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Abstract

In sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century England, portrayals of the Turk reflected aspects of Christian thinking. More specifically, these views varied according to ideological outlook, place and time. To complicate matters further, while there are a variety of images of the Turk responding to a range of Christian concerns, the nexus of images of the Turk – the *imago Turci* – is essentially contradictory. English portrayals and responses to the Turks are not uniform, but vary, while the Turk operates at once both from within and at a distance from English culture in the sixteenth and early seventeenth century. In other words, the Turk is both real and imagined. This project is a response to these issues. It examines the ways in which Turks – both real and imagined – not only figure in early modern English prose texts as a site of their cultural production, perpetuation, and negotiation, but also the ways in which these images relate to and participate in current political and cultural debates that also informed these prose texts. As a consequence of the diversity of the *imago Turci* in a wide range of available, printed prose works, I adopt five categorical distinctions representing five groups of overlapping genres, or modes for my analysis: history, religion, travel, mercantile writings and romance. Reading the material in their historical contexts, one of the arguments to arise from this is that the use of the Turk in these English texts reflects the wider cultural and political developments in Western Christendom and England, and between Christendom and the Ottoman Empire. The central argument of this project is that the *imago Turci* in early modern English prose emerges as a complex discursive site in which a variety of competing interests are negotiated.
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and how // Edward Cotton had served the Turk within the Strayts and sold many Christians into the gullies, which thing yf yt be true I could wysh a precher to exhort the people at the spittal sermons when Collections be made for captives rather to pay money unto such men of war before and to such that cary ordynance etc. to the Turk as did Sir Thomas Gressam [Gresham], than to suffer them to sel our Christians first and than we be forsed thro charitye to redeem them.1

In sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century England, portrayals of the Turk reflected aspects of Christian thinking. More specifically, these views varied according to ideological outlook, place and time. To complicate matters further, while there are a variety of images of the Turk fashioned in response to a range of Christian concerns, the nexus of images of the Turk – the imago Turci – is essentially contradictory. Richard Madox’s suggestion that the Turk is at once a partner in trade and a danger, encapsulates this paradox. While private and official correspondence played a significant role in the circulation of such ambivalent ideas, it was perhaps the commercial stage that disseminated and explored them most widely. Christopher Marlowe’s two Tamburlaine plays (c. 1586-7) are a case in point. They exhibit what their audience both admired and feared in the Turk: the possession of an empire and the cruelty of its ruler. As Simon Shepherd points out in his analysis of the plays, the qualities inscribed in the Turkishness exhibited by some of their characters, both Muslim and Christian, ‘show attitudes that are familiar but that cannot be ideologically recognised as natural to the politics of England’.2 Above all, what these two examples indicate is that portrayals and responses to the Turk are not uniform, but vary; moreover, they also demonstrate that the Turk operates at once both from within and at a distance from English culture in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The Turk here is both real and imagined.

This project is a response to these issues. It examines the ways in which Turks—both real and imagined—figure in early modern English prose texts as sites of their cultural production, perpetuation, and negotiation. It also explores the ways in which these images relate to and participate in contemporary political and cultural debates. As a consequence of the diversity of the *imago Turci* in a wide range of available, printed prose works, I adopt five categorical distinctions representing five groups of overlapping genres—or modes—for my analysis: history, religion, travel, mercantile writings and romance. The choice of a genre-based approach is partly a response to the evidence in the material which suggests recurring themes and motifs in the portrayal and uses of the Turk, and partly because such an approach offers a stronger sense of the wider influences and traditions that helped to shape the *imago Turci*. The criterion by which each of the texts discussed here is assigned to one of these analytical groups is predicated less on a set of formal features than on their topical matter. The underlying assumption here is that the two—form and content—are related. Finally, I do not wish to downplay the significance of historical contexts for understanding *imago Turci*, or that of the specific historical events which will, of course, be provided throughout the discussion. One of the arguments to arise from these historicised readings is that the use of the Turk in these English texts reflects the wider cultural and political developments in Western Christendom and England, and in the relationship between Christendom and the Ottoman Empire. The central argument of this project is that the *imago Turci* in early modern English prose emerges as a complex discursive site in which a variety of competing interests are negotiated.

With this in mind, a brief gloss on what I understand by ‘the politics of anxiety’ is required here. The term ‘anxiety’, according to the *OED*, refers to ‘the quality or state of being anxious; uneasiness or trouble of mind about some uncertain event; solicitude, concern’. Anxiety can thus be interpreted as a state of mind that is marked by suspicion without certainty or trust. Mark Breitenberg asserts that the ‘meaning and context’ of the term
anxiety has remained fairly stable since the seventeenth century. Additionally to the OED he refers to Robert Burton, who defines anxiety as 'doubt and suspicion' – a kind of fear without knowable referent or cause. In the context of this discussion, too, anxiety is often understood as 'doubt and suspicion', or as relating to concerns that are rooted in uncertainty or lack of trust. A sense of anxiety is revealed by Richard Madox, in the passage with which this introduction is prefaced, who suspects Edward Cotton of selling off ‘Christians into the Gallies’ of the Turk. Anxious about this kind of trade, Madox’s two principal sources for these feelings are the Turks and the Christian practice of trading in Christians with the Turks.

In contrast to Breitenberg, anxiety in the context of this discussion is related to a specific referent: the Turk. Christians perceived the Turks as both a physical and a spiritual threat, and often these two would go together. While Madox is silent on this, captives, if not redeemed, often ‘turned Turk’, that is, they converted to Islam to either improve their lot, or to escape slavery. But to ‘turn Turk’ was not associated with religious conversion alone; it also referred to the process of assimilating characteristics usually identified with the Turks, for instance, ‘aggression, lust, suspicion, murderous conspiracy, [and] sudden cruelty masquerading as justice’. In this sense, the idiom extends anxieties that are linked to the figure of the Turk to a wider field of semantics, and thus to manipulation. Madox’s second source of anxiety – the Christian practice of selling Christians to the Turk – relates to a perceived transgression of a Christian behavioural norm. This much is suggested by Madox who sardonically suggests that it is better ‘to pay money unto such men of war before and to

---

7 See also Patricia Parker, ‘Barbers and Barbary: Early Modern Cultural Semantics’, *Renaissance Drama*, 33 (2004), 201-44.
such that cary ordnance etc. to the Turk as did Sir Thomas Gressam [Gresham], than to suffer them to sel our Christians first'. It is not the trade with the Turks per se that Madox deplores, but the behaviour of those who transgress what he considers permissible. The relevant point of this brief illustration is that while the Turk is a figure of anxiety, Christian practices related to the Turk, too, were regarded with suspicion. As a consequence, the figure of the Turk is also a marker of transgression. The possible motivations or interests that inform the ways in which English writers engaged, wrote or thought about the Turk, then, are what I refer to as the politics of anxiety.

Christian interest in the Turk during the period under discussion is indisputable. Between 1500 and 1600, Carl Göllner lists some 3500 printed titles in his Turcica – a bibliography of the available printed material on the Ottoman Turks in Europe – of which the better part, 2500, were printed in the second half of the century.\(^8\) This much is reflected in the output of printed documents on the Turks in England, which saw a significant increase in the second half of the sixteenth century; it is also one of the reasons for this project’s terminus a quo and its terminus ad quem respectively.\(^9\) Moreover, the growing number of texts on the Turks was matched by the diversity of material. While initially many of the texts available in England were translations from continental sources, soon England’s own increasing involvement with the Ottomans, which may be dated with the procurement of the first trading

---

\(^8\) Carl Göllner, *Turcica: Die europäischen Türkendrucke des XVI. Jahrhunderts*, 3 vols (Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1961-78); According to Almuth Höfert of the texts that comprise the Turcica only 1.73% account for English printed texts, while 45.7% represent the overall printed material in the Hapsburg Empire. This statistic is, by her own admission, debatable, since Göllner’s bibliography is not exhaustive and does not record texts which do not deal with Turks as their primary subject, Almut Höfert, *Den Feind beschreiben: Türkengefahr und europäisches Wissen über das Osmanische Reich 1450-1600* (Frankfurt; New York: Campus Verlag, 2003), pp. 116-17.

privileges in 1579, resulted in a flurry of English works published on the Turks.10 Indeed, the latter half of Elizabeth’s reign can be considered, as Matthew Dimmock notes, ‘a high point in the production of texts of all kinds relating to the Ottoman Empire’.11

Despite the availability of texts of ‘all kinds’ about Turks, it is the commercial drama that has received the most attention from critics in their exploration of early modern English representations of the Turk.12 This is not surprising, because, as Daniel Vitkus has shown, the commercial drama was deeply inspired by the ‘English encounter with exotic alterity’ as a direct result of England’s commercial ventures with the Ottomans.13 Moreover, London’s playhouses disseminated images of the Turks far more easily among the populace than, for example, a voluminous prose historiography. Simultaneously, the theatre catered for an audience that would have had limited access to written works on the subject. This is not to suggest, firstly, that the Turk in prose texts has not received any attention at all, nor, secondly, that interest in the Turk should be exclusively identified with commerce.

In a recent study on Islam and English drama, Jonathan Burton observes that by the end of the sixteenth century ‘Britons prompted to think about the Turks drew from three broad, associative inventories’, which he calls, ‘the textual-historical, the experiental, and the domestic’.14 These inventories, or rather collections of ideas related to the Turks, are by no means discrete and would not have been recognised as such by contemporaries. In essence, they reflect inherited late medieval and early Renaissance ideas about Turks, the experiences gained from contemporary cross-cultural encounters, and ‘notions of difference that

---

13 Vitkus, Turning Turk, p. 27.
14 Burton, Traffic and Turning, p. 22.
contributed to an Englishman’s sense of normative selfhood’. By emphasising these inventories, Burton usefully opens up one way of exploring the complex relationships between early modern Christianity and Islam, and images of the Turks in non-dramatic material and a network of wider concerns he associates with the domestic inventory. I agree that these inventories should not be seen as discrete categories, that they overlap and, to a certain extent, shape one another. Yet while these inventories are helpful, they remain somewhat opaque as to what precisely it is ‘Britons’ could withdraw from them. They do not explain, or illuminate, the ways in which English writers actually made sense of the imago Turci in its various textual forms. For one, Burton’s textual-historical inventory conflates prose-historiographies like Knolles’ Generall Historie of the Turkes (1603) with other historical writings such as John Foxe’s, whose apocalyptic agenda portrays the Christian-Ottoman conflict in ways that are absent from Knolles’ text. While my own approach, too, considers the multiple meanings and ideas related to the Turk in early modern English culture, I differ from Burton in two significant ways: firstly, by focusing on works of prose, I explore textual material and ideas that Burton subsumes under his threefold inventory, and secondly, instead of regarding these texts as collections of ideas to which ‘Britons’ turned when prompted to think about the Turk, I treat these texts less as deposits of ideas, than as explorations of the Turk worth considering in their own right and on their own terms.

The choice of prose texts for this project is not based on their relative neglect in the current critical debate alone. Works of prose reflect widely differing ideological currents that influenced the imago Turci, and their writers engaged with the Turk in significantly different ways that reflect past and present concerns about their own culture. This is of course also true for dramatic texts. For instance, Robert Daborne’s play A Christian Turn’d Turk (1609-12?) is ostensibly preoccupied with the problems of Christian apostasy to Islam, and Christians

\footnote{Ibid, p. 24.}
turning to piracy as a career in the Mediterranean. The two are related, and, according to Daniel Vitkus, presented in the play in such a way as to address not only the crimes of piracy and conversion to Islam, but also to discourage any potential converts to such practices in the audience. In so doing, the play responds to real anxieties about these two abiding problems outside the theatre. The play, Vitkus maintains, serves as a 'cautionary lesson for anyone thinking about a career in Barbary'. On another level, however, the play can also be read as a discussion of concerns related to the current politics at the Jacobean court. In Claire Jowitt's allegorical reading of A Christian Turn'd Turk, the play is not only a warning against pirates, but also 'a warning to tyrannical monarchs of the dangers of believing their word is law and [of] being influenced by sensual and sexual counsel'. She argues that the 'turning Turk' of the pirate Ward 'can be seen as articulating fears about James's contamination by corrupt, arbitrary and sensually inspired counsel'. Jowitt's reading is important, because it draws attention to the ways in which an engagement with the Turk and related anxieties should not only be read as a reflection of early modern England's engagement with Islam, but also with itself. Here it is useful to recall Vitkus' argument that the commercial stage's engagement with Islam and the Turk is inspired by England's commerce with the Porte. Prose texts, on the other hand, testify to an interest in and concern with the Turk that significantly precedes these commercial engagements and, as a consequence, are informed by different impulses. It is one of the purposes of this project to identify and explore texts and contexts in which the Turk played a significant role outside Anglo-Ottoman commercial relations.

16 The play is reprinted in Vitkus (ed.), Three Turk Plays, pp. 149-245.
20 Matthew Dimmock makes this connection explicit in his discussion of Robert Wilson's Three Ladies of London (c. 1581), New Turkes, pp. 95-102.
All the texts discussed in this project deal with the Turk, but in different ways, to different degrees, and for different purposes. Arranging these texts according to genre indicates some of these interests as well as the principal cultural and textual intersections at which the figure of the Turk emerges. A project of this size cannot claim to be exhaustive. Consequently, this is largely a case study. The bulk of printed documents discussed here stems from the Elizabethan period, reflecting the increasing significance of the Turk in England during this time. Although the Turk certainly receives greater prominence during the reign of Elizabeth, each chapter also emphasises the significance and relevance of the Turk for England in an earlier moment by drawing attention to material on the Turk published before Elizabeth's rule. This is also the rationale behind the project's *terminus a quo* which signals roughly the earliest printed documents I discuss, while the *terminus ad quem* marks the publication of the final documents explored in this project. Using publication dates to define the temporal limits of this project rather than regnal dates, or a specific historical event – the accession of Elizabeth I, or the siege of Vienna in 1529 – is to recognise the complexity of influences that inform the *imago Turci* along both a textual and a temporal axis. This temporal framework is thus partly designed to allow for a glimpse of the influences on later textual debates, but also of the echo of these texts, and, in some cases, their reception during Elizabeth's reign, in those composed during the reigns of her successors.

This project is structured along generic rather than chronological lines for two reasons; firstly, genre reflects the fields of experience in which early modern writers and readers encountered the Turks; secondly, the five divisions – history, religion, travel, mercantile writings and romance – allow for distinctions between the different ways in which the *imago Turci* develops, rather than conflating important differences. I do not argue that these categories would have been recognised in precisely the same way by contemporaries, but they are a useful tool to tackle the vast available material on the Turk. Moreover, these genres overlap and are inclusive of a wide range of sources. Stephen Orgel has shown that 'notions
of genre have changed radically since the Renaissance', and, while they are largely exclusive and definitive for us, 'they tended to be inclusive and relational' in the sixteenth century.21 This does not mean, of course, that there are no significant generic formal distinctions in the Renaissance, but, as Rosalie Colie has pointed out in her discussion of Julius Scaliger's genre theory, it is subject matter that is 'the definer of kind'.22 In other words, the texts discussed under each generic group are assigned by virtue of subject matter rather than formal features. With regard to the representations of the Turk one final distinction may be made here: the texts discussed under the heading of history and religion turn to domestic constructions, while the third and fourth chapter discusses material that reflects the experiences of actual English encounters with the Turks. The final chapter, on the other hand, turns to the genre of romance, a highly neglected area in available studies on early modern English representations of the Turk.

In recent years, the role of the Turk, or perhaps more broadly, that of the Ottoman Empire has moved from a virtually marginal position in early modern studies to the centre of scholarly attention. Following a long gap after the publication of Samuel Chew's magisterial work The Crescent and the Rose in 1937, a number of significant publications with a distinct focus on cultural exchanges between 'East' and 'West' were published.23 Initially it was largely the work of historians like Dorothy M. Vaughan, Fernand Braudel, and Norman Daniel that charted the impact of the Ottoman Empire on Europe, but it was soon further pursued by other revisionist and cultural historians whose enquiry into the multiple relationships between 'East' and 'West' resulted in a number of studies by critics such as

John Hale, Lisa Jardine, Jerry Brotton and Daniel Goffman.\(^{24}\) One of the key insights to emerge from their respective work was that the relationship between ‘East’ and ‘West’ was characterised by commercial and intellectual exchange rather than by impermeable boundaries, and, as a result, they suggested that the Renaissance could no longer be thought in exclusively Eurocentric terms.\(^{25}\)

The insights of these critics challenge the views posed by the dominant study in the field of Western engagements with the East: Edward Said’s *Orientalism*.\(^{26}\) For Said, Orientalism can mean several, interdependent things, an academic practice, a style of thought, but above all it is ‘a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient’.\(^{27}\) Since his study takes as its starting point the eighteenth century, many critics have found fault with its applicability to earlier periods, which do not show the epistemological categories and power relations Said identifies for the period he examines.\(^{28}\) In his two studies *Islam in Britain, 1558-1685* and *Turks, Moors and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery* Nabil Matar addresses this ahistoricism (or rather the limits) of Said’s model, and successfully questions its applicability to the early modern period.\(^{29}\) He exemplifies this by tracing the


\(^{25}\) This project has been revisited most recently by Gerald MacLean (ed.), *Re-Orienting the Renaissance: Cultural Exchanges with the East* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2005).


\(^{27}\) Ibid, pp. 2-3.


multiple power relations between Islamic countries and Britain, in particular the relations between the Ottoman Empire and England. In direct opposition to Said, Matar suggests that in the early modern period ‘Muslims had a power of self-representation which English writers knew they had either to confront or to engage’.\textsuperscript{30} Christian engagement with Muslims in the period were clearly marked by a sense of inferiority, however, responses to this sense were not as consistent as Matar’s comment suggests. My readings of English representations of Turks in the following chapters also complicate both Said’s Orientalist model, and Matar’s equally strict line of division between Muslims and Christians, which, ultimately, reduces complex relations to mere binaries. Instead, I am largely in agreement with scholars like Matthew Dimmock, Daniel Vitkus and Jonathan Burton who all argue for the existence of multiple concepts of Islam and the Turk in an economy that produced early modern English representations of the Turk that ranged, as Burton put it, ‘from the censorious to the laudatory, from others to brothers’.\textsuperscript{31}

At this point it is also useful to comment briefly on the term Turk, and to define its uses in my discussion. Broadly speaking, in English usage of the sixteenth century the term referred to Muslims in general. The idiom ‘turning Turk’ – meaning either conversion or moral corruption, or both – is, as we have seen, semantically linked to the Turk. In turn, the two ideas could be used almost interchangeably. For instance, in the religious debates between Protestants and Catholics both factions would call each other Turks, while calling for ‘a united crusade against the real Turks’.\textsuperscript{32} There is however yet another nuance. The convert

\textsuperscript{30} Matar, \textit{Islam in Britain}, pp. 11-12.
\textsuperscript{31} Burton, \textit{Traffic and Turning}, p. 12.
John Leo – ‘by birth a More, and by religion for many yeeres a Mahumetan’ – tells his readers that:\textsuperscript{33}

The Turkes, especially those of Europe, are of two sorts: for some are naturall Turkes, others accessorie, or accidental. Naturall I terme them, that are borne of Turkish parents and them I call accidentall, who leauing our sacred faith, [...], become Mahumetans: the which the Christians performe by circumcising themselves, and the Iewes by lifting vp a finger.\textsuperscript{34}

To ‘turn Turk’ not only designates conversion to Islam, it extends the range of ethnic identities associated with Turks significantly beyond what constitutes the ‘naturall Turkes’. The single most important point here is that in sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century England the term Turks was understood as a template that could refer to an ethnic identity and to a set of specific characteristics alike. In sum, representations of Turks were fluid but powerful ideological constructs. Nevertheless, throughout my discussion I differentiate between those who ‘turn Turk’, and the use of the term Turk to indicate ideological and religious difference, and, finally, the Ottoman Turks, or Ottomans as a people whom Englishmen and women in different capacities encountered in war, travel, or even at home.

Recent years saw a burgeoning number of publications dedicated specifically to the representation of Turks in English literature. Daniel Vitkus has made accessible a number of significant, but hitherto neglected, plays\textsuperscript{35}. Furthermore, his own readings of these and canonical works, Vitkus has demonstrated the need to re-adjust, or re-focus our critical lens through which to read many of the plays that represent Christian-Muslim relations, including such plays as \textit{Tamburlaine} and \textit{Othello}.\textsuperscript{36} In many ways, Matthew Dimmock’s study develops the work of Vitkus and Nabil Matar further and, in so doing, demonstrates the central significance of the Turk for early modern English culture. In his study, \textit{New Turkes –

\textsuperscript{33} Africanus, Johannes Leo, \textit{A Geographical Historie of Africa}, trans. by John Pory (London: George Bishop, 1600), STC 15481, ‘To the Reader’.

\textsuperscript{34} Africanicus, \textit{A Geographical Historie}, sigs. 2L1\textsuperscript{r}v.

\textsuperscript{35} Vitkus (ed.), \textit{Three Turk Plays}.

\textsuperscript{36} Vitkus, ‘Turning Turk’; Turning Turk.
Dramatizing Islam and the Ottomans in Early Modern England, he focuses on the fractured images of the ‘turke’, and identifies the development of ‘Turkishness’ in its various guises as a contested metaphor in English culture between 1529 (the year of the first Ottoman siege to Vienna) and the end of the sixteenth century. Alongside his study, which examines both contemporary drama and an impressive range of prose works, Dimmock also made available an edition of a long-neglected play, William Percy’s Mahomet and His Heaven. Gerald MacLean’s study, The Rise of Oriental Travel, examines specifically the narratives of English travellers who visited Ottoman dominions. In so doing MacLean emphasises the allure of the Ottoman Empire and identifies the lack of control exhibited by Westerners in their journey through these regions. For those who went, the experience of going to these lands, MacLean argues, ‘changed what it meant to be English’. Finally, Jonathan Burton’s most recent study extends this debate of Anglo-Ottoman encounters by examining ‘translated accounts of Ottoman and North African Muslim writers’ alongside English texts. He seeks to demonstrate the ways in which ‘Muslims contributed to the discourses by which they were known in Europe and England’.

With these critics I share the general direction they have taken regarding English representations of Turks, which they all identify as complex, contradictory and often overdetermined. What their research also shows is the inherent instability of binary oppositions such as ‘Christian’ and ‘Muslim’ in the contexts of Anglo-Ottoman encounters, both imagined and real. Such cultural negotiations are the key to my own project. Part of the difficulty in delineating these negotiations is the sheer complexity of imago Turci itself. For example, John Leo’s differentiation between ‘naturall’ and ‘accidentall’ Turks illustrates

37 Dimmock, New Turkes.
38 William Percy, Mahomet and His Heaven ed. by Matthew Dimmock (Ashgate: Aldershot, 2006).
40 Burton, Traffic and Turning, p. 14
41 Ibid, p. 233.
some of the ways in which early modern commentators had at their disposal an extended vocabulary to refer to the Turk; one which, similar to early modern concepts of Jewishness, defines Ottoman Turks in a myriad of ways through religion, lineage, and customs. What I want to demonstrate throughout this project is that the Turk as a concept has the property to destabilise what seems certain or familiar, but it can also bring assurance to what seems vague. The contradictions are inherent within the economy that produced them. While my own project explores texts that have been discussed by other critics, notably Matthew Dimmock, I also differ from earlier discussions in significant ways. The politics of anxiety is a useful way of thinking about the ways in which not only anxieties related to the Ottomans are played out in these texts, but also how these anxieties enabled writers to manipulate them for their own purposes. In this sense, I pursue a similar aim to Dimmock: to identify the various topical uses to which the Turk could be put. However, I differ in both my approach and the texts I read, some of which Dimmock considers to represent a point of closure in both Anglo-Ottoman interaction and the development of the concepts of Turkishness, such as Richard Knolles’ *The Generall Historie of the Turkes* (1603).

