²² Hatice Aynur, *Ibid*, p.49, footnote no.29.

somewhat dramatic and thrilling “love affair” of sorts. Documents from the State Archives of Venice attest that in 1483, a certain Captain Yusuf was condemned to death for having raped a boy in the inn Al Cappello Nero near St. Mark’s Square. The convict was only released upon the intervention of the Sultan³²³. Another manifestly high-priced amorous adventure is that of Ahmed Paşa (d.1497), grand vizier of Mehmed the Conqueror (d.1481). According to biographical dictionaries (tezkires), the poet/statesman Ahmed Paşa was particularly fond of the young “pages”, or European slave-boys, trained in the palace school “for service to the Sultan and the highest administrative posts in the Empire”. As Walter Andrews remarks, “his fall from the Sultan’s grace and a near brush with execution are attributed to an intemperate passion for one of these young men”³²⁴.

Besides such anecdotal accounts, other – less perilous – stories further elaborate on cross-cultural encounters characterized by infatuation and romantic affection. The collected poems of Cem Sultan (d.1495), the Ottoman prince who had resided in the Frengistan as a captive until his sudden death, provide intense and heart-rending depictions of the tragic events and misfortunes during the last years of the caged Ottoman

³²³ Maria Pia Pedani, “Ottoman Merchants in the Adriatic: Trade and Smuggling”, *Acta Histriae*, 16, 1-2, 2008, p.159.

³²⁴ Walter Andrews, “Other Selves, Other Poets, and the Other Literary History: An Essay in Three Movements”, in *Intersections in Turkish Literature, Essays in Honor of James Stewart-Robinson*, (ed.) W. Andrews, The University of Michigan Press, 2001, p.73. For additional information on the rumours surrounding Ahmed Paşa’s dismissal from high office, see pp.215-6 in *Ottoman Lyric Poetry: An Anthology*. For European slave-boys who entered the service of the Sultan, see for example the passage in the chronicle of Kemalpaşazade (d.1534), Vol.VIII, p.146. Enumerating the countless riches the Ottoman corsair Kemal Reis (d.1511) had brought from his naval expeditions, Kemalpaşazade focuses on the elegance of two precious young boys, sons of “Frankish lords”. Using fixed images of the Ottoman lyric repertory, he compares them to blooming “cypresses” (servi) and “beautiful creatures” (peri) with alluring faces. For “exceptionally charming Genoese boys” (mahbublukta görülmemiş Ceneviz oğlanları...) captured by the Grand Admiral Barbarossa and occasionally offered to the Sultan, see the biographical account of his companion Seyyid Muradi, *Gazavat-ı Hayreddin Paşa*, (ed.) Mustafa Yıldız, 1993, p.187.

royalty³²⁵. However, they concurrently reveal the means by which Cem had found “consolation” in the hostile and foreign lands of Christendom. Numerous passages indicate that Cem had quite skillfully accustomed himself to “Frankish ways”. Adopting the classical imagery traditionally employed to depict refined soirées set in a standardized context of homosocial gathering, Cem lavishly described “delicious foods, roast meats, fruits, nuts and candies of every kind, accompanied by the purest wines in crystal bowls”³²⁶. All these were then served by rosy-cheeked lovely youths with “bud lips” or “hyacinth hair”. In Cem Sultan’s text, the conventional figure of the young beloved had been transposed and identified with “moon-faced” Frankish boys, thus reflecting the somewhat extraordinary conditions surrounding Cem’s life³²⁷.

Besides the prince’s relatively formal and ceremonial parade of epheberasty, various Ottoman narratives illustrated romantic interfaith liaisons much more graphically and vividly, allowing the reader/listener to further penetrate into the emotional world of the characters involved. One such example could be found in the work of a 17th century Ottoman poet. Broadening the prevailing conventional poetic terminology used by Cem,

³²⁵ From captivity to homesickness, the poems of Cem Sultan express deep sorrow and desperation. See the couplets referring to the death of his son Oğuz Han in Egypt in *Cem Sultan’ın Türkçe Divanı*, (ed.) Halil Ersoylu, Tercüman Yayınları, İstanbul, 1981, pp.60-64.

³²⁶ For the significance of the topos of the *mejlis* (-male- gathering) in Ottoman poetry, see *Ottoman Lyric Poetry: An Anthology*, 2006, pp.33-34. All the expressions mentioned are quoted from this work, and fit almost perfectly Cem’s descriptions of Frankish banquets in *Cem Sultan’ın Türkçe Divanı*, pp.60-65. Besides unnamed Frankish boys, Cem refers to a certain *Şehzade-i Efrengi*, a “prince of the Franks”. This might be an allusion to the young Charles I, Duke of Savoy mentioned in Cem’s travelogue as a young and lovely boy. See Vatin, *Sultan Djem*, 1997, p.160.

³²⁷ See Cem Sultan, *Cem Sultan’ın Türkçe Divanı*, p.232 for another description of a Frankish beloved. See also Hindi Mahmud who lauds the beauty of Frankish boys from Naples he presumably encountered during his captivity days. Ahmet Karataş, “The Prison Memoirs of an Inebahtı Veteran”, p.35.

Nevizade Atayi (d.1635) portrayed an offbeat love affair involving two Ottoman and two English gentlemen³²⁸.

Written in 1627, the seventh and last part of the work entitled *Heft Han* (“The Seven Stories”) by Atayi is a perfect case of Ottoman textualizations of romantic love³²⁹. Narrating the rather quixotic tale of two middle-class Ottoman youths called Tayyib and Tahir, who undertook a spiritual trip to Egypt after repenting of their sins and blameworthy past which they had spent roaming the taverns of Galata, Atayi carefully constructed a captivating love story³³⁰. Although the fate awaiting Tahir and Tayyib did not initially seem reassuring as they had been taken prisoners by an English vessel which had rescued them from their sinking boat, circumstances changed after they met and “befriended” two English noblemen named Sir John (Can) and Sir Janno (Cano) respectively. The plot followed its dramatic course by reporting the breathtaking adventures of the four characters who progressively fell in love. After enduring countless hardships at open sea, the four lovers finally (and miraculously) reached Istanbul where the two Englishmen embraced Islam and took the names of Mesud and Mahmud.

Even though Atayi’s account cannot - and should not - be taken at face-value, the ease with which cross-confessional romance is conveyed in a popular and widely-circulated

³²⁸ I am grateful to Prof. Selim Kuru for bringing this story to my attention.

³²⁹ See Walter Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı, *The Age of Beloveds*, 2006, p.59. Unfortunately, the tale’s Turkish edition, *Heft-Han Mesnevisi: Inceleme-Metin*, (ed.) Turgut Karacan, Ankara, 1974, has not been available to me. For a lengthy summary of the story, see *The Age of Beloveds*, pp.59-62. For a close reading and discussion of the story, see also Joseph A. Boone, *The Homoerotics of Orientalism*, Columbia University Press, 2014, pp.6-16.

³³⁰ For popular Ottoman accounts reminiscent of the initial phase of the story of Tayyib and Tahir, see Tülün Değirmenci, “An Illustrated Mecmua: The Commoners Voice and the Iconography of the Court in Seventeenth-Century Ottoman Painting”, *Ars Orientalis*, 41, 2011, p.197.

work is quite telling and significant in its own right³³¹. Indeed, nothing seems to suggest that declaring that the hearts of the four lovers “were consumed in flames of passion” could be perceived as condemnable or blameworthy by the intended audiences. On the contrary, an almost natural form of cordiality and intellectual reciprocity between the four individuals is assumed throughout the text, as all protagonists originated from relatively prosperous and educated milieus in their respective societies.

Another “explicit” and pictorial account that externalized and naturalized cross-confessional and cross-communal love affairs is a curious passage from the previously mentioned captivity memoir of an Ottoman officer named Osman, who had forcibly dwelled in “infidel lands” from 1688 to 1699 as a servitor of Austrian noblemen³³². Upon his arrival in Kapfenberg with the retinue of his master, the young Osman had been compelled to temporarily lodge in the house of a customs official. The extract recounting his stay is worth quoting in full length, as it conveys invaluable information on Ottoman norms, projections, and visions of sexuality and sensuality:

“Le douanier était un gars d’à peine quatorze à quinze ans, rond et naïf: il n’était pas fâché de mon intrusion chez lui et il m’accueillit même avec des démonstrations d’amitié. Le soir venu il se déshabilla, grimpa dans sa couche sans caleçon et me lança cette invitation: ‘Déshabille-toi et viens au lit!’

³³¹ Although the work presents some originality and contains elements pertaining to daily life experiences, Tunca Kortantamer indicates that stories from the *Heft Han* should be first and foremost interpreted and read as tales. See Tunca Kortantamer, “17. Yüzyıl Şairi Atayi’nin Hamse’sinde Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’nun Görüntüsü” [The Picture of the Ottoman Empire According to the *Hamse* by the 17th Century Poet Atayi], *Eski Türk Edebiyatı: Makaleler*, Ankara, 1995, p.62.

³³² For further information on Osman Ağa’s autobiographical piece, see pp.83-84 and footnote no.200.

Bon gré mal gré, je me déshabillai, y compris la chemise et le caleçon, et m'allongeai dans le lit qui ne pouvait accueillir que deux personnes côte à côte. Vue sous un certain angle, cette situation était extraordinaire! Si un dévergondé avait été à ma place, il n'aurait pas pu se retenir tant le désir eût été fort car le gars était attirant et en plus on pouvait aborder toutes sortes de sujets. Il commença par me parler de ceci, de cela, m'interrogea sur les moeurs avillissantes des Turcs dont il avait entendu parler et il voulait que je lui apprenne, lui qui était nu à mes côtés dans le lit, comment on procédait! Mais je me contrôlais totalement et meme si j'étais par moments très excité, je ne me laissai pas aller et ne fautai pas³³³.

Situated in Galata or not, all the above-mentioned examples point to the fact that, *inter alia*, Ottoman-Muslims could perceive and envision Euro-Christians as captivating and appealing love objects. Alluding to various stylistic patterns of Ottoman literature, Joseph A. Boone conveniently suggested that “the trope of the beautiful boy crosses class strata and encompasses multiple nationalities and ethnicities”³³⁴. The unhindered appearance and identification of idolized young beloveds as “Franks” in the Ottoman lyric-erotic sub-genre attests to the relative popularity and genuineness of such images as they presumably reflect the real-life experiences, expectations, or fantasies of Ottoman-Muslim audiences³³⁵. Although most cases limit themselves to expressions of fascination,

³³³ The translation has been effectuated by F. Hitzel in *Osman Agha de Temechvar, Prisonnier des Infidèles*, Sindbad, Actes Sud, 2001, 1998, pp.101-102.

³³⁴ Joseph A. Boone, *Homoerotics of Orientalism*, p.63.