Each of the following chapters is conceived as a discrete exploration and analysis of *imago Turci*. The first chapter of this project prepares some of the ground for much of what is to follow. Here I turn to English prose historiographies on the Turk and first explore the discourse of a Turkish threat which pervades many of the narratives that follow, before shifting my focus on Richard Knolles’ *Generall Historie of the Turkes* (1603). Hailed as the first English prose historiography on the Turk, this work has received comparatively little attention. In contrast to earlier available historical works on the Turks, Knolles’ large folio does not simply compile existing foreign sources, but he arranges and interprets them for his purposes. In so doing, he seeks to promote his main objective: to call upon all Christians to act in unison against the perceived threat of Ottoman invasion. Couched within a

providentialist framework, Knolles also pursues others interests, one of them being to present the history of the Ottoman Turks as accurately as possible. While the two positions — a call to Christendom to fight against the Turks and the urge to offer a factually correct history — are not mutually exclusive, Knolles' own prejudices against Spain, however, reveal his idea of an all-inclusive concept of Christendom to be illusory.

The second chapter explores the portrayal and uses of the Turk in England’s religious struggles both at home and within the larger context of Christendom. The discussion begins with a brief examination of two religious tracts published at the beginning of Mary's reign to exemplify the ways in which Protestants and Catholics referred to each other as Turks in order to mark their respective religious position. Following the discussion of these early texts, the chapter then turns to an early Elizabethan document which re-appropriates Catholic identification of Protestants as Turks: *The seditious and blasphemous Oration of Cardinal Pole* (1560). This is a belated Protestant answer to charges made by Cardinal Pole towards the Protestant creed in England in 1536. While it refers only marginally to the Turk it encapsulates one of the most pressing problems for Catholics and Protestants alike, the indelible association with Turkishness in the context of the Reformation. John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* (1571) continues this discussion. In the second edition of his church history Foxe incorporates a long digression outlining a history of the Turks which is followed by prophecies regarding their imminent demise. Through his association of the Turk with Antichrist, Foxe seeks to support his overall religious agenda of reformation. Advancing an argument for the need to reform the Protestant church in order to withstand the powers of Antichrist — both the Turk and the Pope — Foxe reads Turkish history through the lens of apocalyptic exegesis. In so doing, he allocates the Turk a central role in his larger defence of the Protestant Church. Finally, Meredith Hanmer's sermon, *The Baptizing of a Turke* (1586), merits attention for its unique exploitative rhetoric in the context of the conversion of a
Muslim to Protestantism. Hanmer’s sermon not only exemplifies the use of the Turk for a Protestant cause, but locates this association in a distinctly English Protestant context.

The third and the fourth chapters turn to actual encounters. While chapter three examines narratives of captives and those who ventured forth as merchants, pilgrims or simply as educational travellers to the Ottoman Empire, the fourth chapter focuses predominately on Richard Hakluyt’s vast collection of travel and mercantile texts, the *Principal Navigations* (1598-1600). The travel accounts examined here record the diverse experiences of Englishmen with apostates or ethnic Turks. While many of the travellers whose texts I discuss had previous knowledge of the Turk, some were simply taken by surprise, such as captives. Others, on the other hand, had prepared their journeys meticulously by consulting histories, earlier travel accounts or apodemic writings, the latter prescribing how to prepare for, or what to note during the journey. While the writers of these narratives accumulated first-hand knowledge about the Turk, these encounters inevitably questioned or confirmed prejudices. Depending on the kind of traveller, the implications were vast. Thomas Saunders’ *A true Discrision and breve Discourse of a most lamentable Voiage, made latelie to Tripolie in Barbarie* (1587) recalls his captivity under the Turks. Like most authors of these accounts, he also provides his English readers at home with an example of endurance and steadfastness in the Protestant faith, particularly in the face of conversion to Islam. Marked by its Englishness, the author uses the Turk economically to outline his own identity but never to consolidate it. This process is never the same and will be examined in the writings of later travellers such as Henry Timberlake and George Sandys. I will also examine the extent to which other motifs or agendas underlie these accounts and in what ways this is conveyed in the portrayal of the Turk.

The fourth chapter, too, is concerned with actual encounters, but examines them from the vantage point of their compiler and editor, Richard Hakluyt. I want to advance the argument that the Turk played a significant role in Hakluyt’s nationhood project, but also
presented him with some great difficulties. Such an undertaking is possible because Hakluyt accepts a paradox on which he stakes his claim to have outlined his nation’s achievements in the Mediterranean. This paradox is expressed by his qualification of Anglo-Ottoman commercial relations as ‘our new trade with Turkes and misbeleeuers’. Merchants played a key role as the new explorers in Hakluyt’s nationhood project. As such, trade with the Turks as the many edited documents, including the sultan’s trade permissions and other diplomatic correspondence testify were welcome to Hakluyt. However, he was also aware of the religious implications. This chapter reflects the politics of anxiety on a larger scale as Hakluyt attempts to accommodate both religious antagonism and national interests.

The final chapter is concerned with the Turk in romances. All the texts examined in the previous chapters recognise a plurality of literary forms through which early modern Englishmen and women engaged with ‘Turks’ and Islam. On the other hand, the representations of Muslims in romances only rarely – if at all, conform to those discussed so far; instead they derive their portrayals and vocabulary from an earlier, medieval tradition. Images of Muslims as idol-worshipping pagans or their associations with magic and sorcery were as frequent as the valiant Saracen in these earlier texts. These representations of Turks and Saracen are the result of literary works, such as the chanson de geste, which, in turn, had initially celebrated early crusading successes. After the decline and failure of these military ventures these portrayals survived in the romances that followed. As a result they continued to circulate in reprints of medieval texts, but also in English translations of Italian, French and Spanish novella and romances. English authors like Anthony Munday made use of these images in their own work. In the context of a Turkish threat these portrayals, or rather the narratives in which they occurred, could provide reassurance of what Christians failed to achieve in real encounters, such as the defeat of Muslims, or their conversion. These images seemingly encapsulate the ideal of the unitas Christiana. However, many of these images, I argue, were employed to question and evaluate culturally accepted norms.
This project, then, has a bifurcated focus in that it examines not only the *imago Turci* in selected English prose, but also places these portrayals in the context of wider English concerns and debates. These, as we have seen, were linked to European interests, which frequently echoed in the portrayal and use of the Turk. By considering this complex interplay one of the aims of this study is to balance an emerging Anglo-centrism against a European-wide concern with the Turk as a threat, a threat to which Christendom became increasingly alive since the fall of Constantinople in 1453. The *imago Turci* is a complex cultural construct which was renegotiated continuously in the shifting parameters of Elizabethan and early Jacobean culture. This project offers five different narratives which all converge in different ways at different times, but allow for different perspective through which to approach these cultural encounters with Turks and Islam. In some ways this project complements the work of Matthew Dimmock, but it also departs in its general thrust in opting for a generic approach over a chronological one. By stressing the different textual and cultural intersections at which English writers engaged with *imago Turci* this project offers a useful way of exploring early modern England’s exploration of Islam and Ottoman culture. The central argument of this study, then, is that the manifold uses of the *imago Turci* in these texts not only reflect the ways in which English texts reflected an interest in the Turks, but also how English interests were often marked by this use Turk and other conflicting interests both in Europe and at home.

---

43 For the purposes of this project I use the name Constantinople as opposed to Istanbul. While the Ottomans employed the name Istanbul following their conquest of Byzantine Constantinople in 1453, sixteenth and seventeenth century Western sources and commentators continued to refer to the city at the Bosphorus as Constantinople. My own use reflects this use by early modern writers, but I also acknowledge that it is, perhaps, not shared by others, such as the revisionist historian Daniel Goffman, *The Ottoman Empire*, p. 6 fn 9.
1. England and the Turkish threat - Richard Knolles' *The Generall Historie of the Turkes* (1603)

Hailed by Samuel Chew as 'the greatest English work of the Renaissance period dealing with Turkey', Richard Knolles' *Generall Historie of the Turkes* (1603) was the first English prose history of the Ottoman Turks. As the principal text of this chapter - and the first in this project to be discussed - Knolles' history is of particular significance. The *Historie* reflects the ardent interest taken in the Ottomans in England at the turn of the seventeenth century, but also represents the most complex historiographical expression of this interest in the English vernacular. One of a small number of historiographical accounts of the Ottomans published in England since the beginning of the sixteenth century, Knolles' work quickly became the standard account. Moreover, while earlier tracts on the Ottomans were predominantly translations of French, Italian or Latin narratives, Knolles arranged, collated, and assessed - and hence interpreted - his sources according to his 'simple judgement'. His text also reflects contemporary beliefs as to why the Ottoman Turks successfully deprived Christendom of both territory and 'infinit numbers of wofull Christians'. This chapter is concerned with two interrelated problems: firstly, it considers the complex relationship between, on the one hand, Knolles' conviction that the Ottoman Turks constituted a threat to all of Christendom, and, on

---

1 Chew, *Crescent and Rose*, p.111.
2 Richard Knolles, *The generall historie of the Turkes from the first beginning of that nation to the rising of the Othoman familie: with all the notable expeditions of the Christian princes against them. Together with the liues and conquests of the Othoman kings and emperours faithfullie collected out of the- best histories, both aunient and moderne, and digested into one continuat historie vntill this present yeare 1603* (London: Adam Islip, 1603), STC 15051, henceforth I refer to the 1603-edition as *Historie* unless stated otherwise.
4 Ibid. sig. A6f.
5 Ibid. sig. A4f.
the other, his desire to offer a representation of their history as factually accurate as possible. The second related problem concerns the significance of England’s strategic involvement with the Ottoman Empire during the second half of Elizabeth’s reign, and considers the implications this has for a reading of Knolles’ text.

Running to a stupendous 1200 folio pages in its first edition alone, the Historie is not easy to digest. The work is divided into three parts: the first 128 pages deal with ‘[t]he General Historie of the Tvrkes, before the Rising of the Othoman familie’ and early Christian successes during the early Crusades; the second and largest part encompasses ‘[t]he Lives of the Othoman Kings and Emperors’, running to page 1152; and finally, an un-paginated ‘brief discourse of the greatnesse of the Turkish Empire’ surveys the political system of the Ottoman state. Given the length of the work, those who have discussed the Historie have done so within necessarily tight limits, and a fully fledged investigation of this work is yet to be undertaken. The Historie had been an immediate bestseller, and saw another six editions by 1700, each duly updated by different writers after Knolles’ death in 1610. About the Historie’s author, however, little is known. Richard Knolles belonged to a family resident in Cold Ashby, Northamptonshire, and was probably born in the late 1540s. He matriculated at Lincoln College, Oxford, from which he graduated in 1564-4, proceeding MA in 1570. It was Sir Roger Manwood (1525-1592), Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer, who appointed

6 Christine Woodhead’s DNB entry maintains that the ‘brief discourse’ was only added to the 1610-edition of the Historie; However, while Knolles certainly extends the discourse in his second edition, the 1603-edition already includes this ‘brief discourse’.


8 DNB, Parry, Knolles, pp. 1-12; all subsequent biographical information on Knolles refer to these two sources.

Knolles as Master of the Free School at Sandwich, Kent, about 1572. After Sir Roger’s death, his son, Sir Peter Manwood, became Knolles’ patron and provided him with the documents necessary to compose the *Historie*. By Knolles’ own admission it was also Sir Peter who was ‘the first moouer of me to take this great Worke in hand’.\(^{10}\) Knolles remained at Sandwich for the rest of his life and produced two other major works: a translation of Jean Bodin’s *De Republica*, published as *The Six Bookes of a Commonweale* (1606), and an unpublished translation of Camden’s *Britannia*.

The narrative of ‘[t]he glorious Empire of the Turkes, the present terrour of the world’, as Knolles refers to the Ottomans, is an ambivalent text.\(^{11}\) A large, but handsome folio focusing for the better part on the political and military history of the Ottoman Turks, its ambivalence has become the pivot about which much of the critical commentary on the *Historie* revolves.\(^{12}\) For one critic, this text represents a point of closure in the formation of knowledge about the Ottoman Turks.\(^{13}\) For others, an oscillation between admiration and fear sets the characteristic tenor of the work, as Richmond Barbour’s discussion of the text shows.\(^{14}\) Barbour argues that ambivalent feelings about the Ottoman Empire – sentiments that reflect both the desire to emulate and fear – were inescapable. Carefully distinguishing the domestic constructions in Knolles’ *Historie* from that of ‘early modern Europe’s strategic and economic relations’ with the Ottomans, Barbour maintains that ‘the English were not so precise about constellations or locations of difference’.\(^{15}\) Yet, he also asserts that Knolles was sporadically indulging in a ‘nuanced vision of Asian and European peoples as emulous inhabitants’, but only to settle eventually on a ‘fundamental enmity between Islam and

\(^{10}\) Knolles, *Historie*, sig. A3r.
\(^{11}\) Ibid. sig. B1r.
\(^{12}\) See also Matar, *Islam in Britain*, pp. 11-12.
\(^{15}\) Ibid. p, 5, p. 15.
Christendom'. The latter statement collapses the distinctions he made before in favour of a Jacobean proto-orientalism. This ambivalence characterizes the Historie, which exhibits the domestic constructions of an inscrutable 'East' which it fails to contain either discursively or materially.

Barbour demonstrates one productive way of addressing this neglected and unwieldy prose historiography. His approach also indicates an attempt to accommodate the Historie’s ambivalences and tensions that the text offers to its readers. My own reading of Knolles does not seek to resolve these. I agree with Barbour that Knolles’ text reflects domestic investments in his portrayals of Ottoman Turks, which are indeed negative and overdetermined. Nonetheless, while I do not deny the possibilities of a proto-orientalism in Knolles’ text, I disagree with Barbour regarding the significance of precision he ascribes to Knolles in the latter’s approach to Ottoman history. To be sure, the Historie does not view the Ottomans through a prism of capitalist relations between Christians and Muslims; instead the book approaches their history from an ideologically dominant view that regarded the Ottomans above all as a threat. However, while Barbour rules out Knolles’ engagement with the strategic relations that did exist between Muslim rulers and Christian princes, he seems to have had predominately economic relations in mind. As we will see in the final section of this chapter, Knolles does engage with Anglo-Ottoman relations in at least one case explicitly.

The general argument I propose for this chapter is that Knolles’ Historie exemplifies, on the one hand, a culture’s capacity to assimilate ideological contradictions while, on the other, providing a sophisticated text that complicates, if not perhaps undermines, the ideological investments it sets out to promote, in this case by defying a uniformly negative portrayal of

---

16 Ibid. p. 17.
the Turks.\textsuperscript{17} For the second, more specific argument, some further explanation is required at this stage.

The primary aim of Christian historians of the Ottomans, Carl Göllner observes, was to document the war against the Turks.\textsuperscript{18} Knolles' \textit{Historie} clearly advocates this agenda when he encourages Christians to 'joyne their common forces against the common enemie'.\textsuperscript{19} However, England's past involvement with the Ottoman Empire, especially during the reign of Elizabeth, contrasts starkly with the conflict-driven outlook of Knolles. While some Englishmen had joined Christian forces against the Turks,\textsuperscript{20} Elizabethan England officially never engaged in warfare with the Ottomans. Furthermore, its geographical distance made it an unlikely object of interest for Ottoman expansionism. As Fynes Moryson noted in the late 1590s, the Turkish Emperor had expressed amazement when he beheld England and its considerable distance from his Empire and had wondered 'that the king of Spain did not dig it with mattocks, and cast it into the sea'.\textsuperscript{21} Geographical considerations aside, from the early 1580s onwards England had enjoyed first mercantile, and then diplomatic relations with the Porte.\textsuperscript{22} Trade, or rather its disruption by pirates, was the reason why James I launched the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[17] Knolles' contemporary, the Arabist William Bedwell, reflects similar investments. Bedwell considered Arabic primarily as a means by which the study of subjects such as arithmetic and scriptural exegesis could be facilitated. His attitude towards Islam, however, was hostile, a fact that did not compromise his admiration for the language; Alastair Hamilton, \textit{William Bedwell, the Arabist, 1563-1632} (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985).
\item[19] Knolles, \textit{Historie}, sig. A4'.
\item[20] Sir Robert Sydney recommends a Mr. Cox, who desires to serve Essex, because the former 'comes now from the Emperor's army in Hungary, of which he can speak very particularly, for he was a good time in it, and saw the overthrow of the Turks and the taking of Strigonin' (HMC Hatfield, 5 Nov. 1598).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
only English military attack on Muslim territory in 1621. Despite James’ desire for peace with Christian sovereigns and vague talks ‘to unite for the destruction of their common foe’, England never sent a crusading army to the Ottomans, and vice versa.

Knolles is not concerned with amiable Anglo-Ottoman relations; instead, he deplores the discordant state of the Christian commonweal in its religio-military confrontations with the Ottoman Turks. His hostile rhetoric is rooted in a humanist tradition which represented the Ottomans as a perennial threat to Christendom. At the heart of this humanist agenda is the idea of a ‘common corps of Christendom’ – the solidarity of Christian Europe as against the Turks, which, according to Franklin Baumer retained its currency throughout the sixteenth century. It is thus not surprising that Knolles invites his English readers to see themselves, above all, as Christians, not as Protestants or Catholics. Notably, Knolles downplays the religious schisms that had led to the break-up of the universal Catholic Church following the Reformation. The contrast between England’s realpolitik and Knolles’ rhetoric could not have been greater.

There is no reason to assume that Knolles believed the Turkish threat to be insignificant to Christendom, and, for that matter, to England. At this point it is useful to define what I understand by the concept of a Turkish threat: it is the discourse that postulated an Ottoman threat to all of Christendom. Its articulation is not limited to prose historiographies, of course, but pervades virtually all areas in which Christian-Muslim encounters are rehearsed. However, as subsequent chapters will show, responses to this threat varied and allowed writers to manipulate the use of this threat for their own purposes. Knolles is no exception. For example, as Richmond Barbour notes, in Knolles’ list of Christian allies against the

---

23 Matar, Turks, Moors, and Englishmen, pp. 150-51.
26 See Knolles’ address to the ‘Christian Reader’ in Knolles, Historie, sig. A4v.
Ottoman Turks, including the ‘Bishops of Rome’, it is Spain that is ‘conspicuously’ absent.\(^{27}\) Barbour does not offer an explanation for this. However, given England’s uncertain position in Christendom at the time, it is reasonable to ask to what extent Knolles’ *Historie* actually promotes an all-encompassing concept of Christendom. As I will argue, the omission of Spain points to an exclusionary notion of Christendom in Knolles’ text.

Before I consider Knolles’ text proper, the first section of this chapter turns to the inception of the Turkish threat in order to exhibit some of the motifs humanists employed to articulate the danger they associated with the Ottoman Turks. The Turkish threat was not simply a commonplace that conveyed a range of anxieties; it performed a crucially productive role within Western Christendom. It could serve as a communication process which enabled writers, especially humanists, to link those who were geographically distant from the actual threat to the wider Christian community. The second subsection turns to Knolles’ work in greater detail and explores the ways, and the extent to which the threat is manifest in Knolles’ historiography. The purpose here is to explore in greater detail images of the Ottomans in Knolles, and to reveal the complexity and sophistication of Knolles’ historiography that allows for a multifaceted portrayal of the Ottomans. The final section shifts the focus onto two events that were significant to both the Ottoman Empire and Christendom at large: the battle of Lepanto (1571) and the Spanish Armada against England (1588). Significantly, the first event is marked by England’s absence, but represents Spanish success over the Turks. While the Armada is not immediately associated with Ottoman history, Knolles nonetheless comments on this event in the context of the Christian-Ottoman conflict. As a result, he complicates our understanding of the ways in which the opposition between Christendom and the Muslim world was imagined.

\(^{27}\) Barbour, *Before Orientalism*, p. 36.
1.1 The Turkish threat and English prose historiography

'[A] forreine enemie is a reconciler of bretheren', Edwin Sandys (1561–1629) noted in his *Europae Speculum* (1605).\(^{28}\) Assessing Christendom's capacity to act united against the Ottoman Turks, he maintains that it is the 'common daunger [that] holdes them together', which only lasts as long as the threat remains, 'which else should flie asunder vppon everie light occasion'.\(^{29}\) With its universal pretensions, Christendom was a concept invoked with ease by Christian rulers and popes alike in the rhetoric of crusade. But, as the title of Sandys' tract indicates, Christendom coincided, and was increasingly rivalled by, the idea of Europe with its emerging connotations of national sovereignty, and cultural and political diversity as opposed to a homogenous concept of a united Christian community.\(^{30}\) While I am not concerned here with the emergence of the concept of Europe, its presence in this context reminds us that Christendom was by no means a monolithic idea that ruled the minds and conduct of all rulers. It is in the confrontation with the Turkish threat, both in its rhetorical and actual form, that Christendom's fractures and inconsistencies can be glimpsed. In this section I will explore briefly the concept of a Turkish threat and its constituent elements before turning to Knolles' *Historie*. The purpose of this survey is to provide a contextual framework and a sense of the underlying dynamics of the humanist tradition which informs Knolles' and other texts that deal with the Ottoman Turks.

The Ottoman threat to Christendom was perceived as real. However, as the work of scholars such as Dieter Mertens, James Hankins, Michael Heath, and, more recently, Nancy Bisaha has demonstrated, the impulse for the formation and subsequent spread of a discourse
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\(^{28}\) Edwin Sandys, *Europae Speculum A relation of the state of religion* (London: Simon Waterson, 1605), STC 1781.01, sig. VI'.

\(^{29}\) Ibid.

\(^{30}\) Melvin E. Yapp, 'Europe in the Turkish Mirror', *P&P*, 137 (1992), 134-155.
of the Turkish threat initially rested on the humanists' engagement with the Ottomans. Following the fall of Constantinople and a time of 'moral bankruptcy for the crusading ideal', humanists began to supplant the clergy in their role of promoting crusade. Like the clergy before, the humanists, too, failed in their endeavour to achieve unity among Christians. The beginning of the threat's articulation coincided with - or, as Almuth Höfert argues, emerged as a result of - the fall of Constantinople in 1453. With its capture, Christianity not only lost a strategically important outpost, but the Ottoman Empire finally asserted its growing influence on the politics of Western Christendom. Another consequence of the city's fall was the immediate need to adjust to the Ottoman threat. Marking the end of the Byzantine Empire, the loss of the city was read by Christian exegetes as the end of the third of the four world empires, with only Rome remaining. In the context of salvation history, this event signified the beginning of the end, and many Christians now anticipated the arrival of Antichrist - a reading which, as we will see in the next chapter, was exploited in the exegesis of John Foxe. Furthermore, humanists such as Flavio Biondo and Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, lamented the loss of Constantinople's classical past and heritage, the looting of its learning


32 Hankins, 'Renaissance Crusaders', 114.

33 For a comprehensive overview, see Höfert, Feind, pp. 51-87.

34 There are a number of narratives on the conquest of Constantinople; for a Christian perspective Steven Runciman, The Fall of Constantinople, 1453 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965); Erich Meuthen, 'Der Fall von Konstantinopel und der lateinische Westen', Historische Zeitschrift, 237 (1983), 1-35; see also Caroline Finkel, Osman's Dream: The Story of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1923 (London: John Murray, 2006), pp. 48-59.
and wealth, and the alleged burning of books.\textsuperscript{35} ‘The new barbarian’, as Nancy Bisaha claims, preoccupied the writings of humanists at a time when the Turks were considered both a security risk and a threat to culture.\textsuperscript{36}

According to Almut Höfert, all these factors – the conquest of a strategically important Christian city, its status in salvation history, the fall’s place in humanist-thinking – were significant in the articulation of the Turkish threat, while its perpetuation was largely assured by the printing press.\textsuperscript{37} Notably, one of the oldest printed books still extant is a short tract on the Turkish menace called, \textit{Eyn manung der Christenheit wider die durken} (A warning to Christendom against the Turks) (1454).\textsuperscript{38} Alongside publications related to Ottoman incursions, humanists and clergy alike continued their calls to crusade. As Dieter Mertens demonstrates, their rhetoric of crusade was realigned to fit the motif of warfare against the Ottoman Turks, with the aim of joining all Christians in a common cause against the enemy.\textsuperscript{39} The crusading ideal now placed Constantinople, not Jerusalem, at its heart.\textsuperscript{40} Furthermore, the Turkish threat was linked to the idea of a \textit{unitas Christiana} as opposed to the \textit{respublica Christiana}, an ideal which had to be embraced by the whole of Christendom, including those that were geographically distant. It was Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini who cautioned those who considered themselves safe from incursions of the Ottoman Turks and admonished them to show solidarity. Specifically, he referred to ‘Hispani et Galli neque Theutones qui Rhenum

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{Bisaha2} Bisaha, \textit{East and West}, p. 64.
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\bibitem{Setton} Setton, \textit{The Papacy and the Levant}, II, p. 142.
\end{thebibliography}
accolunt neque Anglici oceano circumfuse'. Although geographically remote from the actual Turkish threat, England is linked by Piccolomini to the common corps of Christendom, and the obligation to defend it.

England was alert to these Ottoman incursions, as the printed indulgences indicate that were issued to ‘raise money to fight the Turks’ in the late fifteenth century. Ottoman success in conquering Christian territory – Athens (1460), Bosnia (1463), Negroponte (1470), Otranto (1480), and Mohács (1526) – had left its mark, and simultaneously reflected the inability of Christians to act united. Nonetheless, calls to Christian unity, and the duty to act in unison against the Ottoman Turks, were invoked with undiminished fervour. In 1525, Henry VIII, for instance, had proposed to turn against the Ottoman Turks, and again in 1530 he admitted that concerted efforts against the ‘common enemie’ were required. The problem at the heart of Christian failure to act in unison was forcefully argued by Erasmus. Composed at the eve of the Diet of Augsburg in 1530, Erasmus’ *Utilissima consultation de bello Turcis* needs to be read against the backdrop of Suleiman’s recent but failed siege of Vienna in 1529, the current debate on Christian defence in the light of the rise of Protestantism, and Luther’s claim that to fight the Turks is to violate the will of God. The Turkish threat, Erasmus argues, concerns all Christian nations, not only those directly exposed to Ottoman invasion. Echoing Piccolomini, Erasmus maintains that, ‘the whole body of Christendom should be moved by Christian sympathy to grieve for each of its members in distress’; moreover, Christians should ‘give assistance to our brother nations in their time of distress’ (316). His call to solidarity

---

42 *Indulgences issued to raise money to fight the Turks or to ransom captives* (Westminster: Caxton, 1480), STC 14077c.110; Christopher Tyerman, *England and the Crusades, 1095-1588* (London and Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1988), pp. 302-70.
succinctly illustrates the significance of the Turkish threat as a means by which co-operation was not only invoked, but regarded as a Christian duty. In this sense, the Turkish threat can be read as a communication process to which all Christians were expected to be alert, and through which they were linked, irrespective of their geographic location, to the *corpus christianum*.\(^{45}\)

But Erasmus also recognised another, internal threat to Christendom: Christian Turkishness.\(^{46}\) For him, this is the true obstacle to Christian unity, and, according to Michael Heath, the real subject matter of the *De bello Turcico*.\(^{47}\) Lamenting the repeated defeats and losses of Christian territory suffered at the hands of ‘this race of barbarians’,\(^{48}\) Erasmus identifies the causes for this decay in Christian sin, the ‘loathsome “Turkish” vices – avarice, ambition, power-lust, self-satisfaction’\(^{49}\) – and the ‘mercenary outlook’ of Christian soldiers.\(^{50}\) ‘We have relied upon our own strength for victory’, he maintains, ‘and have forgotten that the battle is fought in the name of Christ, and conducted ourselves like Turks against the Turks’.\(^{51}\) At the heart of this argument lies Erasmus’ *philosophia Christi* – the teachings of Christ – as the formative ideal for Christians and, ultimately, Christianity itself. As Quentin Skinner puts it, for Erasmus the true Christian is he ‘who has embraced Christ in
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\(^{45}\) Winfried Schulze also conceives of the Turkish threat as a communication process. His study, however, explores this threat in the context of the Reich’s internal, institutional responses to the Turks; *Reich und Türckengefahr in späten 16. Jahrhundert* (München: C.H. Beck, 1977).


\(^{48}\) Erasmus, *De Bello Turcico*, p. 315.

\(^{49}\) Ibid. p. 324.

\(^{50}\) Ibid. p. 327.

\(^{51}\) Ibid. p. 316.
the innermost feelings of his heart, and who emulates him by his pious deeds'. However, for Erasmus, Christians are not ready to fight the Ottoman Turks unless they have purged themselves of their sins. Erasmus here utilizes the Turkish threat by turning it inwards to illustrate both his vision of an ideal Christian way of life, and that of his ideal Christian commonweal. War against the Turk becomes a secondary motive which he neither condones, nor, given the immediacy of recent Ottoman incursions, entirely rejects.

In sum, Erasmus' meditation on war with the Ottoman Turks reflects and illustrates humanist investments in the Turkish threat. While he conceives of the threat as a communication process through which Christians should respond to its 'members in distress', he is primarily concerned with the promotion of Christian ideals, rather than the advancement of war. His identification of 'Turkish' behaviour in Christians, their avarice and sinful lives, are recurring features found in a range of texts, such as, for instance, sermons and prose historiographies. In particular, the emphasis on Christian sin, interpreted in a providentialist context, casts the Ottoman Turks as the scourge of God to punish Christians for their transgressions. By directing the Turkish threat inwards, Erasmus is able to endorse his ideal of a Christian commonweal. Here then, the Turkish threat serves a new purpose which differs significantly from that of the humanists' original agenda of acting in unison in order to wage war against the Ottomans. The utility of the Turkish threat as a means to reinforce particular interests was, as we will see throughout this project, recognised and employed by many Christian writers.

If Erasmus' response to the siege of Vienna in 1529 was one of defiance towards war with the Ottoman Turks, other writers sought to promote military advances. The Italian historian Paolo Giovio (1483–1552) composed his Commentario de le cose de' Turci (1531)

as a result of the siege, and dedicated it to Charles V. The work was to contribute to the
Emperor's attempts to lead a successful crusade against Suleiman by documenting the war
with the Ottoman Turks.54 Giovio's text was well received by his contemporaries, and his
portrayal of the Turks, especially of their prowess in battle, praised.55 For some readers it was
so detailed and vivid that they commented facetiously that Giovio's 'propaganda might
almost win Europe for the Turk'.56 The short text was extremely popular and saw a number of
reprints in Italy followed by translations into French, German, Polish, Latin and English.57
Translated by Peter Ashton as A shorhte tratement uppon the Turkes chronicles in 1546, the work
still referred to the original dedicatee, Charles V, on its title page. But by the time of its
publication, the composition's original impulse – to support Charles against the Ottoman
Turks – had already vanished.58

Nonetheless, the publication of Giovio's tract in England illustrates the perpetuation of
the Turkish threat in England, and indicates an abiding interest in the Empire's continuing
expansion. Following the siege of 1529, Ottoman incursions recurred regularly, culminating
in the annexation of Hungary in 1541.59 This much is suggested in Ashton's preface, in which
he draws his readers' attention to 'the great slawghter & bloodshed of the christiens, [and] the
extreme tyrannye & cruelty of the Turkes'.60 Nor does Ashton hesitate to hijack Erasmus'
authority to promote war when he writes '[t]ruly (as Erasmus writeth verye well and godly)
we owght all that professe christen and bear the name of christiens, to consider it [Christians'

54 T.C. Zimmermann, Paolo Giovio The Historian and the Crisis of Sixteenth-Century Italy
55 Knolles, Historie, sig. A3', A6'.
56 Zimmermann, Paolo Giovio, p. 123.
58 Paolo Giovio, A shorhte tratement uppon the Turkes chronicles, trans. by Peter Ashton (London:
Edward Whitchurch, 1546), STC 11899.
59 Vaughan, Europe, p. 127.
60 Giovio, A shorhte tratement, sigs. *4'-*5'.
fate under the Turks], and take in hand also to revenge it'.61 Once again, the Turkish threat is turned inwards – although, unlike in the case of Erasmus, not for the betterment of a Christian commonweal per se, but to promote war. By the time Knolles composed his text, invocations like Ashton’s had become largely formulaic.

By contrast, it is often easy to forget that, despite the Turkish threat, Christian leaders cooperated with the Porte. The French king Francis I strategically allied with the Ottomans as a counterpoise to Charles V’s hegemony in Western Christendom, an alliance that became manifest in trade capitulations for France in 1536 as well as Franco-Ottoman naval attacks against Habsburg dominions.62 The Porte’s close involvement with France was not an exception. Venice and the Ottomans had fostered commercial relations with each other for a long time, but it was England that broke up French-Venetian hegemony in these markets with the establishment of the Levant Company, and the appointment of an English ambassador at the Porte during the reign of Elizabeth.63 Knolles’ Historie does not engage with England’s commercial relations, and it is only in passing that he notes elsewhere in his Historie that ‘marchandise’ is in the hands of ‘the Iewes, or the Christians of Evrope, viz, the Ragusians, Venetians, Genowais, French, or English’.64 Above all, he is concerned with Ottoman expansionism and success at the expense of Christendom.

In his dedication to James I, Knolles expresses his hope that the new monarch will find ‘no lesse grace and fauour’ with this history than those to whom earlier ones had been dedicated.65 The two historical works he lists are ‘Pau. Iouius, de Rebus Turcicis’, and ‘Coelius Secundus, de Bello Melitensi’, which were dedicated to Charles V and Elizabeth I

61 Ibid. sig. *5r.
64 Knolles, Historie, sig. 5F2r.
65 Ibid. sig. A3r.
respectively. In so doing, Knolles envisages a similar role for James as Giovio had for Charles, as the singular prince who 'with the rest of the Christian princes, sitting at the helme of your Estates', should 'gieue remedie' unto the Ottoman Turks. In the case of Elizabeth matters are more complex. The reference to Curione's text on the siege of Malta serves the purpose of continuity, since the dedication is more an encomium on Elizabeth than a call to arms against the Ottomans. This subtle detail merits attention for another reason: none of the English translations of continental histories of the Turks printed during Elizabeth's reign were dedicated to her. Curione's short treatise circulated on the continent and in translation in Ralph Carr's *The Mahumetane or Turkish historie* (1600); it also served Knolles as one the


67 Knolles, *Historie*, sig. A3r.

68 According to Markus Kutter, Celio Secondo Curione, an Italian Protestant who held the chair of rhetoric at the university of Basel, did not write the account of the siege of Malta, but translated it from Hieronymus Comes Alexandrinus' *Commentarii Hieronymi Comitis Alexandrini de acerrimo, ac omnium difficillimo Turcarum bello, in Insulam Melitam gesto, Anno M.D.LXV* (Nürnberg, n. pub., 1566). Curione mentions Elizabeth favourably in some of his other texts in his efforts to glorify her throughout Christendom as Protestant ruler, see Kutter, p. 247. The dedication reads: 'Ad Divam Elisabetam / Angliae Reginam / C. S. cvrionis Epigramma. / Diua potens, orbis Moderatrix alma Britanni, / Pace colis populos, quae pietate Deum: / Quae ingenio atq; animis, / celso splendoreq; / uincis Zenobiam, & si quae clarior ante fuit: / Qui tibi diuinam mittebam scripta puellae, / lam saeui mitto nobile Martis opus. / Dulcibus illa modis si flectere docta nequuit / Nunc forsah Phrygio flexerit iste sono. / Nec tamen absurdum est, bello donare puellam: / Ipsa etenim Pallas maxima gerit. / Netu igitur nostrum quaesio, ne despice munus, / Qui colimus nomen Regia Virgo tuum: / Exiguum, fateor: sedsi modo suscipis, isto / Felici & mango Numine, maius erit', in Caelii Augustini Curione, *Cvrionis Sarracenicae historiae libri tres, ab autore innumeris locis emendati atque expoliti. In Qvibvs Sarracenorum, Turcarum, aliarum, gentium origins & res per annos septingentos gestae continentur / His accessere Volfgangi Drechsleri erundem rerum Chronicon, fiue breuiarium. / Item. Cael. Avgvst. Cvrionis Marochensis regni in Mauritania nobilismi a Sarracensis conditi, description, nunquam antea edita. / Caelii Secvndi Cvrionis de bello Melitensia à Turcis gesto,historia nova* (Basle: Oporin, 1568), sig. B8r; copy consulted Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Sig. Um 180.
sources for his own account of the siege of Malta. However, while Knolles did not publish the dedication to Elizabeth, by drawing his readers’ attention to Curione’s, he can project a trajectory of continuity in which Elizabeth could be cast in the same role he had in mind for James, irrespective of their vastly differing policies towards the Ottoman Turks.

This sense of urgency, indicated in the dedication, is fully revealed in the first half of the preface to the reader. Following a lengthy lamentation about the ‘the long and still declining state of the Christian Commonweale’, Knolles lists the causes for Ottoman success: first and foremost, ‘the just and secret judgement of the Almighty’. Within this providentialist framework Knolles interprets the Ottomans as God’s scourge who punish Christians ‘for their sinnes’, while others ‘no lesse sinfull than they’ are spared, ‘calling them vnto repentance’. Another, perhaps more mundane cause is the idea of ‘the uncertainetie of worldly things’. More importantly, however – and Knolles is careful not to offend – he identifies ‘the small care the Christian princes, especially those that dwelt further off have had of the common state of the Christian Commonweale’, even though ‘the verie greatest are to account themselues but as the principall members of one and the same bodie’. While echoing Erasmus here, Knolles also reflects on Christendom’s fragmented ideological state. He ascribes the lack of mutual Christian support against the Ottomans to ‘the small care’ of Christian princes who are preoccupied with ‘questions of religion [and] matters touching their owne proper state and soueraignetie’. Knolles cautions his readers not to forget their
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69 Ralph Carr, *The Mahumetane or Turkish historie containing three bookes* (London: Thomas Este, 1600), STC 17997, sigs N4r-2D4v; Knolles, *Historie*, sigs 3Y1r-4A2v; Carr retains Curione’s original preface which discusses the usefulness of history as a teacher and storehouse of examples.
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Christian duty and advocates, above all, a call to arms against the Ottomans over Christian factionalism.

Alongside reasons ‘not depending of the improuident carelesnesse, weaknesse, discord, or imperfections of others’, Knolles relates Ottoman success to causes ‘more proper vnto themselues’:

[their] ardent and infinit desire of soueraignetie ... [the] rare vnitie and agreement amongst them, as well in the manner of their religion... as in matters concerning their state ... as that thereof they call themselues Islami, ..., men of one mind ... their notable vigilance in taking the advantage of every occasion for the enlarging of their Monarchie, their frugalitie and temperatnessse ... their straight observing of their auntient militarie discipline, their cheerful and almost incredible obedience vnto their princes and Sultans

Knolles recognises that the principal strength of the Ottoman Turks consists in their ideological cohesion. Their unity is assured by what he regards as ‘the two strongest sinews of every well gouerned commonweale, reward propounded to the good, and Punishment threatened vnto the offender’. More importantly, the system he describes is egalitarian, and allows ‘every common person, be he neuer so meanely borne, to aspire vnto the greatest honours and preferments both of the Court and the field, yea euen vnto the nearest affinitie of the great sultan himselfe, if his valour or other worth shall so deserue’. The Flemish ambassador Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq once remarked on this system which values personal merit above everything else that it reminded him of ‘the fickleness and uncertainty of what men usually call nobility of birth’. Indeed, for many Christians such a system offered

75 Ibid. sig. A5v.
76 Ibid. sig. A5r.
77 Ibid. sig. A5v.
opportunities from which they were excluded by birth in their native countries; and it is perhaps less surprising that many decided to 'turn Turk'.

However, Knolles' stance on this system is ambivalent, and he is quick to find faults elsewhere. If reward and punishment are a 'commendable and lawfull meanes' — presumably, because they could also be transferred to a Christian army without great difficulty — they are considered 'meere tyrannicall' when discussed in the context of 'Othoman gouernment'. The distinction is purely ideological; Knolles can show admiration for a system that can breed effective soldiers, but not for a system that, by the same token, produces a government in which everyone can potentially rise into society’s higher echelons through merit alone, 'yea euen vnto the nearest affinitie of the great Sultan himselfe'. The absence of an aristocracy disturbs Knolles, and he perceives of the Ottoman government as one of 'master ouer slaue ... for the great Sultan is so absolute a lord of all things within the compass of his empire, that all his subjects and people be they neuer so great, doe call themselues his slaues and not his subjects'. But it was precisely this system that produced the sultan’s elite force Knolles admired most: the 'Ianizaries'.

This last example illustrates the contradictions and anxieties that pervade much of Knolles' Historie. Admiration for Ottoman military might does not preclude condemnation if it serves Knolles' overall agenda. The responses to the Turkish threat are evident in both the nomination of James I as the new champion of Christendom and Knolles' general call to arms, linking England to the common cause. Despite these ambivalent and usually hostile attitudes that seem to inform the general character of the Historie, the text is more than a mere accumulation of stereotypes or topoi of fear and merits further attention for its sheer complexity alone. One of the major points to emerge from the next section of this chapter is
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that notwithstanding this hostile outlook, Knolles is equally persistent in portraying Ottoman history as accurately as possible.

1.2 ‘The very truth of the Historie’

When Knolles’ Historie left Adam Islip’s printing press for sale in London, it faced stiff competition from other historical works on the Ottomans. Among the most recent competitors were Giovanni Tommaso Minadoi’s The history of the warres betweene the Turkes and the Persians (1595), the anonymous ethnographic compendium The policy of the Turkish empire (1597), Ralph Carr’s Mahumetane or Turkish historie (1600), and – published in the same year as the Historie – Lazzaro Soranzo’s The Ottoman (1603).\(^3\) The topicality of the Ottomans in England was not just a matter of the perceived threat that they posed. Interest in things Turkish also found expression in the consumption of exotic goods imported through the newly established Levant Company (1581). Since the first signed trade agreements between England and the Porte in 1579, valuable, exotic commodities from the Levant became available in greater frequency, and were sold to well-to-do households and the court, among them: ‘all sortes of Spices, Rawe Silke, Appoticarie drugs, India blewe, and Cotton Wool, … Galles, Currants, Sweete Oyle, Sope, Quiltes, Carpete and divers other commodities’.\(^4\) In fashion, too, interest in the Ottomans was evident, as William Harrison’s

\(^3\) Giovanni Tommaso Minadoi, The history of the warres betweene the Turkes and the Persians, trans. by Abraham Hartwell (London: John Woolf, 1595), STC 17943; The policy of the Turkish empire (London: John Windet, 1597), STC 24335; Lazzaro Soranzo, The Ottoman of Lazaro Soranzo, trans. by Abraham Hartwell (London: John Windet, 1603), STC 399.05.

\(^4\) Cited in Re-Orienting the Renaissance: Cultural Exchanges with the East, ed. by Gerald MacLean (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2005), p. 10.
remark on his contemporaries’ ever-changing tastes signals when he says that ‘by and by the Turkish manner is generally best liked of’.  

Despite the reflection of this interest in fashion and material goods, the continuing conflicts between the Ottoman Empire and Christendom, especially the Ottoman-Hungarian war (1593-1606), and the Porte’s ongoing conflict with Persia received considerable attention. On 13 September 1602, the German traveller Philip Julius, Duke of Stettin-Pomerania noted in his diary that ‘a play was acted showing how Stuhl-Weissenburg was gained by the Turks, and then won again by the Christians’. 86 Stuhlweissenburg’s recovery by the Germans in 1601 was a success for Christians in the ongoing Ottoman-Hungarian struggle. 87 The staging of this event in London is noteworthy for both the speed with which news was translated into a play (which is now lost), and the staging’s significance as an index of English interest in this conflict. It is perhaps not too far-fetched to suggest that Knolles also sought to profit from the interest in these recent events when he had his Historie entered at the Stationer’s Register on 85. Decembris 1602’. 88 An expensive folio with elaborate engravings dedicated to the subject would find a ready market in this context. Knolles’ historical work, however, became not only popular for its information on the Ottomans alone. The text was later mined by playwrights and travel writers: the latter consulted it for details to inform or embellish their own

87 Ibid. p. 7.
88 ‘Entred for his copie vnder the handes of my Lord grace of Canterbury and ye wardens A booke called the generall history of the Turkes before the rysinge of ye Ottoman familie, with all the notable expedicions of ye christian prynces against yem together with the lynes of the Ottoman kynges and Emperours Wrytten by Richard Knoles’, *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640 A.D.*, ed. by Edward Arber, 5 vols (London: Privately printed, 1875), III, p. 90.
Moreover, the book was also read for recreational purposes. Lady Anne Clifford (1590-1676), countess of Dorset, Pembroke and Montgomery, in a diary entry from 1619, notes that she consulted 'the Turkish History' alongside works by Chaucer, Spenser, and Montaigne. The detailed Historie, written in a style that would be commended by Samuel Johnson, became finally available in print in September 1603.

A commercial commodity itself, the Historie was unlike any other texts on the subject circulating in England at the time: it was not simply a translation of a foreign source. A brief glance at the 'Avthor's Induction’ reveals both the variety and great number of authors Knolles consulted in compiling his text: these include both Eastern and Western writers, for instance, the Byzantine historian 'Laonicus Chalcocondilas', and the German 'Ioannes Leunclauius', but also works of reference such as the cosmography by 'Sebastianus Monsterus', or authors of accounts of more recent events like ‘Thomas Minadoi’, and, finally, the ‘Alcoranum Turcicum’, the Qur’an. It is due to the scholarship of Vernon Parry that many of Knolles' sources have been identified. While an extensive discussion of the material available to Knolles is beyond the limits of this chapter, or, indeed, this project, my discussion of Knolles' use of them remains largely indebted to Parry's findings. The question of how Knolles obtained the documents for his Historie in a provincial town like Sandwich has also been addressed by Parry. In the absence of any substantial evidence, however, Parry's answer remains tentative. He suggests that Sir Peter Manwood, Knolles' patron and, by Knolles' own admission, 'a louer and great fauorer of learning' provided Knolles with

89 See Chapter 3.
90 Suzanne W. Hull, Chaste, Silent and Obedient, English Books for Women 1475-1640 (San Marino: Huntington Library, 1982), pp. 73, 226. It is not entirely clear whether the reference refers to Knolles' Historie or George Sandys' A Relation of a Journey begun (1615), although in her diary Clifford refers to Sandys under a different title; see further Ros Ballaster, Fabulous Orients, Fictions of the East in England, 1662-1785 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
91 DNB, Knolles gives this date in the 'Avthors induction’, sig. A6'.
92 Ibid. sig. A6'.
93 Parry, Knolles, pp. 92-145.
access to the sources. Manwood's connections with various English scholars, but in particular his association with the Society of Antiquaries, Parry argues, would have enabled Knolles to consult and borrow these texts. Parry's enquiry into the textual transactions and connections within the Society of Antiquaries indicates the extent to which continental material on the Ottomans either in Latin, French, Italian or German circulated in England. This is important, because, with the notable exception of Linda McJannet, current scholarly debates on representations of the Ottomans in England have largely neglected these texts, and have primarily examined material in English. Thus, another of Knolles' merits in writing the Historie was to have made widely available materials that had formerly remained within a circle of a select few, who owned the materials and spoke or read the languages.

As mentioned before, Knolles did not simply translate or compile his sources: he interpreted them. Fortunately for us, in his preface he discusses the methodology with which he approaches the material available to him. Composing the Historie, he explains, was not only a Herculean task, but a novelty, because, he points out, he had no 'sure guide or loadstarre' to follow 'in the course of this so great an Historie'. Given the great number and diversity of documents at his disposal, he needed to prioritise, and, as he says, 'according to my simple judgement' choose from what 'was most probable, still supplying with the perfections of the better, what I found wanting or defectiue in the weaker' always aiming at

94 Knolles, History, sig. A6'. Indeed, a licence to travel was granted to Sir Peter Manwood of Hackington, Kent, to travel abroad 'for his increase in good knowledge and learning', with a clause to go and return at pleasure to travel abroad (undated, 1595, CSPD, 1595-97, p. 148).
95 As the only substantial piece of textual evidence, Parry quotes a letter from Knolles to Sir Robert Cotton in which he requests Cotton's help for 'the continuation of the Turkish historie', that is, the second edition published in 1610. Parry, Knolles, p. 32.
96 Linda McJannet, "History written by the enemy": Eastern Sources About the Ottomans on the Continent and in England', ELR, 36.3 (2006), 396-429; I am grateful to Prof. McJannet for sending me her article prior to publication. Unfortunately, her recent monograph appeared too late before completion of this thesis for consultation; The Sultan Speaks: Dialogue in English Plays and Histories About the Ottoman Turks (New York; London: Palgrave, 2006); see also Burton, Turning and Traffique.
97 Knolles, Historie, sig. A5'.
‘the very truth of the Historie’. He strongly emphasises that he attempted, wherever possible, to draw his material ‘out of the writings of such as were themselues present and as it were eye-witnesses of the greatest part of that they writ’, because of all other texts available theirs are ‘most like also to haue left vnto vs the very truth’. If such texts were not available, he gathered so much ‘out of the works of such, as being themselues men of great place, and well acquainted with the great and worthie personages of their time’. Here, the name of Johann Lewenklaw, or ‘Ioannes Leunclauius’ (1541-1594) is of significance, because his translations provided Knolles with Turkish source material for his Historie.