³³⁵ This is not to say that boy-love - whether directed to non-Muslim youths or not – as well as other homoerotic or homosocial practices such as gatherings in taverns in coffeehouses was not condemned and denounced by various societal or political forces. Joseph A. Boone observes that while homoerotic behavior seems to have been widely institutionalized, “its existence is not unproblematic, as the crackdowns (initially on wine taverns and then on coffeehouses) attest. At such moments, what has hitherto been the mutual coexistence of social groups espousing different value systems reaches pressure points when the religious proponents and guardians of morality gain the upper hand; but, simultaneously, it appears that attempts to suppress any given venue for homoerotic gatherings merely creates another”. See Joseph A. Boone, 2014, p.35

admiration or affection for unattainable and delightful Frankish boys without necessarily disclosing the degree of attachment, intimacy or identity of their beloveds, the last two narratives clearly indicate that a level of intellectual partnership that transcended concerns of sheer physical attraction had occasionally been required and reached³³⁶. As such, alongside his laudable physical qualities, Osman Ağa equally appreciated the custom officer's straightforward eloquence, while Atayi depicted his protagonists engaged in pleasant and inspirational conversations (*sohbet*) held in garden parties³³⁷. As it appears, both physically and intellectually, Franks had penetrated in the minds and souls of Ottoman poets, soldiers, merchants, and even, Sultans³³⁸.

³³⁶ Indeed, intellectual parity or reciprocity seems to have been an integral part of Ottoman homoerotic conceptualizations. Giving the example of Greco-Roman conceptions and practices, Walter Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı argue that “if public space is male space, if there is no educational mechanism for producing shared knowledge and culture, then men and women have very different experiences and usually remain quite foreign to one another in many respects. As a result, (...) the assumption was commonly made that the most complete love, the love that exhibits the highest degree of mutuality and satisfaction, is the love of one educated man for another usually younger (educated) man”. See Andrews and Kalpaklı, *The Age of Beloveds*, p.14.

³³⁷ The descriptions of these garden parties modeled upon the previously mentioned Ottoman-style “meclis” (gatherings), “where lovers and beloveds, elite men and beautiful boys, [are] indulged in poetry, wine, mannered discourse, and flirtation”. See Joseph A. Boone, *The Homoerotics of Orientalism*, 2014, p.13.

³³⁸ Although beyond the scope of this work, Nizar Hermes' analysis of Ibn Al-Qaysarani's (d.1153) poems best illustrates the complex and contradictory aspects of a single individual's ever-changing perceptions of difference in the context of heterosexual love. Hermes observes a drastic change in Qaysarani's views of Franks after a pivotal encounter with a certain Maria in the Frankish town of Antioch. As he argues, “Ibn al-Qaysarani had in several respects lived an epiphanous moment with the Franks whom he once demonized to the point of calling for their utter annihilation. This change of heart manifested itself in the form of an emotional bond with a real Frankish woman (...). Ibn Al-Qaysarani, who had initially been very prejudicial of the Franks, had wholeheartedly edged their *un-heimliche* (unfamiliar) culture after a visit to the city of Antioch”. See Nizar Hermes, *The European Other in Medieval Arabic Literature and Culture*, p.168. For Al-Qaysarani's poems in translation, see pp.165-8.

An Inconclusive Conclusion:

Ottoman Occidentalism?

Perhaps more challenging than the preliminary and rather cursory attempt to chart out kaleidoscopic Ottoman-Muslim constructions of Euro-Christians is the rather troublesome task of drawing pretentious and persuasive deductions from them. As it may be, the only plausible conclusion that one might comfortably reach is that Franks were neither inexistent, nor invisible to Ottoman-Muslims. They were incorporated in myths, illustrated in miniatures, feared in archival documents, examined in historical chronicles and impersonated in frontier narratives. Inside the writings of a single author and depending on contextual factors, they could be equated to redoubtable foreign foes, backbiting local villains, trading partners, thrustful friends, wise and respectable commanders, or even, to quasi-divine and unattainable objects of love. They could appear at any moment, under the most bizarre circumstances and the least predictable footing³³⁹.

³³⁹ Quite unexpectedly, Franks could even surface in first-person Sufi narratives. In the diary of the dissident Sufi Sheikh Niyazi-i Mısrı, the Franks are portrayed as the avengers and saviors of the destitute mystic. Banished from the capital, exiled to the island of Lemnos and living under constant fear and paranoia, Mısrı “warned his Ottoman persecutors that if they killed him, as they no doubt were planning to do, they would meet their end in the hands of the “Franks,” who being adherents of Christ, would come to Mısrı’s revenge, vanquish the evildoers and adhere by the shariah of Muhammad”. See Derin Terzioğlu, “Man in the Image of God in the Image of the Times: Sufi Self-Narratives and the Diary of Niyazi-i Mısrı (1618-94)”, *Studia Islamica*, No.94, 2002, p.161. For interesting discussions on, and perceptions of Franks by Ottoman notables in the margins of Ottoman manuscripts, see Thomas Goodrich, “Marginalia – A Small Peek into Ottoman Minds”, *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 29, pp.181-199. In his comments on a manuscript of the *Tarih-i Hind-i Garbi* describing the wonders of the New World, a certain Eflaki Mustafa (d.1622) expresses his fear that Franks will soon rule over the whole world.

Without doubt, the use or “manipulation” of such a wide array of representational patterns to come to terms with Euro-Christian realities reflected the fluctuation and vitality that defined Ottoman-Frankish relationships on religio-political but also on personal levels. As such, the mixture or association of all the above-mentioned literary tropes or stereotypes with each other did not amount to a monolithic, one-dimensional view of the Frank. On the contrary, the co-existence of seemingly contradictory depictions of Frankishness (sometimes in one single account), bears witness to the wide range of motifs that could be emphasized, imagined and affixed to the Frank depending on the overall socio-political context, the intentions of a particular author, his background or personal experiences, as well as the genuinely distinctive traits of his subject matter³⁴⁰.

Unfortunately, however, accounting for the fragmentation, flexibility or multicolored nature of Ottoman-Muslim imageries of the Frangistan does not shake off the theoretical impasse of the *pluribus* without *unum*³⁴¹. In fact, integrating the multitudinous and occasionally evasive micro-images, subtle literary topoi, or ever-shifting and contrasting illustrations of the West into a larger and coherent meta-narrative of Ottoman image literature seems implausible and perhaps even futile at this stage, given the dearth of academic production. A great deal of research in imagery and xenology is still required to

³⁴⁰ As has been argued throughout the work, Ottoman renderings of *Frankishness* did not necessarily exhibit Frankish *realities*. In most cases the construction of Euro-Christian difference, whether in a negative or positive light, acted as a mere justification of self-critical or self-aggrandizing remarks. Such comments could fall into the rubric of “Strategic Occidentalisms”, that is, narratives that play their primary role as tools in domestic politics. The expression is borrowed from Lorenzo Casini, in “Occidentalism as the Political Unconscious in the Literary Construction of the Other”, in *Orientalism and Conspiracy: Politics and Conspiracy Theory in the Islamic World: Essays in Honour of Sadik J. Al-Azm*, (eds.), A. Graf, S. Fathi, L. Paul, I.B. Tauris, London-New York, 2011, p.32.

³⁴¹ Quoted in Gylfi Magnusson, “The Contours of Social History, Microhistory, Postmodernism and Historical Sources”, in *Mod nye Historier. Rapport til Det 24. Nordiske Historikermøde 3. Redigeret af Carsten Tag Nielsen, Dorthe Geft Simonsen og Lene Wul*, Aarhus, 2001, pp. 83-107.

debunk and detect previously unexposed tropes or visions that could yet be located and discovered in Ottoman and foreign sources. The credibility, relevance and meanings of these depictions should then be evaluated and re-interpreted by way of historicizing them³⁴². Undoubtedly, a comparative approach that would put Ottoman conceptions of Euro-Christians in context would be decisive; indeed, the examination of divergent Ottoman discourses and constructions of alterity set against a larger Eurasian backdrop would contribute to our understanding of the overarching patterns of "othering", their inner (intertextual and societal) significance, transformations, and broader implications³⁴³.

As such, tackling the tangled issue of labeling and classifying Ottoman visions of the Frangistan without (at least) the partial fulfillment of these conditions seems highly problematic and unavailing. This is all the more true, since the meta-categories and concepts that form the backbone of modern historical research do not usually refer to any meaningful, concrete reality. In that sense, naturalized and widely assumed notions such

³⁴² For a successful experiment, see the already mentioned book-chapter by Baki Tezcan, "The Frank in the Ottoman Eye of 1583", 2011, pp.267-96.

³⁴³ Further studies on Ottoman visions of their Muslim or non-Muslim neighbors are needed for a proper and meaningful assessment of their perceptions of Franks. Although such works have been occasionally mentioned throughout the work, see also the relatively new inquiries by Emre Cihan Muslu, *Ottoman-Mamluk Relations: Diplomacy and Perceptions*, Phd. Diss. Harvard University, 2007, 273 pages. Equally important are the analysis of the discourses of alterity and difference that were in vogue within the confines of the Empire itself. A good example is the chapter by Nazlı İpek Hüner, "Travelling Within the Empire: Perceptions of the East in the Historical Narratives on Cairo by Mustafa Ali and Evliya Çelebi", 2013, pp.77-100. For a comparison with earlier (non-Ottoman) Muslim travelogues see Nizar F. Hermes, "The Orient's Medieval 'Orient(alism)': The Rihla of Sulayman al-Tajir", in *Orientalism Revisited: Art, Land, and Voyage*, (ed.) I. R. Netton, Routledge, 2013, pp.207-22 or Ian Richard Netton, "Ibn Battuta in Wanderland: Voyage as Text: Was Ibn Battuta an Orientalist?" in the same volume. For an analysis of architectural tastes as an identity marker and form of differentiation within the Empire, see Çiğdem Kafescioğlu, "In the Image of Rum": Ottoman Architectural Patronage in Sixteenth-Century Aleppo and Damascus", *Muqarnas*, XVI, 1999, pp.70-96 or Tülay Artan, "Questions of Ottoman Identity and Architectural History", in *Rethinking Architectural Historiography*, (eds.) D. Arnold, E. A. Ergut and B. T. Özkaya, Routledge, 2006, pp.85-109.

as “Europe”, “Ottoman”, “Frenghistan” or “Muslim” that form the basis of the present historical investigation as well as others could be equated to no more than mere *catachresises*, that is “rhetorical figures lacking an adequate referent”³⁴⁴. Surely, such limitations in our semantic field call into question the overall depth and value of this - and other – studies in related fields. A similar complication occurs when dealing with the question of (Western) Orientalism and (Ottoman) Occidentalism, as both concepts are widely disputed and remain imprecise and ambiguous in many respects.

Scrutinizing Ottoman attitudes and perceptions of Westerners for various purposes, some historians have used - perhaps a little too hastily – the notion of “Occidentalism” to denote and define Ottoman constructions of Frankish alterity³⁴⁵. Nonetheless, this “Orientalism in reverse”, as Sadik Al-Azm would have it, remains all too vague a concept, and numerous scholars well-versed in early modern (and non-Western) image literature seem divided over its definition and relevance with regards to pre-modern societies³⁴⁶. Nabil Matar argues that “while European writers all too often indulged in

³⁴⁴ The term has been revived and used by Gayatri Spivak and has been quoted by Gerard Maclean in his “Introduction” in *Britain and the Muslim World: Historical Perspectives*, (ed.) Gerard Maclean, Cambridge University Press, 2011, p.5. Maclean defines the expression “Muslim World” as a *catachresis*.