Lewenklaw was a distinguished scholar in Byzantine and Turkish studies. He had visited Constantinople as a member of the Imperial Legacy in 1584-85, where he gathered material from a variety of sources which he subsequently published in translation on his return. While I am not concerned here with the precise nature of Lewenklaw’s sources, it is worth noting the two relevant texts Knolles consulted for his Historie: the Annales Sultanorum Othmandarium a Turcis sua lingua scripti (1588) and the Historiae Musulmanae Turcorum (1591). Both texts circulated widely on the continent and were reprinted and translated into German. Knolles approaches his Turkish sources with scepticism, and expresses his disappointment about their usefulness as a guide through Ottoman history:

yea the Turkish Histories and Chronicles themselues (from whom the greatest light for the continuation of the Historie was in reason to haue beene expected) being in the declaration of their own affaires (according to their barbarous manner) so sparing and short, as that they may of right be accounted rather short
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100 Pál Ács, ‘Tarjumans Mahmud and Murad, Austrian and Hungarian Renegades as Sultan’s Interpreters’, in Europa und die Türken, pp. 307-16; Ács (p. 313) explains how Lewenklaw obtained one the sources for his Historiae Musulmanae Turcorum through a translator at the court of Murad III (1574-1595).
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rude notes than iust Histories, rather pointing things out, than declaring the same.\footnote{102} Nonetheless, by implementing them in his Historie, Knolles implicitly asserts their authority and overall significance for his work. Finally, the presence of Turkish sources in Knolles’ text indicates a departure from earlier historical works on the Ottomans. As a beneficiary of a significant textual exchange between East and West, these Turkish texts contribute to the complex make up that informs the outlook, methodology and content of Knolles’ Historie.

So, how is this reflected in the Histories’ portrayal of the Ottomans? Given the size of the text it is impossible to provide a comprehensive discussion here, and my examination has to remain limited to a few examples by which to examine Knolles’ application of his methodology to his material. Moreover, for the purposes of my discussion it is less significant to know whether negative portrayals outweigh positive ones, or vice versa; rather, it is important to identify whether Knolles actually adheres to his historiographical principles or not, and if so, how this is reflected in the text proper. Given the significance of Turkish sources for Knolles, I will focus on examples and passages in which Knolles refers to and makes specific use of them. My first example is concerned with Knolles’ discussion of Ottoman origins, which, according to Knolles, are ‘so small and obscure, as that it is not well knowne vnto themselues’.\footnote{103} He approaches this question with a certain degree of vagueness:

Some (after the manner of most nations) derive them from the Troians, led thereunto by the affinitie of the words Turci and Teucri, [...] No great reason in my deeming: yet giue the authors thereof leue therewith to please themselues, as well as some others ... [to] borrow, or rather force their beginning from thence,

\footnote{102}Knolles, History, sig. A5\textsuperscript{v}. In 1652, William Seaman commented on Knolles’ remark explaining that ‘Now he, and others, seeing little else extant of them [Turkish histories] in this kinde, save the Annales of Leunclavius, conceived it was because they had no other: whereas indeed the true reason rather was, that there had not been then made, that diligent inquisition, either into the elegancy of their Language, or literature, as to know what they had’, The Reign of Sultan Orchan Second King of the Turks (London: John Sherley, 1652), Wing S225; sigs*4\textsuperscript{v} -A1\textsuperscript{f}; see further McJannet, “‘History written by the enemy’”, p. 425.

\footnote{103}Knolles, Historie, sig. B1\textsuperscript{r}.
without any probability at all; and that with such earnestnes, as if they could not elsewhere have found any so honourable ancestors.\textsuperscript{104}

Knolles rejects this view, and, instead, offers evidence from a range of authors, which, among others, include Johann Lewenklaw, who 'deriue the Turks together with the Tartars, from the Iewes'.\textsuperscript{105} The latter author, however, reflects the opinion of the Turkish source. While Knolles grants probability to these conjectures, he eventually follows Pomponius Mela's evidence and argues for a Scythian origin. He supports this view by the agreement he finds 'in the manners and conditions of the Turks, their antient attire, their gesture, their gate, their weapons, and manner of riding, and fight, their language and dialect, so well agreeing with the Scythians'.\textsuperscript{106}

This identification of the Scythians as the ancestors of the Ottomans was widespread.\textsuperscript{107} As a polemical mark of barbarity, Scythian roots were not exclusively associated with the Ottoman Turks in English writings; they also served to portray the Irish.\textsuperscript{108} However, it is not so much Knolles' conclusion that is of interest here, but the evidence he excludes as improbable: the Trojan origin. While Knolles offers all evidence on the origins of the Ottomans available to him, including Lewenklaw's Turkish source, his decision to settle on a Scythian origin reflects the pervasiveness of the Turks as a threat.\textsuperscript{109} The argument that 'the affinitie of the words Turci and Teucri' led some to believe that Ottomans stem from the

\textsuperscript{104} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{105} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{106} Ibid. sig. B1'.
\textsuperscript{109} A marginal note on Lewenklaw's entry cites 'Io. Leunclauius Pandect. cap. 22' as the source; 'Pandect' refers to Lewenklaw's \textit{Pandectes Historiae Turcicae} ['A gloss on the history of the Turks'], which is included in Lewenklaw's \textit{Annales Sultanorum} (1588); Parry, \textit{Knolles}, p. 114.
Trojans was accepted by early humanists such as the Florentine chancellor Coluccio Salutati. Others, such as Aeneas Piccolomini, however argued against this use of the term ‘Teucri’, because ‘[t]hose who are now called Turks (Turchi) are not, as some think, the Trojans or the Persian. They are a race of Scythians from the center of Barbary’. The term race in Piccolomini’s gloss on the Turk’s origin does not refer to a specific physical attribute as for instance skin colour. Rather, it should be understood as a term that spans across such varied categories as lineage, faith, nation or class. Like Pomponius Mela, Piccolomini seems to have in mind certain traits or behavioural patterns that are evident in the Turks and which assign them to a Scythian lineage, or ‘race’ as he calls it. The underpinning assumption is that their behaviour is distinctly different from that of Christians. Thus, an association of a Trojan origin for both Christians and Ottomans represents an ideologically irreconcilable position.

Another reason, and one much closer to home, was the still widespread belief that England itself could trace its roots to Troy. Edmund Spenser, in his epic *The Faerie Queen* stakes a claim for such a genealogy, in which ‘noble Britons sprong from Troians bold / And Troynouant [London] was built of old Troyes ashes cold’. Although the Italian historian Polydore Vergil had banished the history of Brutus into the realm of myth, it was frequently invoked at various times and sustained its potency, as Lisa Hopkins maintains, as an iconic
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111 Quoted in Hankins, ‘Renaissance Crusaders’, p. 137.
113 The longevity of conceptions of Christianity as a marker of race throughout the eighteenth century has been argued by Roxann Wheeler. She maintains that these ‘were more explicitly important to Briton’s assessment of themselves and other people that physical attributes such as skin color, shape of the nose, or texture of the hair’ *The Complexion of Race: Categories of Difference in Eighteenth-Century British Culture* (Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania, 2000), p. 7.
status of national pride throughout the period. Knolles’ dismissal of those who attribute a Trojan origin to the Ottomans – ‘as if they could not elsewhere haue found any so honourable ancestors’ – is an important detail, because, as the statement implies, the innate value of a Trojan origin for a nation, including England, was still relevant. Even though the viability of this foundation myth had been increasingly undermined, an association of Ottoman Turks with Troy and thus with England would have been an uneasy one. However, whether Knolles believed in his nation’s Trojan roots or not is impossible to tell, but, given his vehement rejection of a Turco-Trojan ancestry, neither can it be ignored; instead, ambiguity prevails.

This brief examination of Ottoman origins in Knolles’ Historie demonstrates two important and interrelated points: on a factual level, Knolles attempts to be as accurate as possible by providing all the evidence available to him; however, on an ideological level, his judgement is steeped in the discourse of a Turkish threat (and, to a certain extent, in nationalist interests). The two positions are not mutually exclusive; Knolles even allows for disagreement, or even error. In his preface he asks his readership not to dismiss what is written in the Historie, if they ‘chance to light upon some things otherwise reported that thou [the readers] hast elsewhere read ... not therefore to condemn what thou here findest, being happily taken from a more certain reporter than was that whereunto though givest more credit’. Where sources disagree, he leaves it to the reader’s ‘good choice ... to follow that which may seeme vnto thee most true’. Knolles’ debate on Ottoman origins demonstrates that he is willing to produce a range of evidence including Ottoman sources, but, at the same time, that his assessment of the evidence remains intricately bound to his ideological agenda.

The significance of Knolles’ use of Ottoman sources is not limited to their textual reproduction alone. Linda McJannet has shown that Knolles often invoked the authority of the
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Turkish chronicles to correct errors in Western historiography. These corrections, as McJannet notes, occurred in matters that were ‘not sensitive from a Western point of view’. As an example, she refers to Knolles’ amendment of Western accounts of the foundation of the institution of the Janissaries, the Ottoman military elite corps. The corps was installed under Murad I and not Murad II as historians like Paolo Giovio had maintained, and, as McJannet shows, whom Knolles corrected on the basis of the ‘Turk’s own histories’. The Janissaries and their origins are of particular interest to Knolles as we have seen already, and, while he does not engage in greater detail with other institutions of the Ottoman state, his exploration of the Janissaries merits attention as an example of Knolles’ meticulous research and pursuit of factual truth.

Knolles details the origin and development of Janissaries at the end of his discussion of Murad II’s reign. According to him, Murad II re-invented the practice of devşirme; a system of ‘periodical levy of Christian children for training to fill the ranks of the Janissaries and to occupy posts in the Palace service and in the administration’. Originally introduced by Murad I, the system was adjusted by his successor to recruit a ‘serviceable ... new kind of soldiers’ to which end he appointed officers who ‘tooke from the Christians throughout his dominions, euerie fift child: the fairest and aptest of whom, he placed in his owne Seraglio ... and the rest in other like places by him built for such purpose’. Following their instruction in ‘the principles of the Mahometan religion, and then in all manner of actiuitie and feats of
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armes', the former Christians were assigned 'into diuers orders' to guard the sultan.\textsuperscript{124} Those whom the sultan deemed of a 'better sort' Murad II 'began to make his Bassaes, his Generals of his armies, and the Gouernours of his prouinces and cities, with all the great offices of the state'.\textsuperscript{125}

Not only does Knolles' examination of Murad II's \textit{devşirme} system demonstrate an unusual degree of detail, he also corrects Western historiography as to the origins of this institution. Furthermore, as the continuing discussion shows, he is very precise about the social and ethnographic differences that resulted from this recruitment system. The division to which he refers emerged between the 'naturall Turks' and the former 'tribute children', and Knolles gives his readers a detailed insight into Ottoman culture. The 'tribute children', he alerts his readers, 'whom we call Turks desire to be called Musulmans (that is to say, right beleevers)'; indeed, they 'hold it a reproachfull and dishonourable thing to be called Turks'.\textsuperscript{126} The 'naturall Turks' live in Natolia, and are 'either marchants, or of base and mechanicall crafts, or poore labourers with the spade and pickaxe ... people vnfit for the warres'.\textsuperscript{127} By contrast, Knolles continues:

\begin{quote}
the rest (as I say) holding it for a title of honour to be discended of Christian parents. Yea the Grand Signior himselfe, although by the fathers side he bee come of progenitors such as were naturall Turks borne, yet many of them had Christian mothers, which they accounted in the greatest part of their nobilitie and honour.\textsuperscript{128}
\end{quote}

The shrewdness of Knolles' observations on the Janissaries is unique for its time, and, while the question of the sources remains open to debate, the analysis clearly demonstrates Knolles' desire for precision and accuracy.\textsuperscript{129}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{124} Ibid. sig. 3F4'.
\textsuperscript{125} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{126} Ibid. sig. 3F5'.
\textsuperscript{127} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{128} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{129} Parry, \textit{Knolles}, p. 73.
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The care with which Knolles describes the institution of the Janissaries can be partly explained by his admiration for this military elite corps, and also because it represents one reason for Turkish greatness. But he is equally commendatory of Murad II, the sultan who had brought the system to fruition, whom he describes in an epitaph as a ‘king [...] of his subjects woonderfully beloued’ and who ‘was more faithfull of his word than any of the Turkish kings either before or after him’. While these sentiments reflect positively on this sultan, Knolles is less favourably inclined towards ‘Mahomet II’, Murad’s son who became known in Christendom as Mehmed, the Conqueror. From the beginning, Knolles’ portrayal of Mehmed II signals a pronounced articulation of the Turkish threat. Indeed, Knolles is at great pains to vilify the new sultan of whom, as he says, many thought he ‘would haue embraced the Christian religion’, because his Christian mother had secretly instructed him therein. Instead, Knolles continues:

[he] embraced in shew the Mahometane religion, abhoring the Christian, but indeed making no great reckoning either of the one or of the other; but as a meere Atheist, deuoid of all religion, and worshipping no other god but good fortune, ... he thought all things lawfull that agreed with his lust, and making conscience of nothing, kept no league, promise, or oath, longer than stood with his profit or pleasure

Knolles’ proleptic rhetoric here reflects existing stereotypes associated with the Ottoman Turks, such as lust, or the breaking of oaths; character traits that are further reinforced by the sultan’s alleged atheism.

The representation of Mehmed II as the lustful, power-seeking tyrant is rehearsed elsewhere in Knolles’ Historie. In the context of this discussion, one episode in particular
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merits attention: the tale of the Greek woman Irene. The story is set during the period immediately following the capture of Constantinople, and revolves around Irene, a beautiful Greek, who is presented to Mehmed II. The conqueror falls in love with her and, as a result of his infatuation, begins to neglect his duties. Mustapha Bassa, Mehmed’s counsellor, alerts Mehmed to the increasingly deteriorating state of affairs throughout his realm. Then Mehmed, in an act of self-control and in order to demonstrate his hold on power, decapitates Irene publicly. Vernon Parry notes that this episode is of a ‘literary and dramatic, rather than strictly historical character’. Knolles’ source for this narrative was presumably William Painter, who, in turn, had translated the tale from a novella collection by Matteo Bandello. I will discuss this episode in greater detail in my final chapter; it shall suffice to say here that its inclusion in Knolles clearly serves to exemplify the motif of Turkish cruelty, and thus reflects the Turkish threat. But, as Parry acknowledges, this episode also poses a historiographical difficulty which has important implications for the way we read Knolles’ text and his use of sources.

In discussing Knolles’ historiography, I have traced his attempt to reveal ‘the truth of the history’: the careful weighing of sources, the accuracy in representing factual knowledge, and the assimilation of Turkish source material. Parry’s comment on the lack of ‘historical character’ in the above episode might not disqualify the Historie overall, but it is certainly seen as a glitch in the text. Above all, it raises the question as to what other kinds of source materials Knolles consulted. Clearly, Parry identifies a conceptual gap between what he and what Knolles considered suitable historical evidence. To illuminate the two different historiographical assumptions it is useful to recall Stephen Orgel’s definition of genre in the Renaissance as ‘inclusive and relational’, rather than exclusive and definitive. The implication of Orgel’s definition is that, for an early modern reader or writer, a text could belong to more
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than one genre. In the case of history, Knolles clearly shares this assumption, as his inclusion of an episode of a 'literary character' indicates. What is important is the recognition that historical sources for Knolles encompassed a range of texts which Parry discards as non-historical. In other words, Knolles considered some kinds of text as historical which we perhaps no longer identify as such. To recognise this is to become alive to the possibilities of meanings and interpretations within texts that would otherwise be lost to us. Discussing at greater length the problem of history and its uses in the early modern period, Paulina Kewes spells out the practical ramifications of this insight: '[r]eaders and writers expected, and were expected, to make comparisons across a spectrum of texts dealing in one way or another with the national or the foreign past'.\textsuperscript{136} Knolles' list of authors consulted for his Historie (which he reproduced in the preface to the reader) can be seen as an invitation to consult further and read across the whole range of these documents. Furthermore, one of the texts which Knolles advertises to his readers is King James I's 'Lepanto, or Heroicall Song', a text, as we will see, that offers its own critical version of 'the greatest and most glorious victorie that euer was by any the Christian confederate princes obtained against these the Othoman Kings'.\textsuperscript{137}

Thus far, I have examined some of the ways in which Knolles' use of sources reflects both his attempt at an accurate representation of Turkish history, and his perpetuation of the Turkish threat. Throughout his project, Knolles never loses sight of his overall agenda, and his repeated calls upon Christian princes to fight in unison against the Ottomans gives the work its overall coherence. From the beginning, he declares that 'the matter and argument of this Historie' is particularly appropriate for James whom Knolles envisages as the leader of a united Christian force.\textsuperscript{138} The ideal of a \textit{unitas Christiana} always lurks in Knolles' narrative, but his strong focus on an English – or perhaps British – leadership in such a venture also

\textsuperscript{136} Paulina Kewes, 'History and Its Uses', \textit{HLQ}, 68. (2005), 1-31 (at p. 5).
\textsuperscript{137} Knolles, \textit{Historie}, sig. A3\textsuperscript{f}.
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raises the question of England’s past involvement. In my final section, I will focus on two events that were of significance to all of Christendom, and which are addressed in very different ways in Knolles’ Historie: the battle of Christian forces at Lepanto (1571) and the Spanish Armada against England (1588). While Ottoman involvement is obvious in the former event, the latter case is less obvious, but Knolles’ response to this event is indeed revealing.

1.3 ‘The Present Terroir of the World’? – England and the Spanish Armada

According to the jurist Alberico Gentili, Christians and ‘Saracens (who are Turks)’ are in a state of ‘irreconcilable war’, whereas ‘with other foreign peoples [Christians] have commercial relations, but certainly not war’. This belief underlies the basic premise of Knolles’ Historie. But, as we have seen, Knolles also acknowledges the existence of commercial relations between the Ottomans and his own and other Christian nations. This contrast becomes even clearer when we look outside the Historie for evidence of these relations. Queen Elizabeth, writing to ‘Mahumet Cham’ (Mehmed III) in 1601, aptly sums up England’s relations with the Ottoman Empire at the end of the her reign. ‘It is no small contentment to us that the amity we have with so high an renowned a prince as you, is by our neighbour princes and their subjects so well known that when they have need to seek any favour or kindness from you, they implore our mediation as the readiest way to obtain their desires’. One of the ‘neighbour princes’ to whom Elizabeth refers is James VI of Scotland, on whose behalf Elizabeth entreats the sultan to release two of James’ subjects. While these
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relations were indeed well known to Elizabeth’s ‘neighbour princes’, it would be a mistake to believe that such relations were looked at favourably by all.  

Despite Elizabeth’s assertions of amity with the sultan in her correspondence, she also subscribed (at least rhetorically) to the ideal of the common corps as against the Ottomans. However, while expediency rather than piety had often played a crucial factor in these assertions of solidarity, they also testify to the continuing currency of the discourse of the Turkish threat. Even after Elizabeth’s excommunication in 1570, she adhered to the ideal of a common corps in spite of her official expulsion from the Catholic Church.  

In this final section I will address this problem of England’s relations with the Ottomans and ask if these are reflected in Knolles’ Historie, and if so, how? At the heart of these questions lies Knolles’ incessant call to Christian unity and his invocation of Christendom as the central notion of this ideal. Given England’s marginal and increasingly difficult position in Western Christendom – a fact that became painfully obvious to England with the attempted Spanish Armada of 1588 – it is reasonable to explore Knolles’ ideal more closely. As a starting point for this enquiry it is useful to begin with his assessment of the Ottoman’s naval defeat at Lepanto in October 1571, since this victory was considered to be an overall success for all of Christendom.

The battle of Lepanto represented an important turning point in the history of the ongoing Ottoman-Christian conflict. On 7 October 1571, the fleet of the Holy League – a
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142 For instance Capatin Norris, who had refused orders to apprehend ‘such English pirates as do impeach the quiet trade her Majesty’s friends in the Levant Seas’, had made it clear that involvement with the Ottomans would lead to the Queen’s dishonour, as ‘some princes of Christendom, her Majesty’s enemies and ill willers, have charged her Highness to be a favourer of Turks and infidels’, HMC-Hatfield, XII, pp. 549-50.

143 Elizabeth was no exception; George of Podiebrad, for instance, ‘who had been pronounced a heretic’, continued to urge Christian princes to unite against the Turks; cited in Yapp, ‘Europe in the Turkish Mirror’, p. 141.

Christian alliance comprising the forces of Spain, Venice, and the Papacy—under the leadership of the Catholic Don John of Austria, the half-brother of Philip II, encountered the Ottoman Armada led by Ali Pasha off the west coast of Greece in a battle that lasted a day, and resulted in defeat of the Ottoman navy.\textsuperscript{145} The military clash was not simply a chance encounter between Christians and Muslims, but was the result of a concerted effort on the Christian side to unite their forces to prevent further Ottoman conquest. Initially, Venice had called upon Christian princes to aid the Serenissima against the Ottomans who had taken Cyprus in 1570. However, it was mainly due to the diplomacy and efforts of the newly elected Pope Pius V, whose interest in rekindling the spirit of crusade made him an ardent supporter of a league against the Muslims, that Spain and Venice finally reached an accord. The Holy League, as it was termed, was a three-year agreement to assemble a fleet in the Mediterranean to check the Ottoman expansionary thrust westwards, and to oppose their growing naval power. However, before its agreed time had lapsed, the League, following Pius’ death in 1572, had been effectively killed off by Venice’s defection to its old commercial partner: the Ottoman Empire.\textsuperscript{146}

Knolles portrays the events leading up to Ottoman defeat in great detail beginning with the first Ottoman schemes to conquer Cyprus, through the formation of the Holy League until the latter’s final demise.\textsuperscript{147} But above all, it is the assembly of a Christian fleet at Lepanto—an event that comes closest to Knolles’ ideal of Christendom acting united against the Ottomans—that prompts enthusiastic comments on the victory: ‘the like whereof was never fought at sea against the Turke, wherein he lost his chief strength at sea, with most of his best sea captains: and might thereby well perceive what he and his successors were to fear, if the Christian princes at unity amongst themselves, all discord set apart, should in zeal of

\textsuperscript{145} For a detailed account, see Setton, \textit{Papacy and Levant}, IV; Vaughan, \textit{Europe}, pp. 156-62.  
\textsuperscript{146} Vaughan, \textit{Europe}, p. 163.  
\textsuperscript{147} Knolles, \textit{Historie}, sig 3B5\textsuperscript{v}-3H3\textsuperscript{f}.  
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their religion joyne their invincible forces against them. For Knolles, the successful battle was a pan-Christian victory that demonstrated the efficiency and superiority of Christian forces over that of the Ottomans. Christendom celebrated and, Knolles continues, the ensuing celebrations in Venice, Spain and elsewhere soon extended to ‘countries further off’, in which there ‘was like rejoysing and signes of joy, as with vs here in England’.

While England was absent from the actual battle – Elizabeth had been excommunicated the year before – the news of the victory received much welcome. Bonfires and sermons celebrated the overthrow of the Ottoman Turks, and the ringers at St. Martin-in-the-Fields sounded a great peal at this occasion. At the same time, translations of news from ‘Venice’ with details of Christian and Turkish losses arrived in print. Later in the same year, the Venetian ambassador Sigismond di Cavalli reported to the Signory that Elizabeth had expressed ‘her great satisfaction at the victory, for which she thanked God’, and that she had felt ‘under obligations to the war with the Turks’. As a reason for her absence, di Cavalli notes ‘the conspiracy which had lately been discovered against’ the Queen; the plot referred to here was the Northern Rebellion of Catholic earls in an attempt to replace Elizabeth with Mary Stewart. Even though ‘the Pope and the King of Spain, being occupied in that matter [the Holy League], were not able to assist the conspirators against her with money’, di Cavalli continues, Elizabeth had to be on her guard and could not expend her resources elsewhere at the risk of being overrun at home. Expressions of solidarity like Elizabeth’s felt obligation to war with the Turks could not mute the tensions and anxieties that existed in the hostile
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climate following Elizabeth's excommunication, and between England's Protestant government and that of Spain and the Papacy.

Not only did the battle of Lepanto prompt a flurry of celebrations throughout Christendom, it continued to excite the imagination of many Christian writers in the years following. One of them was James I who had penned *The Lepanto of Iames the sixt, King of Scotland* in 1585, and first published as part of his *Poetical Exercises* in 1591. James' poem merits attention not simply because it exhibits another encomium on Lepanto, but also because the poem is pointedly invoked by Knolles in the dedication to James I, thus linking it to Knolles' own project. Focusing in the main on the actual battle, James loosely grafts his vision of Lepanto onto an apocalyptic framework, in which the conflict 'betwixt the baptiz'd race, / And circumcised Turband Turkes' (ll. 10-11) unfolds. However, the poem is not exclusively concerned with the Christian-Ottoman conflict; it is also, as James notes in the preface to the reader, 'a Poetike comparison ... mooued, by the stirring uppe of the league and cruell persecution of the Protestants in all countries'. The league to which he refers was the French Catholic league formed between French Catholics and Philip II as a result of the death of Anjou in 1584 which had left the Protestant Henry of Navarre as heir to the French throne. While the conflict between Muslims and Christians at Lepanto provides the ostensible framework of reference for the poem (and its 'comparison' or allegory), James' open anti-Catholicism cannot be ignored. He makes it clear that he did not seek to promote the victor of the naval battle, Don John of Austria. He writes: 'far contrary to my degree and Religion' should I 'penne a worke, ex professo, in praise of a forraine Papist bastard'.
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James' poem presents a particular Protestant view on the famous battle. This much is suggested by the poem's concluding lines in which James praises God's mercy for having given victory to those who profess the Christian religion; more specifically, 'euen to them that mixe therewith / Their owne inuentions slight ... For since he shewes such grace to them /
That thinks themselves are just, / What will he more to them that in / His mercies onelie trust?' (ll. 963-72). The implication, of course, is that a united Protestant force could achieve considerably more than what the Catholic league had already achieved. It is thus that James' poem not only celebrates a major victory of Christians over Muslims, but his poem's allegory promotes a particular Protestant vision of this victory. 160

James' poem was re-printed in 1603, the year of his accession to the English throne, and the publication of Knolles' Historie. Some scholars have read this re-publication as a deliberate confirmation of his strong antipathy towards the Ottomans. 161 If so, it also reproduced the strong anti-Catholic tenor of the poem which sits uneasily in the context of the new monarch's self-appointed role as a peacemaker and advocate of an ecumenical council with the aim to unite Christendom. 162 But of course the two positions are not mutually exclusive. Indeed, at James' accession a large body of his earlier works was reprinted in London; at the heart of these publications was his corpus of political works, notably the Basilikon Doron. 163 Roderick Lyall argues that one reason for the re-publication was to 'introduce the new king to his English subjects', while he also seems to suggest that a larger

160 For a detailed reading of this allegory, see also Robert Appelbaum, 'War and Peace in "The Lepanto" of James VI and I', Modern Philology, 97.3 (2000), 333-63.
161 Dimmock, New Turkes, pp. 199-200; one critic maintains that the 1603 edition of the poem sought to polarize the division even further by adding the qualifiers 'baptiz'd' and 'circumcised Turband' to the original 1591 text; however, the two editions are precisely the same with no further additions made to the 1603 edition; Matar, Turks, Moors, and Englishmen, p. 143.
162 William B. Patterson, King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
concerted effort underlies these reprints in which James' policies were supposed to be distributed not only in England, but across Western Christendom.\textsuperscript{164} The invocation of James' poem in the dedication to Knolles' \textit{Historie} certainly exploits the antipathies towards the Turks. What remains to be seen, however, is whether Knolles shares James' Protestant outlook, or whether Knolles' idea of a united Christendom is more inclusive. Knolles' praise of James' poem should be seen as both an appeal to his leadership and as an invitation to the reader to consult the poem. While this is by no means conclusive evidence for Knolles' own outlook, such a reading it is at least indicative.

Internal textual evidence allows us to infer more about Knolles' view on his concept of Christendom. Richmond Barbour has noticed the absence of Spain in Knolles' terminal rosters of Christian monarchs with which each reign of a sultan is closed. In the case of Murad III, who died in 1595, this is also true (see figure 1).

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Murad III's reign in the context of Knolles' terminal rosters.}
\end{figure}
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The countries represented here are not exclusively Protestant, nor do they reflect any specific alliance. It can be argued that for Knolles the core of the roster, comprising the countries of England, France and Scotland reflect the central corps of Christendom, but none of this explains the absence of Spain. While there is no immediately coherent pattern emerging, it should also be noted that most of these countries entertained diplomatic and commercial relations with the Ottomans, including England.

A snapshot of these relations can be found in Knolles’ brief gloss on the circumcision festivities held in the honour of Murad III’s son at Constantinople in 1582. The episode offers

---
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no further details on the celebrations or revels that took place during the festival, but what is noteworthy is the group of Christian and Muslim ambassadors assembled for the occasion. Following a brief introduction, Knolles explains that ‘vnto which solemnitie, many Christian princes were solemnly inuited; who accordingly sent thither their embassadours with great gifts and presents, in token of peace and confederacie, namely, Rudolphus the emPerour, Henrie the third the French king, Stephen king of Polonia: the State of Venice, the king of Persia, the Moore kings of Marocco and Fes, the princes of Moldavia, Valachia, and others’. What is surprising in the context of Knolles’ Historie is the mention of these Christian-Ottoman relations, given the text’s primary purpose to promote war. And the exchanges of ‘gifts and presents, in token of peace and confederacie’ signal respect rather than enmity. While this episode neatly illustrates the existence of diplomatic networks in place, the brevity of Knolles’ entry should not disguise the fact that these festivities received a great deal of attention across Christendom, resulting in no less than a dozen Christian accounts.

The absence of an English representative from the festivities is telling, and disguises the fact that England had already had dealings with the Ottomans by then. The beginning of these relations can be traced to 1579, but William Harborne, the first English ambassador at the Porte, only arrived in Constantinople on 26 March 1583. Although his primary duties
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167 Terzioglu, ‘The Imperial Circumcision Festival of 1582: An Interpretation’, p. 84; Metin And, A History of Theatre and Popular Entertainment in Turkey (Ankara: Forum Yayinalari, 1963-64), pp. 17-22; a translation of a German report on the festivities circulated in England in Francisicus Billerbeg, Most rare and straunge discourses, of Amurathe the Turkish emperor that now is with the warres betweene him and the Persians (London: J. Charlewood, 1584), STC 3060, sigs C1-F4; this is reprinted in And, A History of Theatre, pp. 118-30.
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were to assure the consolidation and representation of the newly founded Levant Company against French and Venetian competitors, Harborne’s tasks were soon extended. It is in this context of Anglo-Ottoman commercial relations – relations that were also always political – and England’s increasingly deteriorating relations with Spain that I want to consider another piece of textual evidence that can help explain the absence of Spain in Knolles’ *Historie*: a letter sent by Murad III to Elizabeth I in 1589.170

The letter is a response from ‘Amurath the third’ to England’s incessant requests for military support against Spain. In it, the sultan lists a number of points Elizabeth’s ‘orator resiant [sic] in our stately and magnificent Court, hath presented vnto the throne of our Maiestie’.171 The ‘orator’ was William Harborne who had been instructed by Francis Walsingham as early as 1585 to persuade the ‘Grand Seigneur ... to convert some part of his forces bent, ..., from time to time wholly against the Persians, rather against Spain, thereby to divert the dangerous attempt and designs of the said King from these parts of Christendom’.172 This much is also revealed in the letter by ‘Amurath’, or Murad III:

After that, your aforesaid Oratour requested our Highnesse in the beginning of the next Spring to send out our imperall fleet against him, being assured that the king of Spaine could not be able easily to withstand it, for that he had now alreadie receiued a great ouerthrow by your fleet: and being scarce able to withstand you alone, if he should be on diuers parts inuaded, must needs be overcome, to the great benefit of all the Christian princes, as also of our imperiall state173

What is striking about this passage is that England’s appeal was made in 1589, one year after the Spanish Armada, and an indication of the longevity of these requests beyond the actual Spanish Armada. Appeals like these were by no means hidden from other Christians, and
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publications, such as the Fugger News, continued to report on them; for instance, on 3 January 1589 the Fugger news report that the English ambassador had requested from the sultan ‘100 ships to hinder the projects of the King of Spain against the Queen of England’. 174 In the context of Knolles’ call for Christian unity, another question raised by the inclusion of this letter regards its relevance for Knolles’ overall project of the Historie. As a document that effectively reveals strategic Anglo-Ottoman relations, its inclusion seems odd. One possible answer to this question is that Knolles did not regard the Ottomans as the only ‘present terror of the world’.

Elsewhere in the letter, the sultan refers to the English ambassador’s opinion that Spain is a menace to all Christendom. The rich trade with the West Indies and the annexation of Portugal in 1580 have enriched the Spaniards with ‘precious stones, spices, gold, and silver’. 175 As a result, the King of Spain now ‘hath meanes to molest and trouble all other Christian princes’. A military strike against Spain with the help of the Ottomans would surely defeat the Spanish ‘to the great benefit of all the Christian princes, as also of our imperiall state’. 176 No such efforts were undertaken, and the sultan’s letter concludes with the affirmation of the existing, amiable relations between England and the Empire. As an excuse for the absence of military support, the sultan refers to the ‘warres in Persia’, which have depleted his resources. 177 It is not surprising that the English ambassador William Harborne, and later his successor Edward Barton, represented the Spanish as a threat to England and other Christians. But what is curious is to find such evidence in a text with the ostensible
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174 Victor von Klarwill (ed.), The Fugger News-Letter: 1568-1605, 2nd ser. (London: John Lane, 1926), No. 344 (p. 184); see further Nos 352, 377, 381, 390, 395; 396, 399, 402, 405, 408; Knolles’ source for this letter – ‘Nicholaus Reusnerus epist. Turci. lib. 12. pag. 42’ – was a letter collection by Nicholas Reusner (1545-1602), Epistolarum Turcicarum Variorum et Diversorum Authorum Libri XIV (Frankfurt am Main: n. pub., 1598-1600); see Parry, Knolles, p. 132.
175 Knolles, History, sig. 3Q5v.
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purpose of promoting the Turkish threat and uniting Christians to fight against the Ottomans. Further, Knolles’ concluding comment on this letter indicates frustration and disappointment over Ottoman failure to aid England. Notably, he does not show disapproval for his Queen’s policies, rather he complains about the Ottoman Turks that ‘for all these faire shewes it may seeme vnto him that looketh more neere into the state of the Turkish affaires at those times, and that which hath ensued since, that Amurath glad of the discord of these two so great Christian princes, and not yet well assured of his new conquests in Persia, had no great mind to the invasition of Spaine’. 178

There are at least two competing ideologies at work in the above statement: the first refers directly to the Ottomans while the second deals with contemporary English anxieties related to Spain. The phrase ‘for all these faire shewes’ relates to the assumed untrustworthiness Christians associated with Ottoman leagues, a point Knolles had elaborated earlier in his preface where he states that Ottoman rulers ‘breake and infringe the lawes both of Nations and Nature’ – a case he finds confirmed in this letter. 179 But it is the phrase ‘no great mind to the invasition of Spaine’ that emphasises Knolles’ disappointment over the failed support that sits uneasily in this context. The reprinting of this letter in Knolles’ Historie should not be seen as an attempt to promote Anglo-Ottoman relations. Instead, I argue, the inclusion reflects Knolles’ anti-Spanish sentiments, which also explain the conspicuous absence of Spain from the roster. Spain, for Knolles, was another, closer threat to Christendom. As in James’ celebration of the pan-Christian victory at Lepanto in his poem, Spain was a useful albeit imperfect member of the Christian commonweal, and Don John’s success certainly deserved praise. However, while Catholicism for both James and Knolles is acceptable provided Christians unite to fight the Ottomans, Knolles views Spain as a menace to Christendom. Of course, the irony is that the inclusion of the letter also signals diplomatic

178 Ibid.
179 Ibid. sig. A5v.
cooperation between England and the Porte against another member of the Christian commonweal, and thus potentially undermines Knolles' own agenda.

It is easy to overstate the significance of such details, especially given the size of the text. By the same token, if we neglect detailed readings of key parts of this massive text we also risk collapsing its many nuances under generalisations that obfuscate our view of a historically important text. As a work wholly dedicated to the history of the Ottomans, this English text represents one important expression of the imago Turci at the time. Knolles' Historie surely invites a number of readings, a point indicated by the wide range of uses to which it was put as a work of recreation, or as a source for travel writers and playwrights. At the time of the Historie's publication, the pursuit of Christian unity against the Ottomans was still seen as a necessity, and, as Edwyn Sandys had pointed out, was strengthened by 'the bond of common feare' which 'is the strongest indeed of all other, but the shortest withall'.\(^\text{180}\) While Lepanto exemplified Sandys' point, the Spanish Armada, on the other hand, reflected his sober assessment that such unity through necessity is 'unlikely in short time'.\(^\text{181}\) Knolles himself might not have agreed - as the second, updated edition of the Historie in 1610 indicates - while James preferred to turn to peace with Spain when he signed the treaty of London in 1604.

In conclusion, Knolles' text represents both an orthodox outlook on the Ottomans as a threat to Christendom, and an innovative and comprehensive prose historiography. The two positions, as I have demonstrated, are not mutually exclusive; rather, they coexist alongside one another. Indeed, the continuation and perpetuation of a discourse of the Turkish threat should not detract from the Historie's merits, for instance Knolles' use of a wide range of sources including Turkish material derived from Lewenklaw's translations of Ottoman sources, or the correction of existing factual errors on Ottoman institutions. The perception of

\(^{180}\) Sandys, Europae Speculum, sig. V2'.

\(^{181}\) Ibid.
the Ottomans as a society to be both admired and feared remains an unresolved ambiguity that informs the text. Furthermore, the existence of detailed and varied descriptions of Ottoman culture, its institutions and rulers, defy the easy generalisations Richmond Barbour identifies as the defining characteristic of this work. While there certainly are proto-Orientalist tropes in Knolles’ text, they do not yet reflect the binary structures Said identifies in the works of eighteenth-century Orientalists.

As the first English prose historiography on the Ottomans, Knolles’ text also reflects domestic investments. Aside from the continuous invocation of the Turkish threat in his own work, Knolles, as I have demonstrated, invites his readers to compare and read across other texts dealing with the Ottomans. In the case of James I’s poem, The Lepanto, a reading reveals the King’s Protestant interpretation of these events in the context of the ongoing tensions between Catholics and Protestants in France and England. Similarly, Knolles reproduces a letter from Murad III which explicitly recalls England’s strategic relations with the Ottomans and England’s hostilities with Spain. My reading argues that this evidence can be read as a reflection of Knolles’ overall outlook on Christendom, in which Spain is figured as another threat to other Christians. As a result, Spain is excluded from the common corps as a potential ally in the war against the Ottomans, a position that is immediately undermined by Knolles’ reproduction of the letter. As I suggested, this is the case with Spain alone and does not necessarily extend to other countries which profess Catholicism. The imago Turci in Knolles’ Historie is thus deeply ambivalent not only in its portrayal of the Ottomans, but also in relation to the domestic anxieties that inform that portrayal. In the next chapter I will pursue this line of enquiry further when I examine the image of the Turk in the texts chronicling the religious debates during at the reigns of both Mary and Elizabeth.
2. ‘What the Saracen commendeth’ – The Turk, England and the Protestant Church

In the previous chapter we have seen that prose historiographies about the Ottomans expressed anxieties over Christian failure to unite and support one another in the context of a perceived Turkish threat. Some of these anxieties are reflected in the frequent calls on all Christians to act not only in unison, but also to aid fellow Christians in need for help. It was the failure of princes to observe their Christian duty that proved to be the primary obstacle to success. Like Knolles, other writers of prose-historiographies advocated a policy of necessary unity, urging princes to resolve their conflicts and competing interests for the greater good of Christendom. While Knolles' Historie perpetuates these calls, it also offers a sophisticated text that, while largely orthodox in outlook, indicates a remarkable amount of detail and engagement that often betrays the generalisations and tropes that inform the discourse of a Turkish threat. Moreover, I have argued that while Knolles pursues a policy of reconciliation, his own political outlook retains a deeply anti-Spanish tenor, conspicuously undermining his overall project for Christian unity against the Ottomans.

In this chapter I continue to examine the relation between the portrayals of Ottoman Turks and the uses of these portrayals in debates on Christian unity in religious writings. Unlike the historical writings discussed before, the texts considered here do not have as their subject matter the Ottoman Turk per se. As texts broadly concerned with religious debates in post-Reformation England, which include sermons, apologia and Church history, the authors of these texts often turned to the imago Turci as a quarry of tropes through to articulate their respective ideological position. While continental and English prose historiographies ostensibly promoted the ideal of unity as a necessity for Christians in their defence against the Turkish forces, religious texts reveal one of the causes for the failure of such an endeavour: the deep rooted hostility that informed the Protestant-Catholic divide in the wake of the
Reformation. Within these debates the Turkish threat was frequently appropriated and directed inwards by both religious factions to signify difference and transgression. It was less a concern with factual accuracy in the portrayals of the Ottomans which prompted writers of religious texts to turn to the Turk; rather their interest was in the association of Ottoman Turks as perceived heretics. For this reason I shall refer to the Ottomans as Turks in this chapter in order to emphasise the distinct usage in these text. The Turk as a trope serves as a yardstick of Christian difference and theological division on both sides of the Christian divide. I want to suggest that English writers' engagement with the Turk as a trope in these debates offered them another term through which the continuing process of reformation in England could be conducted.

My second argument concerns the role of the Turk in religious debates surrounding Christian unity itself. In Western Christendom this belief in unity was shared by Christians of all denominations, and the evident invocations to unity in prose-historiographies testifies to this. As members of the universal church Christians called upon fellow Christians to aid all those in need against the Turks. Whether a response to such requests followed was a different matter. Following the Reformation and the break up of the Catholic Church with its claim to universality these debates received a new urgency, and were now directed inwards. Yet while the ideal of a united Christendom continued, the question that now concerned participants on both sides of the religious divide was what form the universal church should assume. When, in 1533, Henry declared 'this realm of England' to be an 'empire', he advocated it to be 'governed by one supreme head and king' ruling over both the body politic and 'the body spiritual' now 'called the English Church'. Henry's break with Rome had facilitated the way for Protestantism in England, and the seed for a religious national identity. While this was by

no means a straightforward process, 60 years later Richard Hooker could nonetheless say that 'there is not any man a member of the Church of England, but the same man is also a member of the commonwealth; nor any man a member of the commonwealth, which is not also of the church of England'. In these debates, the Turk emerged as an integral element in the rhetoric of Protestants and Catholics, and their negotiations of England's role and position in the universal church. I want to suggest that the trope of the Turk played an important strategic role in the articulation and justification of Protestant views on the role of their Church and England's role in it.

I begin this examination by exploring the role of the Turk in the dynamics of Protestant and Catholic rhetoric. Looking closely at two religious tracts from the reign of Mary I, I identify and examine some of the principal ways in which the Turk was employed to support a Catholic and a Protestant agenda are identified and examined. As a trope the Turk allowed English Christian writers to express and amplify their respective religious views; it also allowed each group to articulate and strengthen their respective position in relation to a shared ideal of a universal church, that is, to define the form of its religious community. In my next example, *The Seditious and blasphemous Oration of Cardinal Pole*, I trace the complexities involved in the appropriation and use of the Turk in Protestant writings. More importantly, the text's sophisticated use of the Turk imagines England as a Protestant community defined against the claims of a Catholic Church universal. Building on some of these findings, I continue my examination with John Foxe's short digression *The Turkes Storye* in his second edition of the *Acts and Monuments* (1570). I demonstrate how Foxe employs the Turk as a trope of difference to justify the claims of the Protestant Church to truth by demonstrating how Ottoman history could also be employed to serve the specific purposes not of all Christendom, but the Protestant community. The third and final section explores the specific English connotations of the Turk in a sermon given by Meredith Hanmer at the occasion of a

3 Quoted in Russell, 204.
Turk's conversion to Christianity in 1586. The text, again, plays out many of the rhetorical formulations found in previous documents; however, it also extends the debate in a new context in which the Turk is no longer simply an external, abstract signpost, but evident and tangible proof for the claims of Protestantism to universalism.

2.1 Religious truths, doctrinal differences and the 'worser Turk'

In 1554 Thomas Watson, then dean of Durham and newly appointed bishop of Lincoln, gave two of the Lenten sermons before Queen Mary in support of traditional teachings on the Eucharist. With the accession of Mary in 1553, the bonds of the Catholic Church, which had been severed under Henry VIII, were restored, and England made part of the House of Habsburg through the Queen's marriage to the son of Charles V, Philip of Spain. Although the articles of Mary's matrimonial contract had assured England generous terms, the prospect of being subjected to a foreign ruler did not widely appeal to the English populace. Thomas Wyatt's rebellion staged in the same year is merely one example of the discontent felt by many about these recent developments; a sentiment conveyed by a contemporary observer who states that 'all England would rise in like manner at the same time', because 'the whole people are embittered against the marriage'. While the motifs for Wyatt's coup are still debated, it seems that beyond his objection to a foreign ruler, his attempt to thwart religious restoration of the Catholic faith also played an important role. Whatever Wyatt's motivations, the rebellion was suppressed, Wyatt executed and the marriage between Mary and Philip publicly celebrated. While these issues had presented initial difficulties to the

4 Thomas Watson, Twoo notable sermons (London: John Cawood, 1554), STC 25115.3; DNB.
Marian regime, the reinstatement of the Eucharist and sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church proved a different matter.

In March 1554 Mary's injunction on religion officially reinstated the Catholic Church's 'laudable and honest ceremonies'. In support of this, Watson's sermon at once offered a sophisticated argument for the presence of the Eucharist in the Church service and an attempt to disarm the Protestant position on the issue. The sermon's main objective was 'to destroye the kyngedome of sinne', first erected, as Watson says, by the 'deuill' who works 'by imitation, as Infideles, Jewes, heretikes'. He argues that the presence of 'Christes bodye and bloude' in the Sacrament is crucial in obtaining 'remission of synne & spirituall grace & gyftes', because otherwise 'then shuld we be no better then the Turkes'. Further to justify his claim he states that 'both gentils and Iewes, haue had one kynd of outwarde sacrifice' to express their devotion to God, 'sauyng onlye the Turkes'. Invoking the authority of 'Petrus Cluniacensis' Watson maintains that the 'secte that denyeth and destroyeth ye Masse' is the 'sect of Mahumette'. According to Watson's syllogistic logic here, any 'sect' that opposes the Eucharist must be followers of 'Mahumette' and thus errs in theological terms. The point is reinforced by the earlier claim that nearly all other religious groups profess outward ceremonies to express inward devotion, except for the Turks.

Watson's sermon combines the image of the Turk as an external marker for religious difference with that of the militant external threat. The absence of the Eucharist prepares, he argues, 'a waye for the Turke to ouerrunne all Christendome, as he hathe done a greate peece already' and continues:

for what could the Turke do more agaynst oure fayth, yf he dyd ouercome vs, bysyde our thraldome and tyrannical oppression, but as these men do nowe to take

---

8 Tudor Proclamations, II, no. 407.
9 Watson, Twoo notable sermons, sigs. A3v.
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awayeoureSacramentesandsacrifice,andtoleauevsnothyngbutthebarename
ofChrist,andyftherebeanyegoodman,thathathtruereligioninhisheart,to
compelhymtokepeithewithinhym,ytshenalnotexpresseitoutwardlye?\textsuperscript{13}

The scenario of Turkish invasion only reinforces what Watson perceives to be an already dire
situation for those who celebrate the Eucharist in England, because the 'men' who now 'take
awayeoureSacramentesandsacrifice'areevenworsethantheturks.However,by
comparison,themilitantTurkispresentedasalessereviltthanthespiritualstarvationof
Catholicsheidentifysforhisowndays.