³⁴⁵ Referring to rather exceptional Ottoman translations of French chronicles in the 16th century, Bacqué-Grammont observes that “l’amateur occidental potentiel d’exotisme orientalisant se trouve inopinément pris dans le miroir d’un occidentalisme oriental inhabituel”. See, Bacqué-Grammont, *La Première Histoire de France en Turc Ottoman: Chroniques des Padichahs de France*, 1997, p.LIII. Referring to Ottoman poetry, Andrews and Kalpaklı indicates that “conceptualizing relations of dominance and submission in erotic images cut both ways. Western Orientalism had its counterpart in Ottoman Occidentalism”. See, *The Age of Beloveds*, p.28. On the other hand, analyzing the travelogue of Cem Sultan in Europe, Nicolas Vatin notes that defining the work as “occidentalistic” is “perhaps going to far”. See Vatin, “A Propos de l’exotisme dans les “Vakiat-I Sultan Cem: le regard Porté sur l’Europe Occidentale a la fin du XV^e Siècle par un Turc Ottoman”, 2001, p.160.

³⁴⁶ For the questionable and problematical attempts to situate and locate “Orientalistic” discourses or attitudes in the recent and distant past, see Sadik Al-Azm, “Orientalism and Orientalism in Reverse”, in *Orientalism: A Reader*, (ed.) A. L. Macfie, New York University Press, 2000, pp.217-238.

Orientalism, Arab writers did not construct a parallel “Occidentalism”³⁴⁷. Conversely, however, in his monograph entitled *The European Other in Medieval Arabic Literature and Culture*, Nizar Hermes assumes “Occidentalists” (or, as he calls them, *Ifranjalist*) views and perceptions of the West³⁴⁸.

This confusion or disagreement stems from the fact that Hermes and Matar retain contrasting definitional formulas of the term “Orientalism” against which they pit yet another ambiguous concept, “Occidentalism”, to describe Arabo-Muslim attitudes. While Matar appears to be referring to Orientalism primarily as an “oppositional discourse” of domination, Hermes conceptualizes it differently, and alludes to the general practice of “constructing and perpetuating stereotypes and stock images”³⁴⁹. While discussions on the varying connotations and interpretations of Orientalism and its reversed form entitled Occidentalism lie well beyond the scope of this paper, the lack of proper and consensual definitions of such meta-categories impedes the effort to conveniently qualify and classify Ottoman visions of Euro-Christians.

If “Occidentalism” were to be understood as the hegemonic, imperialist endeavor of systematically studying Western civilization and culture, thus laying the foundations of an epistemic, hierarchical, and essentially antagonistic discourse of domination, then early modern Ottomans would hardly fall in the category of “Occidentalists”. Although degrading and even dehumanizing motifs abound in various Ottoman sources, these are

³⁴⁷ Nabil Matar, *In the Land of Christians*, 2003, p.XXXVIII. For a more elaborate and specific discussion see, Idem, “The Question of Occidentalism in Early Modern Morocco”, in *Postcolonial Moves*, 2003, pp.153-170.

³⁴⁸ Nizar Hermes, *The European Other in Medieval Arabic Literature and Culture*, 2013, p.110.

³⁴⁹ See Hermes, p.110 and Matar, “The Question of Occidentalism,” p.167.

more or less balanced with milder depictions that relativize the gloomy picture of the atrocious and barbarous Frank. Perhaps more significant, however, is the absence of institutions exclusively devoted to the study of Westerners as well as the unavailability of technologies such as the printing press that seems to have impeded the production of accurate knowledge while preventing the mass dissemination of consistent, systematic, and monolithic views of the Frengistan³⁵⁰.

Nevertheless, the picture might presumably change if the initial definition of Occidentalism were to be conceived differently. Occidentalism might indeed acquire a broader sense as the rather *universal* practice of formulating stereotyped representations of “alien” or unfamiliar cultures and people so as to classify and make sense of them. In that sense, Ottomans might be considered as producers and propagators of “Occidentalist discourses”. Stock images, figures, and tropes that are persistently channeled through literary, pseudo-historiographic or archival sources hint at the Ottoman preoccupation with categorizing, labeling, demarcating and illustrating the distinctive (or resembling) features that characterized and defined variations of a certain *Frankishness*³⁵¹.

³⁵⁰ This is not to say that more or less fixed concepts and images or accurate information could not circulate in societies devoid of mass printing technologies. Margaret Meserve gives the example of Western societies prior to the emergence and popularization of the printing press. See Meserve, “News from Negroponte: Politics, Popular Opinion, and Information Exchange in the First Decade of the Italian Press”, *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol.59, No.2, 2006, pp.440-480. The significance of the new technology is emphasized by Matar: “only print can make possible a ‘hegemonic reproduction’ of knowledge that can influence not only its own reading society but the values, prejudices, and ideals of societies of other peoples in distant lands”. Matar, “The Question of Occidentalism”, p.166.

³⁵¹ In most cases, “Occidentalism” alludes specifically to the essentialist renderings of the West by members of non-Western polities. Nowadays, this mostly equates to contemporary or near-contemporary non-Western (Muslim) critiques of Western values. See for example Ian Buruma and Avishai Margalit, *Occidentalism: the West in the Eyes of its Enemies*, Penguin Press, 2004. For a good critique of the monograph, see Akeel Bilgrami, “Occidentalism, the Very Idea: An Essay on Enlightenment and Enchantment”, *Critical Inquiry*, 2006, pp.381-411. For another brilliant discussion that contextualizes reactionary and dissenting attitudes towards the West and recalls the ubiquity and universality of such antagonistic ideological stances, see Jonathan Friedman, “Occidentalism and the Categories of Hegemonic

For the obvious reasons mentioned, determining whether Ottoman constructions and visions of Frankish alterity/parity should be conceived as part of an Ottoman “Occidentalism” enterprise remains – and perhaps should remain – unclear. Reversing the Saidian definition of Orientalism and claiming that early modern Ottomans retained “a style of thought based upon an epistemological and ontological distinction between the ‘Orient’ and (...) the ‘Occident’” seems - at the very least – untimely and unwarranted³⁵². Indeed, too much is yet to be discovered, while the already discovered needs to be revised, re-interpreted and re-defined. At this stage, perhaps the safest of all would be to adopt a rather escapist perspective; that of an open-ended, inconclusive conclusion going beyond untenable generalizations, self-limiting geo-historical meta-categories and meta-narratives, exposing nothing more than the lively, vibrant and fictitious textualism of Ottoman-Frankish love, hate, partnership, and diversity that animated certain Ottoman minds and souls.

Rule, *Theory, Culture and Society*, Vol.29, No.7-8, 2009, pp.85-102. Similarly critical of Buruma and Margalit’s viewpoint, Zahia Smail Salhi remarks that one could not speak of a single form of Occidentalism, but of “many Occidentalisms” and attitudes towards the West and Western civilization. See Z. S. Salhi, “The Maghreb and the Occident: Towards the Construction of an Occidentalism Discourse”, in *Orientalism Revisited*, 2012, pp.255-279. Critical or combative approaches towards “the West” alluded to by Buruma and Margalit are sometimes referred to as “ethno-Occidentalism”. For a few examples, see James G. Carrier, “Occidentalism: the World Turned Upside-Down”, *American Ethnologist*, Vol.19, No.2, 1992, pp.198. As Carrier underlines, p.199, another definition of Occidentalism, which is not dealt with here, is “the essentialistic renderings of the West by Westerners”. For a critique of this attitude see Fernando Coronil, “Beyond Occidentalism: Toward Nonimperial Geohistorical Categories”, *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 11, No.1, 1996, pp.51-87.

³⁵² Said, *Orientalism*, pp.2-3.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Published Primary Sources

Anonymous, *Tevarih-i Al-i Osman, F. Giese neşri*, ed. N. Azamat, Istanbul, 1992.

[Anonymous], *Gazavat-ı Sultan Murad b. Mehmed Han: İzladi ve Varna Savaşları (1443-1444) Üzerinde Anonim Gazavatname*, eds. H. İnalçık and M. Oğuz, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, Ankara, 1978.

Atıl, Esin, *The Illustrated History of Süleyman the Magnificent*, National Gallery of Art, Washington, H. N. Abrams, New York, 1986.

Avni, *Fatih'in Şiirleri* [Mehmed the Conqueror's Poems], ed. Kemal Edip Ünsel, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, 1946.

Bacqué-Grammont, Jean Louis, ed. *La Première Histoire de France en Turc Ottoman: Chroniques des Padichahs de France*, l'Harmattan, Paris, 1997.

Before and After Piri Reis: Maps at the Topkapi Palace, Bilkent Kültür Girişimi, Istanbul, 2013.

Binark, Ismet, *et al.* eds. *3 Numaralı Mühimme Defteri (966-968/1558-60)*, 2 Vols. Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, Ankara, 1993.

eds. *5 Numaralı Mühimme Defteri (973/1565-66)*, Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, Ankara, 1994.

eds. *12 Numaralı Mühimme Defteri (978-979/1570-72)*, 3 Vols. Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, Ankara, 1996.

eds. *7 Numaralı Mühimme Defteri (975-976/1567-1569)*, 2 vols. Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, Ankara, 1997.

Busbecq, Ogier Ghislain de, *The Turkish Letters of Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq, Imperial Ambassador at Constantinople, 1554-1562*, trans. E. S. Forster, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1968.

Çavuşoğlu, Mehmet, “Taşlıcalı Dukakin-Zade Yahya Bey’in İstanbul Şehr-engizi”, *Istanbul Üniversitesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi*, c. XVII, 1969, pp.73-108.

Celalzade, Mustafa Çelebi, *Selimname*, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, İstanbul, 1997.

Cem Sultan, *Cem Sultan’ın Türkçe Divanı*, ed. Halil Ersoylu, Tercüman Yayınları, İstanbul, 1981.

Dankoff, Robert, “The Story of Faris and Vena: Eremya Çelebi’s Turkish Version of an Old French Romance”, *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 26, I, 2002, pp.107-61.

De Nicolay, Nicolas, *Dans l’Empire de Soliman le Magnifique*, eds. M.C. Gomez-Géraud and Stéphane Yérasimos, Presses du CNRS, Paris, 1989.

Enveri, *Le Destan d’Umur Pacha: Düsturname-i Enveri*, (ed.) I. Melikoff, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1954.

Evliya Çelebi, *Seyahatname* [The Book of Travels], eds. R. Dankoff, S. A. Kahraman, Y. Dağlı, Vol.1, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2006.

Firdevsi-i Rumi, *Kutbname*, eds. I. Olgun and I. Parmaksızoğlu, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara, 1980.

Gerlach, Stephan, *Türkiye Günlüğü*, [The Turkish Diary] (ed.) Kemal Beydilli, Vol.1, Kitap Yayınevi, İstanbul, 2006.

Gökbilgin, Tayyip, “Venedik Devlet Arşivindeki Vesikalar Külliyyatından Kanuni Sultan Süleyman Devri Belgeleri”, *Belgeler*, I/2, 1964, pp.119-220.

Heberer, Michael, *Osmanlıda bir Köle, Brettenli Michael Heberer’in Anıları, 1585-1588* [A Slave in the Ottoman Empire, the Memoirs of Michael Heberer from Bretten] trans. T. Noyan, Kitap Yayınevi, İstanbul, 2003.