Finally, Watson identifies the 'men' who deprive Catholics of their 'Sacramentes' as
Protestants. '[D]iuersenorableandgodliwryters'hearguesmaintainthatthis'heresyeagainst
ye sacrifice of the church' was first began and upheld by Luther and adds, they call his heresy
'bythisname\textit{Secta Mahumetica}thesecteofmahomet'(sig.B6').ForWatson,Lutheristo
his followers what he considers Muhammad to be to the Turks, the origin of heresy. The
conflation of Luther with the prophet Muhammad was not new in Catholic writings. Thomas
More, in his \textit{A Dialogue Concerning Heresies} (1529) had already linked the Turkish threat to
the Reformer in order to heighten the transgressions of his teachings;\textsuperscript{14} Watson thus reiterates
a Catholic commonplace. Notably, however, he derives the authority for his argument not
from More, but from 'Petrus Cluniacensis' - Peter the Venerable, the Abbot of Cluny (c1092-
1156). Peter of Cluny's engagement with Islam was manifold.\textsuperscript{15} Perhaps best known for his
efforts to have the Qur'an translated into Latin for the purpose of refuting Islam in its own
terms, it was his attempt to mark Muhammad as a heresiarch that makes Watson's reference
significant in this context. Whether Watson arrived at this association directly by reading
Cluny's work or by reading others is not an easy question to answer. For this discussion it is
important to note that his knowledge of Islamic doctrine enabled him to attack a specific

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid.sigs.B5'-B6'.
\textsuperscript{14}Dimmock,\textit{NewTurkes},pp.26-28,atp.27.
\textsuperscript{15}JamesKritzeck,\textit{PetertheVenerableandIslam}(Princeton:PrincetonUniversityPress,
1964);KennethM.Setton,\textit{WesternHostilitytoIslamandPropheciesofTurkishDoom}
liturgical difference between Catholicism and Protestantism to condemn the absence of the Eucharist in Protestantism and Luther's teachings.

Watson's case demonstrates the strategic use and currency of the Turk in the Marian rhetoric of Catholic restoration. However, the identification of one's enemy as a Turk or even worse than a Turk, was neither the prerogative of Catholics nor did it guarantee a subject's submission to the Catholic faith. Preaching at court, Watson had given his sermon in a safe environment. The previous year, on 20 August 1553, he had spoken at St. Pauls where 'ther was about the crosse and in the churche-yarde almost all the garde, with their billes and weapons, for feare of like tumult that was on sonday before'.\textsuperscript{16} Allegiance to a new regime, or indeed acceptance of the old faith was by no means a given as Wyatt's rebellion too had shown. The issue of obedience to a monarch on religious grounds was to be the subject of a Protestant response to the Marian regime's efforts printed in the same month as Watson's sermon: \textit{A faithful admonition of a certeyne true pastor and prophete sent vnto the Germanes at such a time as certain great princes went about to bryng alienes into Germany, [and] to restore the papacy; the kingdom of Antichrist.}\textsuperscript{17}

The topicality of Martin Luther's \textit{Warnung an seine Lieben Deutschen} (1531) - the tract's original title - clearly appealed to English Protestants in 1554.\textsuperscript{18} Prefaced by Philip Melanchthon it expounds the obligations of 'Rulers & gouemors to have the care & charge of his pore church, which suffreth in the world contempt, slander & affliction' and advocates resistance to those who oppose it, above all, the Pope 'the sworne enemies of al true


\textsuperscript{17} \textit{A faithful admonition of a certeyne true pastor and prophete sent vnto the Germanes at such a time as certain great princes went about to bryng alienes into Germany, [and] to restore the papacy; the kingdom of Antichrist} (Grenewych: Conrad Freeman, [1554]), STC 16981; the same year saw two print runs of this translation in total (STC 16980).

Christians'. Writing under the pseudonym 'Eusebius Pamphilus', the English translator addresses his Christian readers to follow the 'councell ministred therein; to preuent that subuersion & extreme inconuenience which at this present hangeth ouer their heades'. More to the point, he vents his resentment over the current events in his address to 'England', proclaiming to resist those 'as go about to bring the[e] in thraldom & subiection vnto Aliens, & to conquer the[e] with tyranny & seduce the[e] with false religion'. The two enemies of England are identified as the 'Spaniardes and Popery' as the run-on header in the text proper emphatically reminds its readers.

Like Watson, Luther in his *A faithfull admonition* makes use of the Turk as an amplifier of religious difference and perceived error. His discussion, however, is concerned with the problem of the true faith and the issue of obedience to a ruler who sets him or herself above, or violates the teachings of, the gospel. Luther lists disregard for, or failure to maintain 'the Gospell of Christ' to which 'everye particular man hath promised and vowed in his baptisme' as a legitimate cause for disobeying the monarch. He argues that those who persecute the professors of the Gospel also rail against the 'true ministracion of al the Sacraments' and thus 'striueth against God'. Their persecution is 'worse than al Turkes & Tartarians, Jewes and Panimes', because the latter act out of ignorance while the Papists, glossed in a marginal note, know their failings, and will 'suffer ten tyrnes more greuous damnation, them ani Turke'. Hence the greater need for this admonition, because 'it is a manifest token yt euen in Christendom among Christians, ther ar worser Turkes than are either in Turky or in hel'. An extensive marginal note brings this point home, identifying the Papists as the 'worser Turkes':
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The great Turke himselfe is not so mad as to rage & raue against hys owne Mahomet & Alcoran as our diuels the papists do against the gospel that they were professed vnto, in their baptisme: wherefor the Turkes mai be angels in respect of the Papistes and the papists verye diuels in respecte of the turkes.

Although Catholicism is not conflated with Islam here, the contrast between the faithful observation of religious practice by the 'great Turke himselfe' and that of Catholic 'rage & raue' against the gospel highlights the latter's perceived transgression.

In the context of the events at the beginning of Mary's reign the implications of such a text are far reaching. Above all, Luther's comments invite a reading that promotes seditious calls to rebellion against the current ruler. Such suspicions conclude John Proctor's *Historie of Wyates Rebellion* (1554) in the shape of 'A prophesy of England vnto the degenerate English' added at the end of the text. The title's distinction between England and its 'degenerate' inhabitants is important; England, here personified, serves as a synecdoche for the Catholic Church to 'whome I wholy am owne and due'. It is the 'newly imbraced learning' of the Protestants that the text marks as subversive since it dared 'seditiously, and rebelliouslye to disturb her, whom duetie bindeth eche godlie subiect to obey'.

Unsurprisingly, it is suggested, should the Protestants not amend their ways and return to the Church universal they 'rather like to become Turkes then to continue Christians'.

In the rhetoric of both Catholics and Protestants the Turkish threat is directed inwards exposing the faultlines of the Christian commonweal. As a trope, the Turk was flexible enough to accommodate positions on both sides of the schism in order to articulate dissident positions along each group's respective lines; indeed, the permutations and combinations were endless. However, the underlying assumption shared by all Christian writers is that the Turk is external to their own religious beliefs. This much is suggested by Kenneth Setton who
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points out that 'to Catholics and Lutherans both, the Turk was much like sin itself'.

In contrast to religious texts, prose historiographies, which also represent the Turk as alien and outside the Christian commonweal, stress this externality in order to achieve pan-Christianity in the face of a Turkish threat. While histories, too, commented on Christian failure to observe this unity, what is at stake in the religious debates in post-Reformation England is, above all, the promotion of competing concepts of what the true Christian community should be.

The various portrayals and images of the Turk were employed in a struggle between Christian creeds in which each group sought to justify its claims over the other. The obvious divide that marks the above texts is that between the Catholics and Protestants, each claiming to represent the true universal church. In both Watson's and Proctor's formulations, Protestant doctrine is identified with that of the Turk and shown to jeopardise England's unity with the Catholic Church universal. Conversely, the translator of *A faithfull admonition* appropriates Luther's pamphlet to express England's break with the papacy. Its claims on behalf of the Protestant community are expressed in opposition to the Catholic Church universal by marking the latter's disbelief in salvation through faith alone as erroneous, a fact which makes them worse than the Turks. English writers on both sides of the divide were aware of the complexities of these formulations and continued to use the trope throughout the century, as the *Turco-Papisimo* controversies of the late 1590s and early 1600s testify. While the trope of the Turk became a staple element in both Protestant and Catholic propaganda, it should also be noted that the above writers employ the Turk to identify and assess England's position within the universal church. Here I want to shift my focus to Protestant writers in Elizabeth's
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reign, and further explore the ways in which their use of the Turk facilitated the articulation of what might be termed a specifically English Protestant commonweal.

Published in 1560, The Seditious and blasphemous Oration of Cardinal Pole illustrates the continuing currency and significance of the Turk as a marker of religious difference following Elizabeth’s accession in 1558. More importantly, it demonstrates just how alive both sides on the divide were to associations and formulations that linked the Turk to either Christian denomination. The following text in particular demonstrates how Catholic propaganda could be addressed and disarmed by turning its rhetoric against itself. Furthermore, in its explicit engagement with the Catholic association of Protestantism and Turkishness, the text seeks to assert England’s identity as a Protestant commonweal.

The hostile tenor of the pamphlet’s title already indicates the content of the text, however, its full title reveals the full extent of Pole’s defection; it continues: ‘both against god & his country which he directid to themperour in his booke intytuled the defence of the eclesiastical vnitye, mouing the emperour therin to seke the destruction of England and all those whiche had professed the gospele’. What is of interest here is Pole’s address of the Emperor, Charles V, ‘to seke the destruction of England’. Cast as the principal culprit Reginald Pole, Cardinal and Archbishop of Canterbury during the reign of Henry VIII, had defected from England to Rome over Henry’s claim to supreme headship of the Church in the early 1530s. As a response to Henry’s request for Pole’s opinion on whether marriage with a deceased brother’s wife was permissible, and, whether papal supremacy was of divine institution, he set out to write a letter which became the 230 page long defence Pro ecclesiasticae unitatis defensione (‘Defence of the unity of the church’) composed in 1536. Widely known as the De unitate, this is the text from which is derived The Seditious and

33 [Pole, Reginald], The seditious and blasphemous oration of Cardinal Pole both against god [and] his cou[n]try, trans. by Fabyane Wythers (London: Owen Rogers, 1560), STC 20087.
blasphemous Oration. The oration’s translator, ‘Fabyane Whythers’, however, did not turn to Pole’s text as a source, but produced the English translation from a pamphlet circulating in Germany, the Oratio R Poli (1554); an excerpt of the De unitate published by the Italian reformer and Pole’s harshest critic, Pier Paolo Vergerio. While I am not concerned here with the circumstances and agenda of Vergerio’s text, it is important to note that Withers appropriated another reformer’s work, a work specifically designed to attack Pole’s role as a peacemaker. It indicates the wide-ranging networks through which these debates were conducted. However, Withers gave his translation a specific English dimension by stressing Pole’s betrayal of Henry VIII, a fact that had been left unexplained by Vergerio.

One of the purposes of the 1560 translation was to mark Pole as a traitor to England. The preface advertises to its English readers that it discloses those who have sought to bring about ‘the vter destruction and ruyne of their owne natife Countrey’. Fabian Withers, the text’s translator, singles out ‘Renold Pole’ as an example for all ‘trew English hartes’ to know ‘a venomous viper they haue of late noryshed euin in their own bosomes’. While the oration itself refers to events in 1536 - as Withers notes in his preface - his example could still teach readers a lesson in 1560, especially in the context of Elizabeth’s recent efforts to undo her half-sister’s restoration of Catholicism. But Pole’s reputation as a traitor is not limited to the content of the oration; he remained in living memory throughout Elizabeth’s reign. Following Mary’s accession, Reginald Pole had returned to England in 1554 in his capacity as

36 For example, Vergerio had omitted to explain that the speech was originally aimed at Henry VIII, not the German Protestants; for the manipulation of the text and its further implications see Overell, pp. 309-310.
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the papal legate to aid Mary's reconciliation with Rome. He was then largely responsible for
the restitution of the Catholic Church. While Pole himself was considered a reformer in the
Catholic Church, for many Protestants, especially those who had left England for exile during
Mary's reign, he was remembered in a very different light. A letter from the exiled Edwin
Sandys to Henry Bullinger reveals the relief Protestants felt at the news of Pole's death in
1558:

We yesterday received a letter from England, in which the death of Mary, the
accession of Elizabeth, and the decease of cardinal Pole is confirmed. That good
cardinal, that he might not raise any disturbance, or impede the progress of the
gospel, departed this life the day after his friend Mary. Such was the love and
harmony between them, that not even death itself could separate them. We have
nothing therefore to fear from Pole, for dead men do not bite.

Deeply despised by the Protestant exiles and an emblem of Mary's reign, the figure of Pole
was bound to touch a sensitive Protestant nerve. In the oration proper, Pole addresses Charles
V, here referred to as 'Cesar', in a moment which invokes images of crusade by imagining
Charles' fleet ready to 'inuade the kyng of turkes being an ancyeant enemy vnto the name of
Christ'. Pole, however, proposes that it would be 'muche more mete & better for thee to
conuert & turne thy hole force and power that waies from whence a greater daunger is
imynent vnto our commonwealth', because it is from 'whence also a present mischief and a
newe enemy much more greuous and worse then the turk, doth vexe and greue vs'. The
familiar formulation of the 'worser Turk' here reinforces Pole's status as a traitor, but he
continues:

I pray you what shal you then haue profited when in place of them whome you
haue expelled out of asia new turkes be risen and spreng vp amongst vs at home

41 Zurich Letters, (1537-1558), Zurich on 20 December 1558, p. 3 (original emphasis).
42 The seditious and blasphemous oration, sig. A1'.
43 Ibid. sig. A1'; this is perhaps in oblique reference to Charles' violent capture of Tunis in
1535; see Vaughan, Europe, pp. 120-121.
44 The seditious and blasphemous oration, sig. A1'.
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for what other thing are the turkes then a certain secte of Christians, which in
tyme past have shrounk and gone a way from the catholyke church.45

The ‘new turkes’ Pole identifies, and the group against which Charles should direct his forces,
are the Protestants in Henrican England. Here again is the familiar association reminiscent of
Watson’s sermon in which both the Turks and Protestants are identified with heresy.

But Pole incriminates England’s Protestants and Henry VIII further. Cautioning Charles
of the situation in his own country of Germany in which, as he says, ‘this Turkish sede is
spred and sowen amongst vs’,46 he then turns to England observing that ‘this sede so sowen
and strength euen by th[e] auctorytuy of one man’.47 Heresy has ‘so i[n]uadid the hart of our
kinge that he doth defende and mayntaine this his secte euen by thee very sames meanes as
the turk doth mahumet shewing and shaking his naked and drawen swerd vnto al such as dare
once dissent or disagree from hym’.48 England’s fall from the true faith, Pole’s accusation
runs, ‘can starkly be discerned from the Turkish sede’; indeed, ‘it is defended withe the
sword, and with the sword they answer all that is obiectid against it’.49 This image of the
militant Protestant who is worse than the Turks is reinforced by a direct contrast with the real
Turks whose ‘sect doth compell no man vnto ther opinion’.50

A gloss by ‘Athanasius’, Vergerio’s pseudonym, responds to Pole’s accusations.51 As a
story of England’s schism from Rome, the 1536 oration offers a welcome and well-known
target for Protestant apologists in 1560. ‘This is the general & natural sense’, Athanasius
declares, ‘of all popysh secte to count all them which haue professed the gospel for turkes and
worse than turkes’.52 The argument held against such polemic is built on the assumption that
the ‘trew church of Cryst such as ar all they whome thou falsly callest Turkes’ offer

45 Ibid. sigs. A2'–A3'.
46 Ibid, Sig. A3'.
47 Ibid. Sig. A4'.
48 Ibid. Sig. A7'.
49 Ibid. sigs. A4'–v'.
50 Ibid. sig. A4'.
51 Ibid., sig. Cl'; ‘Athanasius’, according to Overell, is Vergerio; 309, fn. 33.
52 The seditious and blasphemous oration, sig. Cl'.
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‘Salvation’ but depends on the preaching of the Gospel. The latter, Athanasius argues, is dismissed by Pole because ‘you feare that the power and existimation of your popes shuld be theirby be dymynyshed’. These elements echo the earliest arguments for reform advocated by Martin Luther, in particular the corruption of the papacy. But Athanasius also finds agreement with Pole. He concedes that it is ‘the turkysh maner to answer with the swerd against all such as speak in the name of chryst’, but does so only to assert that it is the ‘pope hym self doth dayly answer the children of God ... with the sword gallows & fyer’. Finally, Pole’s charge that England’s Protestants are the ‘new turkes’ is countered by the allegation that, in fact, it was ‘your worthy head [that] was the cause that Mahomet could not only plant that this most filthy and wile sect but also bring it to such eficasitie and force’. In other words: Pole’s association of Protestants with Turks as a marker of heresy is met by ‘Athanasius’ with a similar strategy in which he identifies parallels in Catholic and Turkish conduct, in particular Catholic doctrine as a cause for the success of Islam. The crucial point is that in both cases the Turk serves as a marker of difference against which both Catholics and Protestants defined their respective religious views.

The Seditious and blasphemous Oration establishes Pole as a traitor to his ‘owne natife Countrey’. While his treason is confirmed by his betrayal and deception of those who ‘haue of late noryshed [him] euen in their own bosomes’; it is further highlighted by his identification of Protestants with the Turk. Pole’s alleged plan to incite Charles V to invade England in 1536 on grounds that Protestantism is the same as heresy conjures fears of invasion which contributed to his role as a defector. In Wither’s translation many of the accusations levelled at Protestants are dismissed as empty words, merely disguising Pole’s real anxieties ‘that the power and existimation of your popes’ should wane. Above all, the containment of his oration

53 Ibid. sig. C1'.
54 Ibid. sigs. C1'-C2'.
55 Ibid. sigs. C3'-C4'.
56 Ibid. sig. C5'.
suggests the validity of Pole’s claim concerning the religious identity of the nation; England is a Protestant community. While his identification of Protestants as the ‘new turkes’ of England is attacked, ‘Athanasius’ does not dispute England’s status as a Protestant community; instead, most of his defence engages with arguments about the precise form of the religious community rather than an attack on Pole’s general claim is populated by Protestants. The spectre of invasion Pole invokes here, and which ‘Athanasius’ contains, merely emphasises England’s exclusion from the Catholic Church universal.

In the wider context of the Elizabethan settlement - the restoration of Protestantism in England initiated by the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity (1559) – Pole’s oration was a useful tool in the hands of Protestant apologists. As an episode taken from the national past, it demonstrates how a prominent Catholic, within living memory, marked Protestants as heretics and Turks, promoting Catholic invasion of England. On a more general note, the usefulness of history in the consolidation of Protestantism in Elizabeth’s reign has been widely recognised. So far, the examples I have considered make use of the Turk as a marker of religious truth and doctrinal difference primarily to disarm their opponents’ respective religious and political position. However, in their defence of the Protestant Church these debates were hardly a substitute for the larger claims to universal truth as stated by both Catholics and Protestants. Elizabeth’s apologists needed to trace a lineage for the Protestant Church that was rooted in the apostolic past. As a result they appealed to history as a source for their project. For this purpose John Foxe, perhaps the most prominent of Elizabeth’s church historians, implemented a narrative of the Turk’s history in his second edition of his Acts and Monuments (1570). In doing so, he differs significantly from the authors discussed

58 John Foxe, The first volume of the ecclesiasticall history contaynyng the actes and monuments of thynges passed in every kynges tyme in this realme, especially in the Church of England principally to be noted: with a full discourse of such persecutions, horrible troubles, the suffering of martyrs, and other thinges incident, touchyng as wel the sayd
above in at least two ways: firstly, he uses Turkish history to support the case of the Protestant Church; and secondly, he assimilates the Turk into his massive apocalyptic historiography through the association of the Turk with Antichrist. This is further complicated by Foxe’s understanding of the Pope as Antichrist which he synthesises with the Turk into an uneasy trinity. But first, a few comments on the notion of Antichrist are required, before I shift the focus of my discussion to the relationship between the Turks and the Protestant Church in Foxe’s *Acts*.

### 2.2 ‘A subtil aduersary’ – Antichrist, the Turk and John Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments*

In the religious writings of post-Reformation England, Antichrist and Pope were synonymous. This association was by no means an invention of Protestant apologists, but is rooted in the familiar tradition of the Antichrist legend popular in medieval Europe. According to this belief, Antichrist is a single man who will be born amongst the Jews in Babylon and whose appearance signals the end of time. His arrival, however, is preceded by others who, like him, oppose the preaching of the Gospel. During his lifetime, Antichrist will, under the disguise of a devout Catholic, lead Christians and Jews astray and perform false miracles; those who refuse to follow him will be marked and, subsequently, persecuted. After the end of his devilish rule, he will fake his own death and resurrection, but will fail in his attempt to rise to heaven when is struck down by the archangel Michael. Prominent
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*Church of England as also Scotland, and all other foreine nations, from the primitue tyme till the reigne of K. Henry VIII* (London: John Daye, 1570), STC 11223; henceforth referred to as *Acts* unless stated otherwise.


medieval theologians, such as the French abbot Adso in the tenth century, or the Calabrian Joachim of Fiore in the late twelfth century had helped to shape and circulate the lore.\textsuperscript{61} But it was Joachim of Fiore who broke with the legend in significant ways. The abbot agreed that there were a number of agents preceding the actual Antichrist figure who were frequently embodied by members of Islam. His real innovation, however, was to relocate Antichrist's origin and place him amidst Christianity as the false Christian who would arise from the West.\textsuperscript{62} Irrespective of the varying beliefs medieval authors held about Antichrist, the Reformation movement introduced a novel understanding of the legend entirely at odds with Catholic beliefs. Whilst Catholicism continued to adhere to the medieval tradition abandoning the Pope as Christ's opponent, Reformists began to associate the papal office itself with the idea of Antichrist.

A key figure in this new development was Martin Luther. Faced with the dual threat of approaching Turkish forces and papal suppression, Luther, in his Tabletalk, was quoted as saying that, 'Antichrist is the same time the Pope and the Turk'; and continued to explain that '[a] living creature consists of body and soul. This spirit of Antichrist is the pope, his flesh the Turk. One attacks the Church physically, the other spiritually. [...] But make a single person of Antichrist and you'll find both liar and murderer in the pope'.\textsuperscript{63} Despite Luther's assertion that the Pope was Antichrist, this double identification of the 'Turk' and the Pope as the two chief enemies of Protestant Christendom recurs regularly in Protestant writings. In England, the earliest Protestant reference to the Pope as the spiritual Antichrist was made by Tyndale in his translation of the Bible; other early apologists, like John Bale, followed Luther in assigning both the Pope and the 'Turk' the role of the son of perdition. Such claims rested on

\textsuperscript{61} Bauckham, pp. 91-112.
\textsuperscript{62} McGinn, p. 141.
\textsuperscript{63} Quoted in Setton, 'Lutheranism and the Turkish Peril', 151.
the assumption of the universality of Antichrist, and generally referred to an opposition to true Christianity.64

But there was no unanimous agreement on these issues amongst English Reformers. In a sermon given before Elizabeth I at Hampton Court on 12 November, 1570 William Fulke argued that the Pope was ‘that Antichrist [who] should deceiue the world with false doctrine’, because neither ‘an heathen man, a Iew or a Turk’ is ‘he that under the pretence of the name of Christ, seeketh most of all to deface the honor of Christ’.65 The Antichrist is, as Fulke asserts, ‘a subtil aduersary’ not an ‘open enemy of the Gospell’ as is ‘Mahomet’.66 John Foxe, too, was an ardent proponent of the doctrine of the papal Antichrist. In 1563, he published his Protestant Church history, Acts and Monuments, which ‘depicted Englishmen throughout the centuries battling against Antichrist’.67 Acclaim for the work followed immediately and Foxe soon after announced the publication of a second, greatly expanded edition, which materialised in 1570.68 Here, for the first time he also included a brief history of the Turks which ‘I adioyne after these popes’.69 Shifting emphasis unto the Turk, Foxe begins to oscillate between the Pope and the Turk as Christ’s chief enemy. Indeed, Andrew Penny considers it ‘curious’ that Foxe crafts an elaborate argument about the papacy in his Acts and Monuments as the Antichrist ‘only to risk torpedoing it in his discourse on Turkish history’.70

64 McGinn, p. 219.
65 William Fulke, A Sermon preached at Hampton Court, on Sunday being the 12.day of November, in the yeare of our Lord, 1570 (London: John Awdley, 1570), STC 11450, sig. G1'.
66 Ibid. sig. G1".
67 Hill, p. 13.
69 Foxe, Acts p. 871.
By discussing this ‘curious’ shift from Pope to Turk as Antichrist, I focus on the The Turkes Storye and the implications of its inclusion in the 1570 edition. My starting point is an exploration of reasons that could have prompted Foxe to incorporate the Storye into his Church history. Why did this only happen in the second edition? And why did Foxe identify the Turk as the Antichrist in his Storye? Peter Lake has suggested that for Protestants Antichrist was not of prime concern, since he was no more than a negative image of Christ. Instead, such an obsession with Antichrist implies a concern with the purity and integrity of the community of the godly; in fact, a preoccupation with Antichrist points towards different visions of the community of the godly. Fulke’s sermon is just one such example. Prefaced by a quotation from St. John, he presents his biblical exegesis to the reader for two purposes: ‘[t]hat by the one we might bee enflamed with loue of the true church of Christ, & by the other be moued to the hatred of that false church of Antichrist’. What is at stake in his sermon is not only the legitimacy of the true, Protestant Church, but also a concern with the integrity of its community: those he wants to see ‘enflamed with loue of the true church of Christ’ and those he wants to abandon the old faith.