Inalcık, Halil, *The Survey of Istanbul, 1455: The Text, English Translation, Analysis of the Text, Documents*, Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, İstanbul, 2012.

Iyani, Cafer, *Tevarih-I Cedid-I Vilayet-i Ungurus: Osmanlı-Macar Mücadelesi Tarihi, 1585-1595*, ed. M. Kirişçioğlu, Kitabevi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2001.

Iz, Fahir, “Makale-i Zindancı Mahmud Kapudan”, *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, 14, 1964, pp.111-150.

_____, “Sergüzeşt-i Esiri-i Malta”, *Bellekten*, 1970, pp.69-121.

Karamuk, Gümeç, “Hacı Zağanos’un Elçilik Raporu”, *Bellekten*, Vol. LVI, 216, 1992, pp.391-403.

Kemal, *Selatinname (1299-1490), XV. Yüzyıl tarihçilerinden Kemal*, ed. N. Öztürk, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, 2001.

Kemalpaşazade, *Tevarih-i Al-i Osman*, Vol.X, ed. Şefaettin Severcan, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, 1996.

_____, *Tevarih-i Al-i Osman*, Vol.VIII, ed. Ahmet Uğur, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, 1997.

Kuran, Timur, ed. *Social and Economic Life in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul: Glimpses from Court Records*, Volume I, Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, 2010.

Latifi, *Elôge d'Istanbul, suivi du Traité de l'Invective (anonyme)*, ed. Stéphane Yerasimos, Sindbad, Actes Sud, 2001.

Levend, Ağah Sırrı, *Gazavat-nameler ve Mihail-oğlu Ali Bey'in Gazavatnamesi*, Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1956.

Osman Agha de Temechvar, *Prisonnier des Infidèles: Un Soldat Ottoman dans l'Empire des Habsbourg*, ed. Frédéric Hitzel, Actes Sud, Sindbad, 1998.

Piri Reis, *Kitab-ı Bahriye*, 2 Vols, ed. E. Z. Ökte, İstanbul, 1988.

Peçevi İbrahim Efendi, *Tarih-i Peçevi*, 2 vols., ed. B.S. Baykal, Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1981.

Sahillioğlu, Halil, "Akdeniz'de Korsanlara Esir Düşen Abdi Çelebi'nin Mektubu", *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi*, 18-19, 1963, pp.241-256.

_____, ed. *Topkapı Sarayı Arşivi: H.951-952 Tarihli ve E-12321 Numaralı Mühimme Defteri*, IRCICA, İstanbul, 2002.

_____, ed. *Koca Sinan Paşa'nın Telhisleri* [The Memorandums of Koca Sinan Pasha], IRCICA, İstanbul, 2004.

Selanikî Mehmed Efendi, *Tarih-i Selaniki*, 2 Vols, ed. Mehmet İpşirli, İstanbul Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, İstanbul, 1989.

Şemsi Ahmed Paşa, *Şehname-i Sultan Murad*, eds. G. Kut, and N. Bayraktar, Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University, 2003.

Seyyid Muradi, *Gazavat-ı Hayreddin Paşa*, ed. Mustafa Yıldız, Aachen, 1993. A modern Turkish translation by E. Düzdağ, *Barbaros Hayreddin Paşanın Hatıraları: Gazavat-ı Hayreddin Paşa*, 2 vols. İstanbul, 1975.

Sıdkı Paşa, *Gazavat-ı Sultan Murad-ı Rabi*, ed. Mehmet Arslan, Kitabevi, Istanbul, 2006.

Vatin, Nicolas, *Sultan Djem: Un Prince Ottoman dans l'Europe du XVe siècle d'après deux sources contemporaines*, Ankara, 1997.

Yazıcıoğlu Ahmed Bircan, *Dürr-i Mekkun* [The Hidden Pearl], ed. Necdet Sakaoğlu, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1999.

Secondary Sources

Acıpınar, Mikail, “The Mediterranean Expeditions of the Grand Admiral Halil Paşa in the Light of Ottoman Chronicles”, *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, 28, 1, 2013, pp.5-35. [In Turkish]

Acs, Pal, “Tarjumans Mahmud and Murad: Austrian and Hungarian Renegades as Sultan’s Interpreters”, *Europa and die Türken in der Renaissance*, ed. W. Köhlmann and B. Guthmüller, Tübingen, 2000, pp.307-316.

Agai, Bekim, “Religion as a Determining Factor of the Self and the Other in Travel Literature: How Islamic is the Muslim Worldview? Evliya Çelebi and his Successors Reconsidered”, in *Venturing Beyond Borders: Reflections on Genre, Function and Boundaries in Middle Eastern Travel Writing*, eds. B. Agai, O. Akyıldız, C. Hillebrand, Brill, Leiden, 2013, pp.101-131.

Agoston, Gabor, “Information, Ideology and Limits of Imperial Policy: Ottoman Grand Strategy in the Context of Ottoman-Habsburg Rivalry”, in *The Early Modern Ottomans: Remapping the Empire* eds. V. Aksan and D. Goffman, Cambridge University Press, 2007, pp.75-103.

Aksan, Virginia, “Theoretical Ottomans”, *History and Theory*, 47, 2008, pp.109-122.

_____, “The Muslim World: Recent Scholarship on the Ottoman Middle East”, *Journal for Eighteenth Century Studies*, vol.34, no.4, 2011, pp.534-542.

Al-Azm, Sadik, “Orientalism and Orientalism in Reverse”, in *Orientalism: A Reader*, ed. A. L. Macfie, New York University Press, 2000, pp.217-238.

Al-Azmeh, Aziz, “Mortal Enemies, Invisible Neighbors: Northerners in Andalusi Eyes”, in *The Legacy of Muslim Spain*, ed. S. Khadra Jayyusi, 1992, Brill, Leiden, pp.259-272.

_____, “Barbarians in Arab Eyes”, *Past and Present*, No.134, 1992, pp.3-18.

Ambros, Edith Gülçin, “Langage reflétant une différence culturelle: Le cas du porc/sanglier (domuz/hinzır) dans le Seyahatname d’Evliya Çelebi”, *Cahiers Balkaniques*, 41, 2013, pp.129-144.

Andrews, Walter and Kalpaklı, Mehmet, *The Ottoman Age of Beloveds: Love and the Beloved in Early Modern European Culture and Society*, Duke University Press, 2005.

_____, Black, Najaat and Kalpaklı, Mehmet, *Ottoman Lyric Poetry: An Anthology*, University of Washington Press, 2006.

Anooshahr, A. *The Ghazi Sultans and the Frontiers of Islam: a Comparative Study of the Late Medieval and Early Modern Periods*, Routledge, New York, 2009.

Arbel, Benjamin, “Nur Banu: A Venetian Sultana?”, *Turcica*, 24, 1992, pp.241-259.

Aydın, Bilgin, “Divan-ı Hümayun Tercümanları ve Osmanlı Kültür Diplomasisindeki Yerleri”, *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 29, 2007, pp.41-86.

Aydoğan, Zeynep, “Creating an Ideal Self: Representations of Infidels in the Late Medieval Anatolian Frontier Narratives”, *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 40, 2012, pp.101-119.

Aynur, Hatice, “Istanbul in Divan Poetry: 1453-1600”, in *Acta Viennensia Ottomanica: Akten des 13. CIEPO Symposiums von 21. bis 25. September 1998*, Vienna, 1999, pp.43-50.

_____, “Ottoman Literature”, in *The Cambridge History of Turkey, Volume 3, The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839*, ed. Suraiya Faroqhi, Cambridge University Press, 2006, pp.481-520.

Bacqué Grammont, Jean-Louis, “Osmanlı Seyyahı Evliya Çelebi’nin bir Teması Üzerine Çevre, Merkez ve Sebep Sonuç İlişkileri”, [Center, Periphery and Causal Links Based on a Theme by Evliya Çelebi], in *Evliya Çelebi Konuşmaları [Evliya Çelebi Talks]*, ed. Sabri Koz, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, İstanbul, 2011, pp.70-79.

_____, Ambros, Edith G. “Cem et la Légende de la Princesse Française selon Evliya Çelebi”, *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 39, 2012, pp.121-142.

Balivet, Michel, “Textes de Fin d’Empire, Récits de Fin du Monde: A Propos de Quelques Thèmes Communs aux Groupes de la Zone Byzantine-Turque”, in *Les Traditions Apocalyptiques, au tournant de la chute de Constantinople*, eds. S. Yerasimos and B. Lellouch, Paris, 1999, pp.181-196.

_____, “Élites Byzantines, Latines et Musulmanes: Quelques Exemples de Diplomatie Personnalisée (Xe-XVe siècles)”, in *Diplomatics in the Eastern*

- Mediterranean, 1000-1500: Aspects of Cross-Cultural Communication*, eds. A. D. Beihammer, M. G. Parani and C. D. Schabel, Brill, Leiden, 2008, pp.423-438.
- Barbour, Richmond, *Before Orientalism: London's Theatre of the East, 1576-1626*, Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Bartlett, Robert, "Medieval and Modern Concepts of Race and Ethnicity", *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, Vol.31, no.1, 2001, pp.39-56.
- Beckett, Katherine Scarf, *Anglo-Saxon Perceptions of the Islamic World*, Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Ben-Dor-Benite, Zvi, "Modernity: The Sphinx and the Historian," in AHR Forum: "Modernity and the Historian." *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 116, No. 3, June 2011, pp.638-652.
- Bilgrami, Akeel, "Notes Toward the Definition of 'Identity'", *Daedalus*, Vol.135, No.4, 2006, pp.5-14.
- _____, "Occidentalism, the Very Idea: An Essay on Enlightenment and Enchantment", *Critical Inquiry*, 2006, pp.381-411.
- Bisaha, Nancy, *Creating East and West: Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks*, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- Blanks, David, "Western Views of Islam in the Pre-Modern Period: A Brief History of Past Approaches", in *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, eds. D. Blanks and M. Frassetto, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 1999, pp.11-54.
- Bombaci, Alessio, *Histoire de la Litterature Turque*, translated by I. Melikoff, Paris, 1968.
- Boone, Joseph, *The Homoerotics of Orientalism*, Columbia University Press, New York, 2014.
- Borromeo, Elisabetta, "Les Catholiques à Constantinople. Galata et les Églises de Rite Latin au XVIIe Siècle", *Revue des Mondes Musulmans et de la Méditerranée*, 107-110, 2005, pp.227-243.
- Bostan, Idris, "Garp Ocaklarının Avrupa Ülkeleri ile Siyasi ve Ekonomik İlişkileri", 1580-1624, *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1988, pp.59-86.
- Braude, Benjamin, "The Sons of Noah and the Construction of Ethnic and Geographical Identities in the Medieval and Early Modern Periods", *William and Mary Quarterly*, 54, 1, 1997, pp.104-42.