Foxe, too, sought to promulgate and consolidate Protestantism in England against Catholic claims. One strategy through which to achieve this goal was to repeatedly identify the papacy with Antichrist. Another way, I argue, was to incorporate the The Turkes Storye as an integral part of his defence. Foxe’s incorporation of the rise of the Ottomans into his history of the true Church of Christ allows him to make an elaborate case for the prosecution of the true believers at home and abroad. Alive to the global persecution of the faithful and alert to the Turkish threat, Foxe discusses what many perceived as a religious struggle at home in terms of a wider conflict in history. Furthermore, for Foxe, this Turkish threat was
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71 Henceforth referred to as Storye.
73 Fulke, A Sermon, sig. A3r.
also both internal and external. As a trope, the Turk enabled Foxe to speak to Protestant anxieties, enforce claims to the truth and legitimacy of the Protestant Church, and further to consider his country's present and future spiritual health. But his reading of Turkish history also reveals the need for Christian unity under Protestantism as opposed to Catholicism if the real Turk abroad and the inward Turk at home were to be successfully defeated. This latter point is revisited in his criticism on Elizabeth's course of reformation in England and echoed in events in the Turkish history.

John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, first published in 1563 and greatly augmented during his lifetime in three subsequent editions - 1570, 1576, 1583 - gained him and his work an important status in post-Reformation England. The success of the book was officially confirmed (and institutionalized) when the convocation of Canterbury decided to place the newly published 1570 edition together with 'a copy of the Bishop's bible (1568) ... in each cathedral church'. This decision, it was recently argued was inspired by the Privy Council's urging to put a copy in all churches in England. The accounts of martyrs disclose the 'unrelenting warfare between the false church, visible, commanding and apparently flourishing, and the true church, depressed almost out of sight'. As such the *Acts* sought to maintain a Protestant claim fiercely attacked by Catholics: the restoration of the 'Churche of our owne'. Inherent in Foxe's ecclesiological thinking - and partly responsible for the expanding scope of his following editions - is the ardent desire to retrace the entire persecution of his Church interpreted through the prism of Revelation. He was acutely aware of the historiographical shortcomings of the 1563 edition; especially its failure to account for the Roman persecutions of Christians that took place after the assumed binding of Satan
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following the passion of Christ – a time of peace for his Church - and prior to the stipulated year of Satan’s loosing in 1000 A.D. (a date he had adopted from John Bale). By 1570, he had redressed the problem through reconsidering the numerology of Revelation; and he newly dated the binding of Satan to coincide with the end of Roman persecution of Christians under Constantine. As a result, the date for the loosing of Satan, or Antichrist, after the end of a thousand year period shifted to the end of the thirteenth or the beginning of the fourteenth century. With this extended apocalyptic framework in place, the 1570 edition - divided up into twelve books covering the primitive Church’s establishment, rise, decay and reformation - Foxe presented his readers (or listeners) with an edifying history of the true apostolic Church.

Recent criticism has reconsidered the textual status of Foxe’s history of the Church. Instead of thinking of the book as a work that had undergone continual rewriting but essentially retained its status as the same book, Thomas Betteridge suggests that there exist three distinctive texts: the prophetic (1563), the apocalyptic (1570), and the monumental (1583). For him, these three editions represent different works each ‘marked by specific political events and religious concerns’. While the first edition was written primarily to support the Elizabethan Settlement (1559), later editions took on a more critical stance towards the ruling regime. At home and abroad political and religious events continued to prove unfavourable to the newly installed Elizabethan regime and its officially proclaimed religion. Abroad the spectre of Catholic dominance in the West loomed large when the already escalating conflicts in the Low Countries were swiftly followed by invasion of the Spanish Duke of Alba. At home, the Elizabethan regime faced their own internal struggles;
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notably the northern rising under the Duke of Norfolk in 1569. In a coup d'état following the
disintegration of a powerful aristocratic and semi-Catholic lobby at Court, the leaders of the
rebellion had hoped to depose Elizabeth and to supplant her with the Catholic Mary, Queen of
Scots. Finally, in 1570 Pius V issued the bull of excommunication, Regnans in excelsis,
which isolated Elizabeth and England even further from a predominantly Catholic continent.
The same year also saw two major publications by Foxe: the second edition of the Acts and A
Sermon of Christ crucified, the latter written directly in response to Elizabeth's
excommunication.

It is in this second edition, located in book six, that Foxe incorporates The Turkes Storye
- an examination of the reigns of twelve Ottoman emperors leading up to Foxe's own days,
and an additional section in which he considers prophecy in relation to the Turk. The Storye
rehearses their 'rising, and cruell persecution of the saints of God'. Through this history,
Foxe, along with the papacy, assigns to the Turk the role of the persecutor of Christians. But
what accounts for this inclusion? In his exhortation '[t]o the Trve and Faithfvl Congregation
of Christes vniuersall Church', Foxe, a marginal note, refers to '[t]he partiall dealing of story
writers'. He regrets their neglect of 'the simple flock of Christ, especially the vnlearned sort'
who do not know 'the course of times, and trve descent of the Church'; above all he objects to
the histories available in England, because they were written by 'Monkes or clients to the sea
of Rome'. Foxe seeks to redress the problem of partiality of their stories, and especially
'how their [popes] warres neuer prospered against the Turke'. The inclusion of the Storye,
then, is an attempt to fill these gaps. By adapting these histories to a Protestant eschatology,
Foxe also echoes one of the arguments found in 'Athenasius' gloss of Pole's speech: the
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impotence of Catholicism to ward off Islam and the Turks. A fact, Foxe implies, Catholics had to disguise in their histories in order to sustain their credibility and authority. Although the partiality of Catholic accounts portraying their wars against the Turk can explain the presence of the *Storye* in the *Acts*, it does not help us to understand why the inclusion only occurred in the second edition. Wars against the Turk had been waged for a long time. And besides, Foxe had contemplated the usefulness of the Turk for the Protestant cause as early as 1556.89

A list of 'causes' or reason why Englishmen and members of other nations should gain knowledge of the Turks, 'their order and doynges', reveals further motives for the *Storye's* inclusion.90 The chief merit of the narrative, Foxe claims, lies in 'the better explainyng of the Prophecies of the new Testament, as in S. Paules Epist. ad Thessal. and also in the reuelations of S. John'; secondly, 'that we may learne thereby, either with the publique Church, to lament, ... or els may feare thereby our own danger'; thirdly, 'that we may ponder more depely with our selves the scourge of God for our sinnes, and corrupt doctrine'; fourthly, that the consideration of their persecution ' [...] may reduce us from our domesticall warres'; fifth, that ' [...] these greate victoryes of the Turkes, [...] may admonish and teach us, following the example of the old Israelites, how to seke for greater strength to encounter with these enemyes of Christ',91 and, finally, to move those who think themselves safe as to 'excite their zeale and prayer to almighty God'.92 The first cause especially merits attention as it asks the reader (or listener) to trace actively and connect events expounded in prophecy within the Turk's history; a confirmation of prophecy through history, and history through prophecy.

89 Quoted in Firth, *Apocalyptic Tradition*, p. 95.
91 Ibid.
92 Ibid. p. 872.
‘The treatment of the book of Revelation as a prophecy of the course of church history’, Richard Bauckham writes, ‘[is] the expectation of the End’. Foxe was convinced he was living at the end of time ‘in hope of the resurrection to come, & is now I trust at hand’. Betteridge’s reference to the 1570 edition as ‘apocalyptic’ is particularly adequate here, because the new extended apocalyptic framework cemented the structure for all subsequent editions and forcefully aided his reading of the persecutions of Protestants since Christ’s passion. Within these structural developments of Foxe’s apocalyptic thought, the Storye supports the fixed historiographical framework of the Acts. Through Revelation, Foxe reads the rise of the beast in the year ‘666’ and associates it with ‘this pestiferous sect of Mahumet’. Furthermore, he parallels the loosing of Antichrist in the late thirteenth century with the emergence of the Ottoman family about ‘the tyme and season of his [Satan’s] loosing out: ... For if we number well by the Scripture ... it amounteth to 1294. which was the very yeare when Ottomannus the first Turke begane his reigne’. The identification of Ottoman rise to power with the loosing of Satan supports Foxe’s newly established periodization. Further, Foxe observes that the rise of the Turks coincides with the arrival of the papal Antichrist doctrine of transubstantiation; here, a marginal note simply states ‘[t]he tyme of Transubstantiation. The tyme of the Turkes’. In short, Foxe found his newly applied historiography confirmed. Palle J. Olsen suggests that it was chiefly this change in the 1570 edition that prompted Foxe to include the Storye. In locating the beginning of the second persecution around 1300 A.D. instead of 1000 A.D. as he did in the 1563 edition, Olsen argues, Foxe was in need of an event that would represent the loosing of Satan, which would lead to the Storye’s inclusion.
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This internal evidence, his considerations arising from the first edition's shortcomings, and the overall desire for further reformation needs to be complemented by the perceived Turkish threat itself. Concluding his account of Turkish oppression, Foxe laments that 'as I was writing herof [...] newes was brought unto vs, how the Turke [...] hath nowe of this present yere, 1566. got the towne of Gyula about Transylvania'. Foxe's acute awareness of the Turk's progress is likely to have contributed to the decision to add the history. In any case it amplifies the perceived threat that arises from these events. According to the final cause, Englishmen and women, 'who thinke themselues to be out of danger', are not excused from considering 'what happeneth to their other brethren', instead thereby should 'excite their zeale and prayer to almighty God'. England's distance from the Ottoman Empire makes it an unlikely target for Ottoman incursions, but the threat of Turkish invasion should move those at home to pray for their 'brethren' of the 'vnuiersal Church' who are scattered throughout the world. Like prose-historiographies on the Turk, the Storye too participates in the discourse of a Turkish threat by perpetuating a Christian call to solidarity.

Historiographical motivation aside, I want to suggest an argument for the Storye's inclusion which hinges significantly on Foxe's identification of the Turk with Antichrist. As Foxe explains in his fifth cause, to encounter the Turk successfully on the battlefield, Christians have to follow the example of the Israelites, because, 'the whole course and historie of those Israelites, exemplifieth and beareth a propheticall image to vs, declaryng what is to be looked for in the vnuiersal Church of God dispersed through the world planted in Jesus Christ'. For Foxe, the fate of the people of Israel, recorded in the Old Testament, is the key to the reading of the prophecies of the New Testament. For him the past is 'the witnesse of tymes, the light of veritie, the lyfe of memory, teacher of lyfe, and shewer of
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but he regards history as *Heilsgeschichte* (salvation history) in which temporal events ‘through God’s lordship led to the faith to Jesus Christ’. He refers to ‘godly Abel slayne by wicked Cayn’ as the principal event in salvation history; and he assigns the role of those who ‘are oppressed by the contrary part, which belongeth not to God’ to Abel; other exemplary pairs for this dichotomy he lists are ‘Isaac and Ismael’, ‘Iacob and Esau’. These biblical figures from the Old Testament assert the typology of characters - the godly subjected by the reprobate – on which Foxe’s accounts of his martyrs relied.

Old Testament reading directs his understanding of New Testament prophecy. In Foxe’s *Storye*, such a reading accumulates in the parallel discussion of the history of Syrian persecution of the Israelites in the Old Testament, with that of Turkish cruelty towards Christians in his own days. For Foxe, both histories show remarkable similarities: following the Israelites’ deliverance from Babylonian captivity until their dissolution 564 years later, ‘the Churche of the Jewes was not gouerned vnder the authoritie of kynges, but the heygh priestes tooke all the power and authoritie to themselues’, likewise Christians, ‘especially of these later 564 yeares ... felt, but onely the Jurisdiction and domination of the Pope and his heygh Priests ... whereby, by the count of these yeares, it is to be thought the day of the Lords commyng not to be farre of’. The Syrians, for Foxe represent Antichrist of the Old Testament, and suggests ‘that the one Antichrist may well represent and prefigure the other’. Foxe calculates the apogee of Antichrist’s assault on the Israelites ‘about 191 yeares before the passion of our Sauior’, starting with the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes; the same scenario is envisaged for the Christians from ‘this present yeare [1566] backward’ resulting in the year 1375, the reign of Bajazeth. Foxe’s meticulous considerations are illustrated in a
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table which parallels the twelve ‘Syrian’ kings with twelve emperors of the ‘Turkes’. He expresses the hope that, like the two last Syrian kings, ‘the bloudy broude of this old Solyman ... may so fight together, and perish in their owne bloud’. He concludes his comparison by asserting that ‘[b]y consent of all writers, this Antiochus beareth a figure of the great Antichrist’; in his own days as Antichrist ‘is ment (no doubt) the Turke, prefigured by this Antiochus’.

In the light of this interpretation, the year 1566 means two things for Foxe: firstly, it marks further incursions by the Turk into Christian territory - ‘the towne of Gyula about Transylvania’, and secondly, it denotes the end of the 191 year-period which signals Antichrist’s return. The first point alone could have convinced Foxe to include the Storye; on the other hand, his plans to make use of the Turk as early as 1556 conflict with such an assumption. Rather, it is the development of Foxe’s interpretation of apocalyptic history, in combination with the strong evidence for an identification of Antichrist with the Turk that makes an inclusion possible. On a structural level, then, Ottoman invasions in 1566 serve at once as evidence for the temporal fulfilment of prophecy and confirm ‘the Prophecies of the new Testament’. Shifting emphasis onto the structural and methodological elements provides an explanation for the inclusion of the Storye as a response to the unfolding of the Reformation in England, Foxe had sought to support from his first edition onwards.

But Foxe’s identification of the Turk as Antichrist is as assertive as it is inconsistent. Following up other prophecies in the course of his Storye, he signals a change of direction from his earlier readings, when he declares that ‘Methodius sayth, not that Antichrist shall be borne among the Saracens, or Turkes, but among the people of God’; instead, ‘the pope may seme rather then the Saracen or the Turke, to be described’. This vacillation between the Pope and the Turk as Antichrist is revisited in his final assertions: ‘[b]ut if it be asked,
whether of them is the truer or greater Antichrist, ... the Turke is the more open and manifest
enemie against Christ and his Churche'. However, should he be asked ‘whether of them
two hath bene the more bloudy and pernicious aduersary to Christe and his members, or
whether of them hath consumed and spilt more Christian bloud, he with sword, or this with
fire and sword together, neither is a light matter to discern, neither is in my part here to
discusse, which do but onely write the hystorie, and the Actes of them both.

Foxe’s sudden retreat from his exegetical reading of the Turkes Storye may leave the
reader puzzled, but it also reminds us of the Turkish history’s other purpose, to chronicle the
unsuccessful warfare Christians led against the Turks. For Foxe the key to success is to purge
sin at home first, that is, to ‘ponder more depely with our selves the scourge of God for our
sinnes, and corrupt doctrine’. Reiterated throughout the Acts, this point is related to the reform
of the Church, the key to victory over the Turk, because only if ‘the Churche of Christ with
the Sacraments thereof, shalbe so reformed, that Christ alone shal be receaued to be our
justifier, all other religions, merites, traditions, images, patrons & advocates set apart: the
sword of the Christians, with the strength of Christ, shall soone vanquishe the Turkes pryde
and fury’. Notably, it is only a reformed universal Church, Foxe argues, that will persevere
in to face the Turkish threat. Solyman’s siege of Vienna in 1529 is a case in point for Foxe.
Following the description of Ottoman retreat from the city, the Catholic king Ferdinand of
Austria emerges on the scene whom Foxe denies the accolades of victory. Instead, he
maintains, it was thanks to ‘the merciful protection and benefit of almighty God’ that Turkish
defeat was accomplished: ‘notwithstandyng that neither Ferdinandus the kyng, nor the
Emperor his brother [Charles V] was there present, but onely the power of God, through the
valianntnes of the worthye Germains’. As Foxe’s explains, ‘take this for a note (gentle
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reader) howe and after what maner, Gods blessing goeth with the true reformers of his religion'. Unmistakeably here God favours the reformed Church.

Foxe's also stresses the combined obstacles Protestantism was facing under Turkish and Popish oppression. After a brief summary of troublesome events surrounding Solyman's succession after his father's death, Selim II, Foxe resumes his narrative of Solyman's siege of Belgrade:

Another vauntage also the Turkes had in besiegyng of Belgrade: For the Christian princes, at that time were in ciuill dissension and variaunce amongst them selues; and the Pope with his Churchemen also were so busie in suppressyng of Luther, and of the Gospell then newly springing, that they minded nothyng els, except it were to maintaine the wealth of their own bellyes. Which pope, if hee had set his care (as his duty was) so much in styring up princes agaynst the common enemy, as he was bent to deface the Gospell, and to persecute the true professours thereof: soone might he haue brought to pass, not onely that Belgrade myght have bene defended agaynst the Turke, but also that to be recovered againe, which was lost before: and moreover, he might have stopped the great daungers and perils, which now are like to fall vpon the religion and Church of Christ: which the Lord of his great mercy auert and turn away.116

Solyman's victory, a result of Christian disunity, is directly related to the Pope's conduct. Had the papacy not persecuted the true professors of Christ - the continued efforts to suppress Luther and his writings - the fall of Belgrade could have been averted, and Christian territory saved. As a result, the danger of Turkish invasion is now likely 'to fall vpon the religion and Church of Christ'. In contrast, Vienna is saved thanks to the power of God and the reformed Germans, Belgrade is scourged as a result of Christian discord and corrupt doctrine. Alive to these foreign events, Foxe essentially responds to the Protestant-Catholic debates at home. For his readership in 'this our countrey of England' such examples of Turkish cruelty served to ponder the 'sinnes, and corrupt doctrine' at home, accounts that were chosen to instil in
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English readers the desire to reflect on the spiritual health of their country through the acts of both Antichrists.117

Foxe's dissatisfaction with the course of Reformation in England has been noted by John King, Thomas Betteridge and, most recently, by Thomas Freeman. Freeman convincingly argues that Foxe's alterations to accounts of Elizabeth's life, particularly her imprisonment under Mary, her rise to power and her religious settlement, were changed and often fictionalised between the 1563 and the 1570 edition. In many cases these alterations are read as a direct criticism on the monarch's conduct in her role as a providential ruler in matters ecclesiastical.118 Freeman's analysis questions the commonly held belief of 'the glorification of Elizabeth as a means of securing the Elizabethan religious settlement', and draws attention to providence and its significance for the support of the Queen in these early narratives.119 He suggests that Foxe not only affirmed God's power in sustaining the Queen's life in the face of adversity, but also identified specific situations in which the power of providence saved Elizabeth from danger. The Bishop of Winchester, Stephen Gardiner's attempt to have Elizabeth executed under Mary, is just one example, which, as Freeman argues, helped to stimulate 'the development of Foxe's providential interpretation of Elizabeth's life and accession to the throne'.120 The important point here for my discussion is the way in which Foxe conceives of the relation between providence and the role the Queen was expected to fulfil: she was the vessel but He (i.e. God) was in charge.

Both the 1563 and 1570 editions of the Acts celebrate Elizabeth as a godly ruler. The iconographic images of the historiated initial 'C', unaltered in both dedications, draw their meaning from their respective Epistles Dedicatory. Elizabeth is presented as sitting on the
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throne with the toppled Pope lying at her feet, with a serpent wrapped around him whilst
Elizabeth is wielding, in her right hand, the sword of justice. The 1563 dedication likens
her to Constantine and thus associates her rule with that of the first Christian Emperor. The
dedication, as Thomas Betteridge observes, ‘is far from being a simple acclamation of the
new queen’ rather, it maintains ‘that Elizabeth’s succession was an act of God and that
therefore for her rule to remain true to itself it needs to continue to fulfil this God-given
role’. The second edition eschews such an association. Instead, Elizabeth’s role as an
instrument of God’s will is highlighted: ‘Christ, the Prince of all princes, who hath placed you
in your throne of majesty, under him to govern the Church and realm of England, give your
royal highness long to sit and many years to reign over us’. It is Foxe’s changed
designation of Elizabeth’s role from ‘supreme gouernour’ in 1563 to ‘principal governor’ in
1570 which expresses a new sentiment. The association of male rulership and her role as
‘supreme gouernour’ in the 1563 edition bestowed on the Queen an almost idealised status,
close to autocracy. With her new designation as ‘principal governor’ of the Church of
England under ‘Christ the Supreme Head of the same’, Foxe modifies such a status. The
divine right to rule did not suffice to justify lawful rule, as Ann McLaren maintains, ‘for
councillors, as for the queen, it would be the fruits of political action that would legitimate the
government’. Since, as John King observes, ‘the queen had serious reservations about
implementing further reforms in church worship that were supported by Foxe’ she was
vulnerable to criticism from within her own ranks. Foxe did not deny Elizabeth the right to
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rule over her subjects, but his further demand for Reformation, and her perceived failure to follow this path led to the emergence of a rather critical undercurrent in his praise for the Queen.

The Storye, I suggest, can be read as an extension of such criticism. In describing the Turkish siege of Chalcis, Foxe writes, it is memorable for 'how that the women of this city, seeing the men begin to faint, and the city to lie in present danger, took the matter themselves in hand, and playing the men, went to the walls, and there defended the city with no less trouble to the enemy, than the men had done before'. Their example is notable precisely because they were not men, but acted as if they were. Another, more telling example of female aptitude is advertised in a marginal note relating to 'A memorable facte of a virgine in defence of her countrey':

Aeneas Syluis, otherwise Pope Pius.2. in describyng Asia Minor, cap. 74 reciteth a certaine fact of a worthy virgine: who, at what tyme the Turkes were besiegyng a certain town in Lesbos, and had cast down a great part of the walles, so that all the townesmen had geuen ouer, putting on a mans harnes, stepped forth into the breache, where not onely she kept the Turkes from enteryng in, but also slue of them a great sorte. The Citizens seyng that rare courage and good succes of the mayden, tooke to them agayne their harte and harnes, and so lustely layd about them, that an incredible number of the Turkes were slaine. The rest beyng repulsed from the lande, reculed into their shyppes: who beyng then pursued by a navie of Calisa, were worthely discomfated lykewise vpon the sea. And thus was the Ile of Lesbos at that tyme, by a poore virgine, that is, by the strong hand of the Lorde workyng in a weake creature, preserued from the Turkes.

The fact that Lesbos had been under Turkish rule for more than a hundred years at the time of the Storye's composition is not mentioned in Foxe's account. This is significant, as the account focuses on the importance of the actions of the virgin, rather than on the fact that Christians have yet again lost lands to the Turks (something that is not even mentioned).