- Brotton, Jerry, “Disorienting the East: The Geography of the Ottoman Empire”, in *Trading Territories: Mapping the Early Modern World*, Reaktion Books, 1997, pp.87-118.
- _____, “St George between East and West”, in *Re-orienting the Renaissance*, ed. G. Maclean, Palgrave Macmillan 2005, pp.530-66.
- Brummett, Palmira, *Ottoman Seapower and Levantine Diplomacy in the Age of Discovery*, State University of New York Press, 1993.
- _____, “The Ottoman Empire, Venice and the Question of Enduring Rivalries”, in *Great Power Rivalries*, ed. William R. Thompson, University of South Carolina Press, 1999, pp.225-53.
- _____, “The Ottomans as a World Power: What we don’t know about Ottoman Sea-Power”, *Oriente Moderno*, Nuova Serie, Anno 20, 81, no.1, 2001, pp.1-21.
- _____, “Introduction: Genre, Witness and Time in the ‘Book’ of Travels”, in ed. P. Brummett, *The ‘Book’ of Travels: Genre, Ethnology, and Pilgrimage, 1250-1700*, Leiden, Brill, 2009, pp.1-35.
- _____, “Placing the Ottomans in the Mediterranean World: The Question of Notables and Households”, *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 36, 2010, pp.77-96.
- Bulut, Mehmet, “The Ottoman Approach to the Western Europeans in the Levant during the Early Modern Period”, *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol.44, no.2, 2008, pp.259-274.
- Burke, Peter, “The Philosopher as Traveller: Bernier’s Orient”, in, *Voyages and Visions: Towards a Cultural History of Travel*, eds. J. Elsner and J.P. Rubies, Reaktion Books, London, 2000, pp.124-37.
- Buruma, Ian and Margalit, Avishai, *Occidentalism: the West in the Eyes of its Enemies*, Penguin Press, 2004.
- Carrier, James, “Occidentalism: the World Turned Upside-Down”, *American Ethnologist*, Vol.19, No.2, 1992, pp.195-212.
- Casale, Giancarlo, “The Ethnic Composition of Ottoman Ship Crews and the ‘Rumi Challenge’ to Portuguese Identity”, *Medieval Encounters*, 13, 2007, pp.122-144.
- _____, *The Ottoman Age of Exploration*, Oxford University Press, 2010.
- _____, “16.yüzyıla ait Türkçe Dünya Haritasında Avrupa Düşüncesi”, [The Concept of Europe in a 16th Century Turkish Mappamundi] in *Harp ve Sulh: Avrupa ve Osmanlılar*, ed. D. Couto, 2010, Kitap Yayınevi, İstanbul, pp.57-82.

_____, “Seeing the Past: Maps and Ottoman Historical Consciousness”, in *Writing History at the Ottoman Court: Editing the Past, Fashioning the Future*, eds. E. Fetvacı and H. E. Çıpa, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 2013, pp.80-99.

Casari, Mario, “Decoding the Labyrinth: Rome in Arabic and Persian Medieval Literature”, *Medieval Encounters*, 17, 2011, pp.534-565.

Caselli, Cristian, “Genoa, Genoese Merchants and the Ottoman Empire in the First Half of the Fifteenth Century: Rumours and Reality”, *Al-Masaq*, 2013, Vol.25, No.2, pp.252-263.

Casini, Lorenzo, in “Occidentalism as the Political Unconscious in the Literary Construction of the Other”, in *Orientalism and Conspiracy: Politics and Conspiracy Theory in the Islamic World: Essays in Honour of Sadik J. Al-Azm*, eds. A. Graf, S. Fathi, L. Paul, I.B. Tauris, London-New York, 2011, pp.29-44.

Coleman, David, “Of Corsairs, Converts and Renegades: Forms and Functions of Coastal Raiding on Both Sides of the Far Western Mediterranean”, 1490-1540”, *Medieval Encounters*, 19, 2013, pp.167-192.

Coronil, Fernando, “Beyond Occidentalism: Toward Nonimperial Geohistorical Categories”, *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 11, No.1, 1996, pp.51-87.

Costantini, Vera, “Contemptible Unbelievers” or “Loyal Friends”? Notes on the Many Ways in which the Ottomans Named the Venetians in the 16th Century”, in *Intercultural Aspects in and Around Turkic Literatures*, ed. N. Kappler, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, pp.29-35.

Cruz, J.A.H.M. “Popular Attitudes Toward Islam in Medieval Europe”, in *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, eds. D. Blanks and M. Frassetto, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 1999, pp.55-82.

Dankoff, Robert, “The Languages of the World according to Evliya Çelebi”, *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 13, 1989, pp.23-32.

_____, *An Ottoman Mentality, The World of Evliya Çelebi*, Brill, Leiden, 2006.

_____, “Ayıp Değil!” [No Disgrace], in *Çağının Sıradışı Yazarı: Evliya Çelebi*, ed. Nuran Tezcan, 2009, pp.109-122.

_____, “Did Evliya Çelebi “fall in love” with the Europeans?”, *Cahiers Balkaniques*, 41, 2013, pp.15-26.

Darling, Linda, "Rethinking Europe and the Islamic World in the Age of Exploration", *Journal of Early Modern History*, 2, 1998, pp.221-46.

David, Geza, "The Mühimme Defteri as a Source for Ottoman-Habsburg Rivalry in the Sixteenth-Century", *Archivum Ottomanicum*, 20, 2002, pp.167-210.

_____, and Fodor, Pal, "Ottoman Spy Reports from Hungary", in, *Turcica et Islamica. Studi in Memoria di Aldo Gallotta*, ed. U. Marozzi, Vol. I, Napoli, 2003, pp.121-131.

Demir, Recep, "Osmanlı Şiirinde Öteki ve Başkası Olarak Kafir İmgesi" [The Image of the Infidel as the Other in Ottoman Poetry], *Turkish Studies*, Vol.8, 2013, pp.431-445.

De Sousa, Boaventura, "A Non-Occidental West? Learned Ignorance and Ecology of Knowledge", *Theory, Culture and Society*, Vol. 26, 7-8, 2009, pp.103-125.

Dikici, Ezgi, "Christian Imagery in an Ottoman Poem: The 'Icons' of Muslim Holy Warriors in Suzi's Gazavatname," *Annual of Medieval Studies at CEU*, 14, 2008, pp.9-22.

Doumanis, Nicholas, "Durable Empire: State Virtuosity and Social Accommodation in the Ottoman Mediterranean", *The Historical Journal*, 49, 3, 2006, pp.953-966.

Dursteler, Eric, "The Bailo in Constantinople: Crisis and Career in Venice's Early Modern Diplomatic Corps", *Mediterranean Historical Review*, 16, 2, 2001, pp.1-30.

_____, "Commerce and Coexistence: Veneto-Ottoman Trade in the Early Modern Era", *Turcica*, 34, 2002, pp.105-134.

_____, "Education and Identity in Constantinople's Latin Rite Community, c. 1600", *Renaissance Studies*, Vol.18, 2, 2004, pp.287-303.

_____, "Neighbors: Venetians and Ottomans in Early Modern Galata", in, *Multicultural Europe and Cultural Exchange*, ed. James P. Helfers, Turnhout, Brepols, Belgium, 2005, pp.33-47.

_____, *Venetians in Constantinople*, John Hopkins University Press, 2006.

_____, "Fatima Hatun née Beatrice Michiel: Renegade Women in the Early Modern Mediterranean", *The Medieval History Journal*, 12, 2, 2009, pp.355-382.

_____, "On Bazaars and Battlefields: Recent Scholarship on Mediterranean Cultural Contacts", *Journal of Early Modern History*, 15, 2011, pp. 413-434.

_____, “Infidel Foods: Food and Identity in Early Modern Ottoman Travel Literature”, *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 39, 2012, pp.143-160.

_____, “Speaking in Tongues: Language and Communication in the Early Modern Mediterranean”, *Past and Present*, No.217, 2012, pp.47-77.

El-Cheikh, Nadia, *Byzantium Viewed by the Arabs*, Harvard University Press, 2004.

Eldem, Ethem, Goffman, Daniel, and Masters, Bruce, *The Ottoman City Between East and West: Aleppo, Izmir and Istanbul*, Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Eldem, Eldem, “Foreigners at the Thresold of Felicity: the Reception of Foreigners in Ottoman Istanbul”, in *Cultural Exchanges in Early Modern Europe*, eds. D. Calabi and S.T. Christensen, Vol.2, Cambridge University Press, 2013, pp.114-131.

El-Rouayheb, Khaled, *Before Homosexuality in the Arab-Islamic World, 1500-1800*, University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Emiralinoğlu, Pınar, “Relocating the Center of the Universe: China and the Ottoman Imperial Project in the 16th Century”, *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 39, 2012, pp.161-187.

_____, “Cartography and the Ottoman Imperial Project in the Sixteenth Century”, *Imperial Geographies in Byzantine and Ottoman Space*, eds. S. Bazzaz, D. Angelov and Y. Batsaki, Harvard University Press, 2013, pp.69-91.

Erekli, Arzu, “Seyahatname’de “Öteki”ne Bakış” [A Look at the “Other” in the Book of Travels], in *Çağının Sıradışı Yazarı: Evliya Çelebi*, ed. Nuran Tezcan, 2009, pp.147-154.

Eryılmaz, Fatma Sinem, “From Adam to Süleyman: Visual Representations of Authority in Arif’s Shahname-yi Al-I Osman”, in *Writing History at the Ottoman Court: Editing the Past, Fashioning the Future*, eds. E. Fetvacı and H. E. Çıpa, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 2013, pp.100-128.

Fabris, Antonio, “From Adrianople to Constantinople: Venetian-Ottoman Diplomatic Missions, 1360-1453”, *Mediterranean Historical Review*, 7, no.2, 1992, pp.154-200.

_____, “Hasan “Il Veneziano” tra Algeri e Costantinopoli”, *Quaderni di Studi Arabi*, 5, 1997, pp.51-66.

Faroqhi, Suraiya, “The Venetian Presence in the Ottoman Empire (1600-1630)”, *The Journal of European Economic History*, 15, 2, 1986, pp.345-384.

_____, *The Ottoman Empire and the World Around It*, Tauris, 2004.

_____, “The Ottoman Ruling Group and the Religions of its Subjects in the Early Modern Age: a Survey of Current Research”, *Journal of Early Modern History*, 14, 2010, pp.239-266.

Fetvacı, Emine, "Others and Other Geographies in the *Şehname-i Selim Han*", *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, Vol.40, 2012, pp.81-101.

_____, "Circulation, Audience, and the Creation of a Shared Court Culture", in *Picturing History at the Ottoman Court*, Indiana University Press, 2013 pp.25-59.

Finlay, Robert, "I am the Servant of the Turkish Sultan: Venice, the Ottoman Empire, and Christendom, 1523-1534", in *Venice Besieged: Politics and Diplomacy during the Italian Wars, 1494-1534*, Chapter X, Aldershot, Ashgate Variorum, 2008.

Fleet, Kate, "The Treaty of 1387 between Murad I and the Genoese", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Vol.56, No.1, 1993, pp.13-33.

_____, "Turkish-Latin Diplomatic Relations in the Fourteenth Century: The Case of the Consul", *Oriente Moderno*, 22, 83, No.3, 2003, pp.605-611.

_____, *European and Islamic Trade in the Early Ottoman State: The Merchants of Genoa and Turkey*, Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Flemming, Barbara, "Political Genealogies in the Sixteenth Century", *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 7-8, 1988, pp.123-137.

_____, "The Sultan's Prayer before Battle", in *Studies in Ottoman History in Honour of Professor V.L. Menage*, eds. C. Imber and C. Heywood, Isis Press, pp.85-99.

Fletcher, Joseph, "Integrative Histories: Parallels and Interconnections in the Early Modern Period, 1500-1800", *Journal of Turkish Studies*, vol.9, 1985, pp.37-57.

Fodor, Pal, "The View of the Turk in Hungary: The Apocalyptic Tradition and the Legend of the Red Apple in Ottoman-Hungarian Context", in *Les Traditions Apocalyptiques au tournant de la chute de Constantinople*, eds. S. Yerasimos and B. Lellouch Paris, 1999, pp.99-131.

Frazer, Charles, *Catholics and Sultans: The Church and the Ottoman Empire, 1453-1923*, Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Friedman, Jonathan, "Occidentalism and the Categories of Hegemonic Rule, *Theory, Culture and Society*, Vol.29, No.7-8, 2009, pp.85-102.

Göçek, Fatma Müge, *East Encounters West: France and the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth Century*, Oxford University Press, 1987.

Goffman, Daniel, *Izmir and the Levantine World, 1550-1650*, University of Washington Press, Seattle, 1990.

Goodrich, Thomas, “Marginalia – A Small Peek into Ottoman Minds”, *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 29, pp.181-199.

Goody, Jack, *The Theft of History*, Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Green-Mercado, Marya, “The Mahdi in Valencia: Messianism, Apocalypticism and Morisco Rebellions in Late Sixteenth-Century Spain”, in *Spanning the Strait: Studies in Unity in the Western Mediterranean*, eds. Y.G. Liang, A.K. Balbale, A. Devereux and C. Gomez-Rivas, Brill, Leiden, 2013, pp.193-219.

Gürkan, Emrah Sefa, “The Efficacy of Ottoman Counter-Intelligence in the 16th Century”, *Acta Orientalia*, Vol. 65, 1, 2012, pp.1-38.

_____, “Batı Akdeniz’de Osmanlı Korsanlığı ve Gaza Meselesi” [Ottoman Piracy in the Western Mediterranean and the Issue of Gaza], *Kebikeç*, 33, 2012, pp.173-204.

Hagen, Gottfried, “Translations and Translators in a Multilingual Society: A Case Study of Persian-Ottoman Translations: Late Fifteenth to Early Seventeenth Century”, *Eurasian Studies*, Vol.2, 1, 2003, pp.95-134.

_____, “Heroes and Saints in Anatolian Turkish Literature”, *Oriente Moderno*, 89, No.2, 2009, pp.349-361.

_____, Bonner, Michael, “Muslim Accounts of the dar al-harb”, in *The New Cambridge History of Islam, Volume 4: Islamic Cultures and Societies to the End of the Eighteenth Century*, ed. R. Irwin, Cambridge University Press, 2010, pp.474-494.

Hankins, James, “Renaissance Crusaders: Humanist Crusade Literature in the Age of Mehmed II”, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, Vol. 49, 1995, pp.111-207.

Heng, Geraldine, *Empires of Magic: Medieval Romance and the Politics of Cultural Fantasy*, Columbia University Press, 2003.

Hermes, Nizar, *The European Other in Medieval Arabic Literature and Culture*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Hess, Andrew, “The Moriscos: An Ottoman Fifth Column in Sixteenth-Century Spain”, *American Historical Review*, Vol. 74, No.1, 1968, pp.1-25.

Hillebrand, Caspar, “Ottoman Travel Accounts to Europe. An Overview of their Historical Development and a Commented Researchers’ List”, in *Venturing Beyond Borders: Reflections on genre, function and boundaries in Middle Eastern travel writing*, eds. B. Agai, O. Akyıldız, C. Hillebrand, Brill, Leiden, 2013, pp.53-74 and 227-262 (bibliography).

Imber, Colin, "The Persecution of the Ottoman Shiites according to the Mühimme Defterleri, 1565-1585", *Der Islam*, 56, 1979, pp.245-73.

_____, "The Crusade of Varna, 1443-1445: What Motivated the Crusaders?" In *The Religions of the Book: Christian Perceptions, 1400-1660*, (eds.) M. Dimmock and A. Hadfield, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2008, pp.45-65.

_____, "Before the Kapudan Pashas: Sea Power and the Emergence of the Ottoman Empire", in *War, Law and Pseudo-History*, Isis Press, Istanbul, 2012, pp.154-164.

Inalcık, Halil, "The Rise of Ottoman Historiography", in *The Historians of the Middle East*, eds. B. Lewis and P. M. Holt, London, 1962, pp.152-167.

_____, "Ottoman Galata, 1453-1553", in *Essays in Ottoman History*, Eren Yayınları, Istanbul, 1998, pp.275-376.

Irwin, Robert, *For Lust of Knowing: The Orientalists and their Enemies*, Penguin Books, 2007.

Islamoğlu, Huri. *Ottoman History as World History*, Gorgias Press, 2010.

Isom-Verhaaren, Christine, "An Ottoman Report about Martin Luther and the Emperor: New Evidence of the Ottoman Interest in the Protestant Challenge to the Power of Charles V", *Turcica*, 28, 1996, pp.299-318.

_____, "Royal French Women in the Ottoman Sultans' Harem: The Political Uses of Fabricated Accounts from the Sixteenth to the Twenty-First Century", *Journal of World History*, Vol.17, No.2, 2006, pp.159-196.

_____, "Barbarossa and his Army Who Came to Succor All of Us: Ottoman and French Views of Their Joint Campaign of 1543-1544", *French Historical Studies*, 2007, 30, 3, pp.395-425.

_____, *Allies with the Infidel: The Ottoman-French alliance in the Sixteenth Century*, Tauris, 2011.

Janos, Damien, "Panaiotis Nicousios and Alexander Mavrocordatos: The Rise of the Phanariots and the Office of Grand Dragoman in the Ottoman Administration in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century", *Archivum Ottomanicum*, Vol. 23, 2005, pp.177-196.

Kafadar, Cemal, "A Death in Venice (1575): Anatolian Muslim Merchants Trading in the Serenissima", *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 10, 1986, pp.191-217.

_____, "Self and Others: The Diary of a Dervish in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul and First-Person Narratives in Ottoman Literature," *Studia Islamica*, 1989, pp.121-150.

_____, “The Ottomans and Europe, 1400-1600”, in *Handbook of European History, 1400-1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Reformation*, eds. T. Brady, H. A. Oberman, and J. D. Tracy, Vol. II, Leiden, Brill, 1993, pp.589-636.

_____, *Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State*, University of California Press, 1996.

_____, “A Rome of One’s Own: Reflections on Cultural Geography and Identity in the Lands of Rum”, *Muqarnas*, Vol.24, 2007, pp.7-25.

_____, “Sohbete Çelebi, Çelebiye Mecmua”, in *Mecmua: Osmanlı Edebiyatının Kırkambarı*, eds. H. Aynur, M. Çakır, S. Kuru and A.E. Özyıldırım, Turkuaz Yayınları, İstanbul, 2012, pp.45-52.

Kaldellis, Anthony, *Ethnography after Antiquity: Foreign Lands and Peoples in Byzantine Literature*, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.

Kalmar, Ivan, *Early Orientalism: Imagined Islam and the Notion of Sublime Power*, Routledge, 2012.

Kaplan, Benjamin, *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe*, Harvard University Press, 2007.

Kappler, Matthias, “The Beloved and his Otherness: Reflections on “Ethnic” and Religious Stereotypes in Ottoman Love Poetry”, in *Intercultural Aspects in and Around Turkic Literatures*, ed. M. Kappler, Wiesbaden, 2006, pp.37-48.

Karataş, Ahmet, “Bir İnebahtı Gazisinin Esaret Hatıraları: Sergüzeştname-i Hindi Mahmud” [The Prison Memoirs of an Inebahtı Veteran: Sergüzeştname-i Hindi Mahmud], *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 37, 2011, pp.17-48.

Kastritsis, Dimitris, “Religious Affiliations and Political Alliances in the Ottoman Succession Wars of 1402-1413”, *Medieval Encounters*, 13, 2007, pp.222-242.

_____, “The Historical Epic Ahval-i Sultan Mehemmed (The Tales of Sultan Mehmed) in the Context of Early Ottoman Historiography”, in *Writing History at the Ottoman Court: Editing the Past, Fashioning the Future*, eds. H. E. Çıpa and E. Fetvacı, Indiana University Press, 2013, pp.1-22.

Khalil, Hassan, *Islam and the Fate of Others: The Salvation Question*, Oxford University Press, 2012.

Kinshita, Sharon, “The Romance of Miscenegation: Negotiating Identities in La Fille du comte de Pontieu” in *Postcolonial Moves: Medieval through Modern*, eds. P. C. Ingham and M. R. Warren, Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, pp.111-133.

Kolodziejczyk, Dariusz, “What is Inside and What is Outside? Tributary States in Ottoman Politics”, in *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, eds. G. Karman, L. Kuncevic, Brill, 2013, pp.421-432.

Köse, Metin Ziya, “Being an Interpreter in Ottoman Galata: Estate and Depts of a Venetian Dragoman”, *Turkish Studies*, Vol. 6, 3, 2011, pp.1065-1074.

Krokar, James, “New Means to an Old End: Early Modern Maps in the Service of Anti-Ottoman Crusade”, *Imago Mundi*, 60, 1, 2008, pp.23-38.

Krstic, Tijana, “Of Translation and Empire: Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Interpreters (Dragomans) as Renaissance Go-Betweens”, *The Ottoman World*, ed. C. Woodhead, Routledge, London, 2011, pp.133-140.

Kuru, Selim, “Biçimin Kıskacında bir “Tarih-i Nev-icad”: Enderunlu Fazıl Bey ve *Defter-i Aşk* adlı Mesnevisi”, in *Şinasi Tekin’in Anısına: Uygurlardan Osmanlıya*, ed. G. Kut and F.B. Yılmaz, Simurg, Istanbul, 2005, pp.476-506.

_____, “Sex in the Text: Deli Birader’s *Daftü’l-gumum ve Raftü’l-humum* and the Ottoman Literary Canon”, *Middle Eastern Literatures*, Vol.10, No.2, 2007, pp.157-74.

_____, “Mesnevi Biçiminde Aşk Hali: Birinci Tekil Şahıs Anlatılar Olarak *Fürkat-name, Heves-name* Üzerinden bir Değerlendirme”, in *Nazımdan Nesire: Edebi Türler*, eds. H. Aynur, M. Çakır, H. Koncu, S. Kuru and A.E. Özyıldırım, Turkuaz, Istanbul, 2009, pp.168-183.

Kunt, Metin, “Ethnic-Regional (Cins) Solidarity in the Seventeenth-Century Ottoman Establishment”, *Journal of Middle East Studies*, 1974, 5, pp.233-239.

Kut, Günay, “Esiri, his “Sergüzeşt” and his Other Works”, *Journal of Turkish Studies*, X, 1986, pp.235-244.

Lassner, Jacob, *Jews, Christians, and the Abode of Islam: Modern Scholarship, Medieval Realities*, University of Chicago Press, 2012.

Lewis, Bernard, “The Use by Muslim Historians of Non-Muslim Sources”, in *Islam in History: Ideas, People, and Events in the Middle East*, Open Court Press, Chicago, pp.115-128.

_____, *The Muslim Discovery of Europe*, Norton, (1982) reissued in 2001.

Lewis, Franklin, “Sexual Occidentation: The Politics of Conversion, Christian-love and Boy-love in ‘Attar”, *Iranian Studies*, Vol.42, No.5, 2009, pp.693-723.

Loiseau, Julien, “Frankish Captives in Cairo”, *Al Masaq*, Vol. 23, No.1, 2011, pp.37-52.

Lomperis, Linda, "Medieval Travel Writing and the Question of Race", *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 31, 1, 2001, pp.147-164.

Luria, Keith, *Sacred Boundaries: Religious Coexistence and Conflict in Early Modern France*, Catholic University of America Press, 2005.

Lyons, M. C. *The Arabian Epic: Heroic and Oral Story-telling*, 2 Vols, Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Magnusson, Gylfi, "The Contours of Social History, Microhistory, Postmodernism and Historical Sources", in *Mod nye Historier. Rapportert til Det 24. Nordiske Historikermøde 3. Redigeret af Carsten Tag Nielsen, Dorthe Geft Simonsen og Lene Wul*, Arhus, 2001, pp. 83-107.

Mantran, Robert, "Images de Galata au XVIIe siècle", *Varia Turcica*, 9, 1987, pp.193-202.

Matar, Nabil, "Renaissance England and the Turban", in *Images of the Other: Europe and the Muslim World Before 1700*, ed. D. Blanks, Cairo Papers in Social Science, Vol.19, no.2, American University in Cairo Press, 1997, pp.39-54.

_____, *In the Land of the Christians: Arabic Travel Writing in the Seventeenth Century*, Routledge, 2003.

_____, "The Question of Occidentalism in Early Modern Morocco", in *Postcolonial Moves in Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, eds. Ingham P, Warren, M. Palgrave, New York, 2003, pp.153-173.

_____, "Arab Views of Europeans, 1578-1727: The Western Mediterranean", in *Re-orienting the Renaissance*, ed. G. Maclean, Palgrave Macmillan, 2005, pp.126-148.

_____, *Europe Through Arab Eyes, 1578-1727*, Columbia University Press, 2009.

Martel-Thoumian, B. "Mamlouks et Ifranj sous les Derniers Circassiens, 1468-1522", in *Centre and Periphery within the Borders of Islam*, ed. G. Contu, Peeters, 2012, pp.185-195.

Mavroudi, Maria, "Translations from Greek into Arabic at the Court of Mehmed the Conqueror", in *The Byzantine Court: Source of Power and Culture, Papers from the Second International Sevgi Gönül Byzantine Studies Symposium*, Koç University Press, 2013, pp.195-207.

McCabe, Ina Baghdiantz, *Orientalism in Early Modern France: Eurasian Trade, Exoticism and the Ancient Regime*, Bloomsbury Academic, 2008.

Macleane, Gerard, ed. *Britain and the Muslim World: Historical Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Melville, Charles, "The Early Persian Historiography of Anatolia", in *History and Historiography of Post-Mongol Central Asia and the Middle East: Studies in Honor of John E. Woods*, eds. J. Pfeiffer and S. A. Quinn, Wiesbaden, 2006, pp.135-167.

Ménage, Victor, "The Beginnings of Ottoman Historiography", *The Historians of the Middle East*, eds. B. Lewis and P. M. Holt, London, 1962, pp.168-179.

_____, "The Mission of an Ottoman Secret Agent in France in 1486," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1965, pp.112-132.

_____, "Three Ottoman Treatises on Europe." in *Iran and Islam, in Memory of the Late Vladimir Minovsky*, ed. C.E. Bosworth, 1971, Edinburgh University Press, 2005, pp.421-433.

Meserve, Margaret, "News from Negroponte: Politics, Popular Opinion, and Information Exchange in the First Decade of the Italian Press", *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol.59, No.2, 2006, pp.440-480.

_____, *Empires of Islam in Renaissance Historical Thought*, Harvard University Press, 2008.

Miovic, Vesna, "Diplomatic Relations between the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Dubrovnik", in *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, (ed) G. Karman, L. Kuncevic, Brill, Leiden, 2013, pp.187-209.

Mitter, Partha, "Can we ever understand alien cultures? Some epistemological concerns relating to the perception and understanding of the Other", *Comparative Criticism*, 9, 1987, pp.3-34.

Murphey, Rhoads, "Seyyid Muradi's Prose Biography of Hizir Ibn Yakub, Alias Hayreddin Barbarossa: Ottoman Folk Narrative as an Under-Exploited Source for Historical Reconstruction", *Acta Orientalia*, Vol.54, 4, 2001, pp.519-532.

_____, "Forms of Differentiation and Expression of Individuality in Ottoman Society", *Turcica*, 34, 2002, pp.135-170.

Necipoglu, Gülu "Süleyman the Magnificent and the Representation of Power in the Context of Ottoman-Hapsburg-Papal Rivalry", *Art Bulletin*, Vol. 71, 3, 1989, pp.401-427.

_____, "Connectivity, Mobility, and Mediterranean "Portable Archaeology": Pashas from the Dalmatian Hinterland as Cultural Mediators", in *Dalmatia and the*

Mediterranean: Portable Archaeology and the Poetics of Influence, ed. Alina Payne, Brill, Leiden, 2014, pp.313-381.

Neumann, Birgit, “Towards a Cultural and Historical Imagology: The Rhetoric of National Character in 18th Century British Literature”, *European Journal of English Studies*, Vol.13, 3, 2009, pp.275-291.

Nicol, Donald, “The Byzantine View of Western Europe”, *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 8, 4, 1967, pp.315-345.

Nutku, Özdemir, *Meddah ve Meddahlık Hikayeleri*, Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları, İstanbul, 1976.

Ortega, Stephen, “Across Religious and Ethnic Boundaries: Ottoman Networks and Spaces in Early Modern Venice”, *Mediterranean Studies*, Vol.18, 1, 2009, pp.66-89.

Ostapchuk, Victor, “An Ottoman Gazaname on Halil Pasha’s Naval Campaign against the Cossacks”, 1621, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol.14, No.3-4, 1990, pp.482-521.

Önalp, Ertuğrul, “La Campana Militar de Carlos V contra Argel segun las ‘Memorias de Barbarroja’ (Gazavat-ı Hayreddin Paşa)”, *L’Empire Ottoman dans l’Europe de la Renaissance, El Imperio Otomano en la Europa Renacentista*, 2005, pp.215-226.

Özgen, Elif, “The Connected World of Intrigues: The Disgrace of Murad III’s Favorite David Passi in 1591”, *Leidschrift*, 1, 2012, pp.75-100.

Öztürkmen, Arzu, “Orality and Performance in Late Medieval Turkish Texts: Epic Tales, Hagiographies, and Chronicles”, *Text and Performance Quarterly*, 29, 4, 2009, pp.327-345.

Pagden, Anthony, ed. *The Idea of Europe: From Antiquity to the European Union*, Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Panaite, Viorel, *The Ottoman Law of War and Peace: The Ottoman Empire and Tribute Payers*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.

Papayianni, Aphrodite, “He Polis Healo: The Fall of Constantinople in 1453 in Post-Byzantine Popular Literature”, *Al-Masaq*, Vol. 22, 1, 2010, pp. 27-44.

Paun, Radu, “Enemies Within: Networks of Influence and the Military Revolts against the Ottoman Power, Moldavia and Wallachia, Sixteenth-Seventeenth Centuries”, in *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, eds. G. Karman and L. Kuncevic, 2013, pp.209-251.

Pedani, Maria Pia, “Safiye’s Household and Venetian Diplomacy”, *Turcica*, 32, 2000, pp.9-32.

_____, “Between Diplomacy and Trade: Ottoman Merchants in Venice”, in *Merchants in the Ottoman Empire* eds. S. Faroqhi and G. Veinstein, Peeters, Louvain-Paris-Dudley MA, 2008, pp.3-21.

_____, “Ottoman Merchants in the Adriatic: Trade and Smuggling”, *Acta Histriae*, 16, 1-2, 2008, pp.155-72.

_____, *Osmanlı Padişahının Adına: İstanbul'un Fethinden Girit Savaşı'na Venedik'e Gönderilen Osmanlılar*, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, 2011.

Peacock, A.C.S, ed. *The Frontiers of the Ottoman World*, Proceedings of the British Academy, Oxford University Press, 2009.

Peirce, Leslie, “Changing Perceptions of the Ottoman Empire: The Early Centuries”, *Mediterranean Historical Review*, 19, 1, 2004, pp.6-28.

_____, “Becoming Ottoman in Late 16th Century Aintab”, *Istanbul as Seen from a Distance: Centre and Provinces in the Ottoman Empire*, eds. E. Özdalga, M.S. Özervarlı, F. Tansug, Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, 2011, pp.59-72.

Philliou, Christine, and Mikhail, Alan, “The Ottoman Empire and the Imperial Turn”, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 2012, 54, 4, pp.721-745.

Pippidi, Andrei, *Visions of the Ottoman World in Renaissance Europe*, Columbia University Press, 2013.

Pistarino, Geo, “The Genoese in Pera -Turkish Galata”, *Mediterranean Historical Review*, Vol.1, 1, 1986, pp.63-85.

Piterberg, Gabriel, *An Ottoman Tragedy: History and Historiography at Play*, University of California Press, 2003.

Porter, David, ed. *Comparative Early Modernities: 1100-1800*, Palgrave, Macmillan, 2011.

Pust, Klemen, “Migrations from the Venetian to the Ottoman Territory and Conversions of Venetian Subjects to Islam in the Eastern Adriatic in the Sixteenth Century”, *Povijesni Prilozi*, 40, 2011, pp.121-159.

Raby, Julian, “Mehmed the Conqueror’s Greek Scriptorium”, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, Vol.37, 1983, pp.15-34.

Reyerson, Kathryn, “Identity in the Medieval Mediterranean World of Merchants and Pirates”, *Mediterranean Studies*, Vol.20, 2, 2012, pp.129-146.

Robinson, Frances, "Ottomans-Safavids-Mughals: Shared Knowledge and Connective Systems", *Journal of Islamic Studies*, 1997, 8, 2, pp.151-184.

Rothman, Nathalie, "Interpreting Dragomans: Boundaries and Crossings in the Early Modern Mediterranean", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 51, 4, 2009, pp.771-800.

_____, *Brokering Empire: Trans-Imperial Subjects between Venice and Istanbul*, Cornell University Press, 2011.

Rozen, Minna, "The Ottoman Jews", in *The Cambridge History of Turkey: Volume 3: The Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839*, ed. S. Faroqhi, Cambridge University Press, 2006, pp.256-272.

Şahin, Kaya, *Empire and Power in the Reign of Süleyman: Narrating the Sixteenth-Century Ottoman World*, Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Said, Edward, *Orientalism*, Vintage Books, New York, 1978.

Salhi, Z. S. "The Maghreb and the Occident: Towards the Construction of an Occidental Discourse", in *Orientalism Revisited: Art, Land and Voyage*, ed. I. Netton, Routledge, New York, 2013, pp.255-279.

Salvadore, Matteo, "The Jesuit Mission to Ethiopia (1555-1634) and the death of Prester John", in *World Building and the Early Modern Imagination*, ed. A. Kavey, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2010, pp.141-171.

Sariyannis, Marinos, "Prostitution in Ottoman Istanbul, Late Sixteenth-Early Eighteenth Century", *Turcica*, 40, 2008, pp.37-65.

_____, "Images of the Mediterranean in an Ottoman Pirate Novel from the Late Seventeenth Century", *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 39, 2012, pp.189-204.

Schick, Irvin Cemil, "Self and Other, Here and There: Travel Writing and the Construction of Identity and Place", *Venturing Beyond Borders: Reflections on Genre, Function and Boundaries in Middle Eastern Travel Writing*, eds. B. Agai, O. Akyıldız, C. Hillebrand, Brill, Leiden, 2013, pp.13-29.

Schmidt, Jan, *Pure Water for Thirsty Muslims: a Study of Mustafa Ali of Gallipoli's Kühü l-Ahbar*, Leiden, 1991.

Schwartz, S.B. ed. *Implicit Understandings: Observing, Reporting, and Reflecting on the Encounters Between Europeans and Other Peoples in the Early Modern Era*, Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Sebastian, Peter, "Ottoman Government Officials and their Relations with the Republic of Venice in the Early 16th Century", in *Studies in Ottoman History in Honour of Professor V.L. Menage*, eds. C. Heywood and C. Imber, Isis Press, 1994, pp.319-338.

Setton, M. Kenneth, *Western Hostility to Islam and Prophecies of Turkish Doom*, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, 1992.

Shin, Leo K. "Thinking about "Non-Chinese" in Ming China, in, *Antiquarianism and Intellectual Life in Europe and China, 1500-1800*, eds. P. N. Miller and F. Louis, University of Michigan Press, 2012, pp.289-312.

Simon, Bruno, "Quelques Remarques sur la Relation de Marin Cavalli, Bayle a Constantinople (1560)" in, *Proceedings: Comité International d'études pré-ottomanes et ottomanes, VI. Symposium, Cambridge, 1984*, eds. J.L. Bacque-Grammont and E. van Donzel, Istanbul, 1987, pp.147-157.

Soykut, Mustafa, *Italian Perceptions of the Ottomans: Conflict and Politics through Pontifical and Venetian Sources*, Peter Lang International Academic Publishers, Frankfurt and Main, 2011.

Spencer, Jonathan, "Occidentalism in the East: The Uses of the West in the Politics and Anthropology of South Asia", in *Occidentalism: Images of the West*, ed. James Carrier, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995, pp.234-58.

Spivak, G.C. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" in, *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, eds. C. Nelson and L. Grossberg, University of Illinois Press, 1988, pp.271-317.

Subrahmanyam, Sanjay, "Connected Histories: Notes towards a Reconfiguration of Early Modern Eurasia", *Modern Asian Studies*, vol.31, No.3, 1997, pp.735-762.

_____, "Taking Stock of the Franks: South Asian Views of Europeans and Europe", 1500-1800, *The Indian Economic and Social History Review*, Vol. 42, No.1, 2005, pp.69-100.

_____, "On the Hat-Wearers, their Toilet Practies and Other Curious Usages", in, *Europe Observed: Multiple Gazes in Early Modern Encounters*, eds. K. Chatterjee, H. Clement, Bucknell University Press, 2008, pp.45-81.

Terzioğlu, Derin, "Man in the Image of God in the Image of the Times: Sufi Self-Narratives and the Diary of Niyazi-i Mısrî (1618-94)", *Studia Islamica*, No.94, 2002, pp.139-165.

Tavakoli-Targhi, M. *Refashioning Iran: Orientalism, Occidentalism and Historiography*, Palgrave, New York, 2001.

Tezcan, Baki, “The Politics of Early Modern Ottoman Historiography”, in, *The Early Modern Ottomans: Remapping the Empire*, eds. V. Aksan and D. Goffman, Cambridge University Press, 2007, pp.167-198.

_____, “Ethnicity, Race, Religion and Social Class: Ottoman-Markers of Difference”, in *The Ottoman World*, ed. Christine Woodhead, Routledge, London, 2010, pp.159-70.

_____, “The Frank in the Ottoman Eye of 1583”, in *The Turk in the Western Eye, 1450-1750: Visual Imagery before Orientalism*, ed. James Harper, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2011, pp.267-96.

_____, “The Many Lives of the First Non-Western History of the Americas: From the New Report to the History of the West Indies”, *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 2012, Vol.40, pp.1-39.

_____, “The Memory of the Mongols in Early Ottoman Historiography”, in *Writing History at the Ottoman Court, Editing the Past, Fashioning the Future*, eds. E. Fetvacı and H. E. Çıpa, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 2013 pp.23-38.

_____, “Law in China or Conquest in the Americas: Competing Constructions of Political Space in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire”, *Journal of World History*, 24, 2013, pp.107-34.

Tezcan, Nuran, “Love for Painting in *Freng-pesend* Style in Evliya Çelebi” [in Turkish], *Cahiers Balkaniques*, 41, 2013, pp.27-42.

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*, Beacon Press, 1995.

Üner, Nazlı İpek, “Traveling Within the Empire: Perceptions of the East in the Historical Narratives”, *Venturing Beyond Borders: Reflections on Genre, Function and Boundaries in Middle Eastern Travel Writing*, eds. B. Agai, O. Akyıldız, C. Hillebrand, 2013, Brill, Leiden, pp.77-101.

Valensi, Lucette, *The Birth of the Despot*, Cornell University Press, 1993.

Vatin, Nicolas, “A propos du voyage en France de Huseyn, ambassadeur de Bajazet II aupres de Louis XI (1483)”, *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, IV, 1984, pp.35-44.

_____, “A Propos de l’exotisme dans les “Vakiat-I Sultan Cem: le regard porté sur l’Europe occidentale a la fin du XVe siecle par un Turc Ottoman”, in *Les Ottomans et l’Occident*, Istanbul, 2001, pp.159-168.

_____, “Le Siège de Mytilène (1501)”, in *Les Ottomans et l’Occident (XVe-XVI siècles)*, Istanbul, Isis Press, 2001, pp.9-29.

_____, “Les Hospitaliers à Rhodes et les Ottomans”, 1480-1522, *L’Empire Ottoman dans l’Europe de la Renaissance, El Imperio Otomano en la Europa Renacentista*, ed. A. Servantie, Leuven University Press, 2005, pp. 85-102.

_____, “Arabes et Turcs au Maghreb dans les années 1513-1520 d’après les Gazavat-ı Hayrî-d-din Paşa”, *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 40, 2012, pp.365-397.

Veinstein, Gilles, “Les Préparatifs de la Campagne Navale Franco-Turque en 1552 à travers les Ordres du Divan Ottoman”, *Revue de l’Occident Musulman et de la Méditerranée*, No.39, 1985, pp.35-67.

Veinstein, Gilles, “Les Fondements Juridiques de la Diplomatie Ottomane en Europe”, *Oriente Moderno*, 88, No.2, 2008, pp.509-522.

_____, “Osmanlılar ve Avrupa Kavramı” [Ottomans and the Concept of Europe], in, *Harp ve Sulh, Avrupa ve Osmanlılar*, ed. D. Couto, Kitap Yayınevi, Istanbul, 2010, pp.47-55.

_____, “Charles Quint et Soliman le Magnifique: Le Grand Défi”, in *Autoportrait du Sultan Ottoman En Conquérant*, Isis and Gorgias Press, 2011, pp. 241-255.

_____, “La Politique Hongroise du Sultan Suleyman et d’Ibrahim Pacha”, in *Autoportrait du Sultan Ottoman En Conquérant*, Isis and Gorgias Press, 2011, pp.119-163.

_____, “Autour de la Lettre de Selim II aux Andalous et des Origines de la Guerre de Chypre”, in *Autoportrait du Sultan Conquérant*, 2011, pp.213-223.

Woodhead, Christine, “The Ottoman Gazaname: Stylistic Influences on the Writing of Campaign Narratives”, in, *The Great Ottoman Turkish Civilisation*, Vol.III, ed. K. Çiçek, Yeni Türkiye, Ankara, 1999, pp.55-60.

_____, “Consolidating the Empire: New Views on Ottoman History, 1453-1839”, *English Historical Review*, Vol.CXXIII, No.503, 2008, pp. 973-987.

Yapp, M.E. “Europe in the Turkish Mirror”, *Past and Present*, Vol. 137, 1992, pp.134-155.

Yerasimos, Stéphane, “Galata à Travers les Récits de Voyage (1453-1600)”, *Varia Turcica*, 13, 1991, pp.117-30.

_____, “Apocalypses Constantinopolitaines”, *Critique*, XLVIII, 1992, pp.609-24.

_____, *Kostantiniye ve Ayasofya Efsaneleri*, translated by Ş. Tekeli, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul 1993.

_____, “De l’Arbre à la Pomme: La Genealogie d’un Thème Apocalyptique”, in *Les Traditions Apocalyptiques*, eds. Benjamin Lellouch and Stephane Yerasimos, Paris, 1999, pp.153-192.

Yumul, Arus, “A Prostitute Lodging in the Bosom of Turkishness”: Istanbul’s Pera and its Representation”, *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, Vol.30, 1, 2009, pp.57-72.

Zacharasiewicz, Waldemar, “The Theory of Climate and the Tableau of Nationalities” in *Imagology Revisited*, Rodopi, Amsterdam-New York, 2010, pp.67-83.

Zachariadou, Elizabeth, “The Catalans of Athens and the Beginning of the Turkish Expansion in the Aegean Area”, *Studi Medievali*, 31, 1980, pp.821-38.

_____, *Trade and Crusade: Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Menteshe and Aydin, 1300-1415*, Library of the Hellenic Institute and Post-Byzantine Studies, no.11, Venice, 1983.

_____, “Holy War in the Aegean”, in *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, eds. B. Arbel, B. Hamilton, D. Jacoby, Routledge, 1989, pp.212-225.

_____, “Gazi Çelebi of Sinope”, in *Oriente e Occidente tra Medioevo ed eta Moderna*, *Studi in onore di Geo Pistarino*, Cenova, 1997, pp.1271-1275.

Zadeh, Travis, “The Wiles of Creation: Philosophy, Fiction, and the Aja’ib Tradition”, *Middle Eastern Literatures*, Vol. 13, No.1, 2010, pp.21-48.

Zaimova, Raim, *Voyager vers l’”autre” Europe: images françaises des Balkans ottomans, XVIe-XVIIIe siècles*, Isis Press, Istanbul, 2007.

Zaman, Taymiya, “Visions of Juliana: A Portuguese Woman at the Court of the Mughals”, *Journal of World History*, Vol.23, no.4, 2012, pp.761-791.

Zeevi, Dror, “The Use of Ottoman Shari’a Court Records as a Source for Middle Eastern Social History: A Reappraisal,” *Islamic Law and Society*, 5, 1995, pp.35-56.

_____, in *Producing Desire: Changing Sexual Discourse in the Ottoman Middle East, 1500-1900*, University of California Press, 2006.