It is tempting to think of the virgin, who single-handedly warded off the Turks with a sword and inspired men to take up the same again, as an allegory for Elizabeth in her role as
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the principal protector of the Protestant faith. The iconography evokes that of the dedication through the defeat of the other Antichrist. This is certainly one way of reading this image. Nevertheless, in the light of Foxe’s concern about Elizabeth’s abandonment of the Reformation, the virgin’s victory highlights Elizabeth’s failure to have contained sufficiently the Catholic influence over her subjects. As the reader is told afterwards, the Turkish threat does not end with the defeat at Lesbos, nor does the Antichrist, in the shape of either the Turk or the Pope, stop infiltrating or conquering the godly community. More specifically, whereas the virgin of Lesbos gained victory over the Turk, Elizabeth is accused of having failed to ward-off this threat through her failure to reform the Protestant Church in England in full measure. Elsewhere, Foxe is even more explicit, when he excites fears of a Turkish threat from within, ‘[f]or though the ‘Turk seemeth to be farre of, yet do wee nourishe within our owne heartes at home, that may soone cause vs to feele his cruell hand, & worse, if worse may be: to ouer runne vs: to lay our land wast: to scatter vs amongst the infidels, the enemyes and blasphemers of the sonne of God’. In addressing the fears associated with this distant threat, Foxe conjures up in his readers’ minds a dystopia, in which Christians are scattered amongst the infidels unless they conform to the Protestant faith. It is the truth of the Word, Foxe argues, not the corrupt doctrine of Catholicism that serves as the weapon against the infidel.

Both the complexity and resourcefulness of Foxe’s composition makes his defence of the Protestant Church one of the most elaborate of the period. There was, as Christopher Highley points out, no Catholic equivalent to Foxe’s ‘histories’. The inclusion of the Turkes Storye enabled Foxe to go beyond the ongoing polemical exchanges between Catholics and Protestants. Although many of the orthodox associations remained, his narrative of the Turk’s rise strengthened his overall defence of the Protestant Church.
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Furthermore, Turkish history was a timely subject. In Foxe, it combined the external Turkish threat of current Ottoman invasions with the need to reform the Church and to purge the Turk within. In other words: turning the Turkish threat inwards enabled Foxe not only to argue in favour of the Protestant cause, but also to support his overall project of justifying the truthfulness of the Protestant Church. The inclusion of this digression was as much a result of Foxe’s extended historiography as it was a response to the needs of his Church and Christian responses to the increasing impact of the Ottoman Turks on Christian politics. This much is suggested by his inconsistent identification of the Turk with Antichrist. Finally, while the Turkes Storye adds to a sense of continuity in the history of the persecuted throughout the world, Foxe is adamant that unity against the Turk can only be achieved under the banner of Christ, while ‘[h]e that bringeth S George or S Denise, as patrons to the field to fight agaynste the Turk leaueth Christ (no doubt) at home’.\(131\) In short, Foxe’s outlook is pessimistic:

Such dissension and hostilitie Sathan hath set amongstest us, that Turkes be not more enemies to Christians than Christians to Christians, Papistes to Protestantes; yes protestantes with protestantes do not agree but fal out for trifles;\(132\)

2.3 ‘Chinano a Turke’ - advertising England’s Protestants

Thus far in this chapter, I have explored the ways in which the Turk served as an external reference point in the religious debates of post-Reformation England. I have considered the flexibility of the trope as a means by which religious views on both sides of the schism could be accommodated, and, in the case of John Foxe, how Turkish history was implemented to support the defence of the Protestant Church while reviewing the progress of further Reformation under the Elizabethan regime. In all of these cases, the Turk remained outside the Christian commonweal and belief system; a reference point through which both English

\(131\) Foxe, Acts, p. 872.
\(132\) John Foxe, A sermon of Christ crucified, preached at Paules Crosse the Friday before Easter, commonly called Goodfryday (London: John Day, 1570), STC 11242.3, sig. T2v.
Protestants and Catholics could articulate their allegiance to the Christian universal church. By contrast, my final example turns to the conversion of a Turk to Protestantism.

Meredith Hanmer’s sermon The Baptizing of a Turke (1586), which tells the story of ‘Chinano a Turke, borne at Nigropontus’, is the earliest printed English text to document the conversion of a Turk to the Christian faith. However, interest in the conversion of Muslims to Christianity had preoccupied Christians for many years, and debates on the subject appeared in a number of publications, for example in the work of Guillaume Postel. Thus it is not surprising that the rare event of an actual conversion of a Muslim to Christianity should readily be noted. On 18 August 1575 Peter Bizarus wrote to Lord Burghely in England that merchants who had lately arrived at Venice from Byzantium had reported ‘that a certain priest of the Mahometan faith whom they call in their language a “Moftin,” a man of approved virtue and singular learning, had declared both privately and in public assemblies that the Christian faith was the true faith and the Mahometan altogether false’. According to these merchants, the subsequent execution of this priest led to a mass conversion, which, confirmed by other reports, had inspired ‘over ten thousand men’ to convert to the Christian faith. Even before Burghley had received the news in August, Walsingham had been informed by July about the Turk’s alleged conversion. While such reports circulated as rumours rather than documented facts, they testify to the Christian belief (and hope) in the potential conversion of Muslims on a larger scale. Hanmer’s sermon is a detailed analysis of such a conversion with a distinctly Protestant spin.
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Notably, the Turk ‘Chinano’ is humanised and given a history. ‘By birth a Turke’ and ‘heretofore by profession a Saracen’, Hanmer writes in his preface, Chinano had been ‘addicted vnto the superstitious lawe of Mahomet’. But following a ‘publike confession of his true faith in Jesus Christ’, ‘marked by Baptisme’, he is then ‘sealed vp ... for the childe of God’. We are also told that he does not understand English, ‘but as heretofore vpon priuate conference, and at this present also by an interpreter in the Spanish tongue, hec is readic, and shall deliuer before you all, a true confession of the faith in Jesus Christ’. Further, we learn that ‘[h]e is about 40. yeares of age (as he saith himselfe) born at Nigropontus [which was] taken and subdued by the Turke, through treason of one Thomas Liburne, maister Gunne of Nigropontus, in the yeare 1471 ... [he then was] taken captive by the Spaniard, where he continued in great misery the space of 25 yeares, whome the most worthy knight S. Frauncis Drake found at Carthaginia’. David B Quinn has suggested that Hamner’s Turk was one of 100 Turkes brought by Sir Francis Drake out of the West Indyes (where they served as slaves in the Spanishe Galleys)’ in 1586.

This carefully choreographed sermon reflects current political and religious concerns. Nabil Matar has acknowledged this, pointing to the text’s two principal political themes, the promotion of ‘Protestantism and the conflict between England and Spain’. Here, I am interested in the ways in which the Turk enables Hanmer to articulate and elaborate upon these concerns, but also how his strategic use of the Turk reflects on the relationship between the English Protestant commonweal and the universal church. Despite giving his readers a history of this singular Turk, Hanmer notably refers to ‘Chinano’ simply as a Turk throughout the text. The use of a generic designation allows Hanmer to talk about both the convert and
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other Turks more generally; this much is suggested in his comment on further conversions, 'wheras now one silly Turk is won, ten thousands no doubt woulde receiue the faith'. It is only at the end of the sermon, after he is baptized and given his Christian name, 'William', that the Turk has become a Christian. Before that moment, he had remained alien to the Christian community. And it is his status as an outsider to Christendom that allows Hanmer to present the Turk's arguments for conversion as purportedly objective. In turn, this provides Hanmer with a strong case for the promotion of an English Protestant commonweal as the true form of the universal church. Foxe's Protestant Church was not limited to England, but could be found throughout the world; in Hanmer's case, it is specifically English, because, as we will see, the Turk is shown to prefer Protestantism over Catholicism as the result of Englishmen's actions, rather than by faith alone.

Hanmer begins his sermon by surveying the current state of Christianity. He deplores the overwhelming presence of other religions with 'Christian religion' couched 'in the North partes of the world'. As the cause for this, he identifies the corruption in Christendom which, according to Hanmer, is recognised throughout the world:

The heathens in far countries do wonder at the couetousnes of the christians, & the cruelty among other nations of the Spaniard. Presbiter John in Affrike crieth out vpon the Christian Princes for their diuision & discorde. The great Turk at Constantinople laugheth the pope & his prelats to scorn for their pride, the Christian churches he reuileth, and not without cause for their idols & images

While Hanmer's emphasis on the 'the cruelty among other nations of the Spaniard' reflects contemporary Anglo-Spanish hostilities, his address is directed at all Christians in the universal church. In his formulation Hanmer resists a straightforward identification of Christian transgression with the Turk; instead, he inverts the paradigm and voices the scorn Turks and heathens hold for Christian depravity.
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With the Turk as a judge of Christian virtues (or the lack thereof), Hanmer can build his Protestant case on the actual conversion of ‘Chinano’. He lists two principal reasons for the Turk’s conversion:

The one before his coming to England, the other at his arrival. Before his coming, the virtue, the modesty, the godliness, the good usage, & discrete government of the English Christians, & amongst others (as he chiefly noted) he was most beholden unto the Right worshipfull knight S. Frauncis Drake; and the worthy captain W. Haukins, terming them most worthy Christians. After his arrival, he saw courtesy, gentleness, friendly salutations of the people, succour for him & his countrymen, pite & compassion of the English men, & withal he learned that the poor, the aged, the impotent, the sick & diseased Christians were provided for whereas in his country, & where he had been in captivity, the poor, the sick, & diseased were scorned, despised & accounted of as dogs.\textsuperscript{148}

Overwhelmed by England’s virtuous Christians, in particular by ‘S. Frauncis Drake; and the worthy captain W. Haukins’, the Turk testifies to the care and charity he finds exhibited in this country. His own experiences at home and in captivity contrast strongly with these new impressions. Notably, the stress here is on acts and deeds, rather than religious tenets that, ultimately, persuade the Turk to convert.

Inevitably the sermon turns to the Turk’s captivity under Spanish rule. Strategically followed by this eulogy on England’s godly Christians, Hanmer reports that the Turk ‘utterly, misliked in the Spaniard (which diswaded him from the faith) his cruelty in shedding of blood, and his Idolatry in worshipping of Images’.\textsuperscript{149} Once again, he digresses briefly in his endeavour to vilify Spain, supported by the Turk’s confirmation of the Spaniard’s cruelty.\textsuperscript{150} The Spaniard’s actions contrast with those of the English, and while idolatry is condemned and ascribed solely to ‘that Antichrist of Rome’,\textsuperscript{151} Hanmer - purporting to have adopted the stance of an observer - recommends to his readers not his own but the Turk’s judgement in
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order to decide which religion should be preferred: 'Then we see what the Saracen commendeth, and moueth him to glorifie the God of the Christians, and what he discommendeth, and dissuadeth him from the faith'. By virtue of commendation and disapproval, the Turk serves as an index of the true faith. The implication is that Chinano's choice of Protestant England over Catholic Spain, Protestantism is given the seal of the true faith. Furthermore, the Turk opted for England and Protestantism, not because England was Protestant, but because the virtues exhibited by its representatives, Drake and Hawkins in particular, convinced him. After all, it was, 'not holy words, but works, not the name of faith, but the view of fruits' that moved the Turk to turn Christian, Hanmer asserts.

Prompted by this success, an enthusiastic Hanmer extends this logic, and suggests the likelihood of further conversion of others, in particular Turks. Indeed, Muhammad himself had allegedly 'commended the Christian faith'. Another, more contemporary example he cites refers to the great Turk, Murad III:

Musdafa Beg, secretary to the great Turke of Constantinople that now is writing to the Queene of England as appeareth by his letters bearing date the 15. of March, and in the yeare of great Iesu (so he writeth) 1579. sheweth the great affection his maister the Turke together with himselfe beareth to this lande and of our religion as it is interpreted he saith thus: We know that your soueraigne Maiesty among all the Christians haue the most sound religion, and therefore the Christians throughout the world envy your highnes, whom if they could, they would hurt.

These comments do not imply that Hanmer necessarily considered Islam or the Ottomans in favourable terms - Hanmer spends two-thirds of his sermon railing against Muhammad's 'false doctrine and wicked religion' - but he recognises an ambivalent relationship between Ottoman Turks and England, if only for the potential such an association has for his own agenda. That the great Turk considers England's Christians to 'haue the most sound
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religion' only confirms what ‘Chinano’ has already suggested: England's Protestant commonweal is the true model for the universal church. And this, Hanmer confidently asserts, is ‘what the enemye reporteth of our God, of Iesus our Saviour, and the worde of God which wee professe’.

The Baptizing of a Turke triggers many debates. While the sermon reflects the contemporary political situation between England and Spain, it also demonstrates another refined use of the Turk in Protestant rhetoric. Hanmer constructs an argument around the conversion of the Turk which promotes the idea of a specifically English Protestant commonweal as a template for the universal church. Laudable actions, which are distinctly English and not faith, are the cause for the Turk’s conversion. As a purportedly objective judge, the Turk is used as a measure for Christian conduct. From Hanmer’s point of view, England has successfully achieved what ‘the Saracen commendeth’. However, overlooking the current state of religion in Christendom in general and Spain in particular, he deplores the fact that many more Turks could have been converted, but ‘this is the credite these Images haue brought in to the Church, this was a stumbling blocke in the way of this Saracen that he would not be baptized in Spain, Fie vpon Idolatry, filth, and abhomination’. Here, Hanmer calls for Reformation throughout the universal church – ‘Let the Church of God bee swept’ – because, ‘then will the Heathens the Iews, the Turks & Saracens the sooner come in’.

On a final note, by the time Hanmer had published his sermon and presented his arguments, the trope of the Turk in Christian rhetoric had become a means of expressing the entrenched antagonism between Protestants and Catholics. The range of Protestant applications of the Turk to Catholic enemies as a marker of difference and heresy was aptly summarised by the Protestant Matthew Suitcliffe in his preface to the De Turcopapismo (1599):
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Turcismus is therefore all those impieties and collection of errors which now the Turks, whether received from Muhammad or his successors, hold and defend, be they contained in the Qur'an, in any other book, or in unwritten tradition. In some places we also understand Turcismus to be moral turpitude in agreement with the impure dogma of the Turks.  

Here, it is worth recalling Edwin Sandys' assessment of Christian unity in the face of a Turkish threat. As I mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, for Sandys, 'persuasion', the practice of both Catholics and Protestants to 'eate out the strength of the other' and thus to draw 'away by perswasion his followers and adherents', was a second, more promising option compared to unity as necessity.  

With 'vnitie of veritie' on the Protestant side, and the 'Papists hope that their perswasion being seconded by so great Princes authoritie', the aim of reconciling Christendom, once again, became a distant ideal. Sandys doubts that Catholics would unite with Protestants since Catholic 'desires & attempts to recover England' would prevent any such union. The main cause for the Catholic desire to recover England, Sandys reasons, is England's role in the Reformation, 'the onely nation that walke the right way of justifiable reformation'. If the Turk as a trope in these debates was used by both sides of the Protestant/Catholic divide, it was above all a measure of Christendom's war with itself.

In this chapter I have argued that both English Protestants and Catholics employed the Turk as a trope through which they articulate and defend their vision of a Protestant community. Furthermore, the texts explored here reveal the complexities and flexibility of this trope to accommodate opposing political and religious positions on both sides of the schism. In this capacity, I suggested, the Turk offered another term through which English Protestant writers conducted the continuing process of Reformation in England. Furthermore, as I have demonstrated in my discussion of Watson's sermon advocating the Eucharist and
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Luther's English tract on Protestant resistance to Catholicism, the use of the Turk not only intensified their respective accusations, it also allowed each group to articulate and strengthen their respective positions in relation to a universal church — that is, to define the form of its religious community. In the case of Pole's oration, I have indicated the potential offered and the complexities involved in the appropriation and use of the Turk in Protestant writings. More importantly, the text's sophisticated use of the Turk establishes England as a Protestant community against the claims of a Catholic Church universal, represented by Pole and his attempt to incite Charles V to conquer England.

However, the use of the Turk in John Foxe's Acts and Monuments demonstrates that the association between the Protestant Church and England is not necessarily so neat. Instead, Foxe establishes a lengthy justification of the Protestant Church which he places in an international context, and which he supports by his addition of the Turkes Storye into his overall historiographical framework. Here, his identification of the Turk as Antichrist is crucial, because it allows him to link the progress of the Catholic Church with the rise of the Ottoman Turks around 1300. In turn, this synthesis strengthens his case for a pure Protestant Church which is now persecuted by both the Catholic Church and the Turk. Further, the inclusion of the history of the Turk allows him to criticise what he perceived as an insufficient progress of the Reformed Church in England. Finally, at the other end of the Christian spectrum, Meredith Hanmer's sermon, The Baptizing of a Turke, identifies the Protestant community with the English people. Here, the Turk is at once a measure for the universal truth of Protestantism and its most ardent advocator. Steeped in anti-Spanish propaganda, the sermon nonetheless demonstrates the effectiveness of the trope and the potential for its application. At the same time, the text does not betray a sense of the deep-seated antagonism that marks these religious debates in which each of its participants could be worse than the Turk. The representation and uses of the Turk in religious writings largely testify to the religious investments of their authors. While Richard Knolles' equally antagonistic Historie
seeks to unite Christians to act against the Turks by portraying them as accurately as possible, the portrayals of Turks in religious writings, in particular in John Foxe, owe more to a strict millenarian, militant Protestantism. Both writers have similar objectives – to overcome dissension and unite against a common enemy – but for Foxe this threat came above all from Catholicism.
3. **Anxious travellers – English identities and Ottoman Turks**

Do not under-value an Enemy by whom you have been worsted. When our Country-men came home from fighting with the Saracens, and were beaten by them, they pictured them with huge, big, terrible Faces (as you still see the Sign of the Saracen’s Head is) when in truth they were like other Men. But this they did to save their own Credits.¹

In their exploration of the *imago Turci* the last two chapters have focused on historical works on the Ottomans and religious documents. These texts largely represent domestic constructions of the *imago Turci* and reflect an English preoccupation with pan-Christian unity as a means to ward off a perceived Turkish threat, whilst simultaneously indicating an increasing interest in the Ottomans and their institutions. On the other hand, read against the background of the continuing religious struggles following the Reformation in England, the Turk was also of interest in its capacity as a trope through which both Protestants and Catholics expressed their respective religious and ideological positions. This chapter is concerned with travel narratives which retell actual encounters between English travellers and Ottoman Turks. By examining the journeys undertaken by three English travellers who ventured to the dominions of the Ottomans – the captive Thomas Saunders, the Protestant pilgrim Henry Timberlake, and the humanist George Sandys – this chapter not only explores the different contexts of their encounters, but also the ways in which they reflect on these in terms of their own English Protestant identity. Although these travellers all visited the Ottoman Empire in different capacities, it should be noted that they all undertook these travels at a time in which England’s relations with the Porte had been firmly established. Nonetheless, for many English travellers the Turk represented

¹ John Selden, *Table-talk, being discourses of John Seldon, Esq or his sense of various matters of weight and high consequence, relating especially to religion and state* (London: Jacob Tonson, 1696), WING S2438, p. 182; also quoted in Chew, *The Crescent and the Rose*, p. 146; see also Burton, *Traffic and Turning* p. 34.
even then a considerable source of anxiety, and the responses to these encounters differ significantly. One of the aims of this chapter is to demonstrate the diversity of these responses; in so doing it is important to note the significance of the traveller’s capacity in writing and reflecting about the experience of going. Above all, this chapter argues that these portrayals should not be understood in terms of anxieties related to the Turks alone, but that they are the result of a complex interplay between a number of variables, the individual’s views, the traveller’s capacity, and anxieties associated with travel itself. Daniel Carey notes that authors of travel accounts typically use the ‘public terrain of print’ as an opportunity to ‘establish the integrity of identity’, and concludes that to look for ‘more explicit deliberations over identity’ one has to look elsewhere. However, as we will see, it is possible to extrapolate some of these ‘deliberations’ through the writer’s engagement with the Turks. John Selden’s comment on returning soldiers who had fought the ‘Saracens’ abroad neatly exemplifies the points made above.

In his evocative comment on war, the lawyer and historian John Selden (1584-1654), singles out the Saracens as objects of both success and ridicule. Images of Saracens ‘with huge, big, terrible Faces’ were not exclusive to soldiers’ tales, but also belonged to the fictitious world of medieval romances; the latter, however, remained popular throughout the sixteenth century. In these narratives Christian heroes usually defeated or converted their Islamic opponents, while Christian soldiers elsewhere were often less fortunate, and returned – if at all – home defeated. In turn, as Selden maintains, they fictionalised their enemy in order to divert attention from their own


3 See further chapter 5, passim.
failure, and restore their own credibility. Samuel Chew, exploring the portrayals of the Saracen in the context of English alehouse signs, thinks such an explanation far-fetched, because 'the motive was, obviously, to caricature one's enemy'. I concur with this view, but in the context of Selden's original remark, I would further argue that these, and similar representations reflect a process in which Christians had to come to terms with their own and their enemy's identities. Selden's example not only indicates the complexity of this process, it also shows an awareness of the fictitious nature of these images. The monstrous Saracens are the result of the soldiers' anxieties arising from their failure in battle abroad and their expectations at home. Moreover, Selden's conclusion that the Saracens 'were like other Men' further suggests affinity rather than absolute difference between Christian and Muslim soldiers. There is then in the soldier's portrayal a sense in which cultural commensurability is at once recognised and discarded; the ambivalence is retained, however, because the soldiers' self-image compares unfavourably with the image they have of the Saracens.

With this emphasis on travel it may seem perverse to begin this discussion with an example that is, perhaps, not immediately associated with travel as such. Thomas Palmer, in his An Essay of the Meanes how to make our Trauailes, into forraine Countries, the more profitable and honourable (1606), however, considers soldiers - alongside 'Ambassadors', 'Intelligencers', and 'Messengers' - as regular travellers. Palmer's reference to soldiers as travellers is a reminder of the diversity of people early modern culture embraced under this notion of travel; it also suggests its

4 Chew, The Crescent and the Rose, p. 146.
6 Thomas Palmer, An Essay of the Meanes how to make our Trauailes, into forraine Countries, the more profitable and honourable. (London: Humphrey Lownes, 1606), STC 1075.14, sig. IA.
significance for society at large by indicating the vast network of social relations through which people communicated news and politics.\textsuperscript{7} The documentation of travel, on the other hand, was a different matter. Not every traveller was also a writer, kept a diary, or composed and published a narrative of his (and less often) her ventures. Selden’s soldiers are a case in point; we only know about them because he chose to comment on them. They are a useful reminder that while not all narratives have come down to us in print or manuscript, their tales left considerable impressions as they circulated, for example, in public houses and the market place.\textsuperscript{8}

Aside from this kind of indirect and often irretrievable information, a great number of extant travel accounts portray meetings between English travellers and Ottoman Turks, both in manuscript and print.\textsuperscript{9} As was noticed already the period under consideration saw a notable increase in published material on Anglo-Ottoman encounters from the 1580s onwards, predominately as a result of England’s initiation of commercial and diplomatic relations with the Ottoman Empire in the late 1570s.\textsuperscript{10} These relations are significant for the actual explanation for the increase, but they do


\textsuperscript{8} Adam Foxe, \textit{Oral and Literate Culture in England, 1500-1700} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002) p. 32; The story of ‘Vincent Juckes’, a seaman from Myddle who had been captured by the Turks, but who successfully escaped, recalls that on his return he ‘bought a new sute of cloaths, and a good horse, and came downe to Myddle, and was there att what time they were singing ballads abroad in Markett townes of this adventure’ in Richard Goughe, \textit{The History of Myddle} ed. by David Hey (London: Penguin, 1981), repr. 1988, at p. 115.


not, in any case, reveal the kinds of traveller. Merchants may have been the vanguard of English travel to the Ottomans in Elizabeth’s reign, but they were not their sole representatives.11 William Sherman recently outlined a cast of people involved in the genre of travel writing between 1500 and 1720, which included pilgrims, errant knights, merchants, explorers, colonisers, castaways, ambassadors and pirates.12 I would add another kind of traveller to this list, the educational traveller, who, with the rise of the ‘Grand Tour’ in the seventeenth century, would play a significant role in shaping the genre.13 What needs to be stressed here is the diversity of travellers, and the significance of the role in which a traveller encountered the Turk for the ways in which an account reflects on the identity of both the Turks and the traveller.

Like Selden’s soldiers, a traveller’s capacity informs to a large extent the ways in which he or she views, experiences, writes and reflects on their travels. Inevitably, these views are linked to the traveller’s motivation to visit these countries in the first place. Gerald Maclean’s recent study, The Rise of Oriental Travel, emphasises this aspect by retelling journeys undertaken by four Englishmen who in their respective roles reflected on and wrote about their ventures in very different ways.14 For my own purposes I adopt a similar approach and structure my discussion of each narrative around the traveller’s capacity.15 In doing so I seek to emphasise the specificity of each traveller’s experience, their specific purposes or motivation, but above all I stress

---

11 Matar, Turks, Moors and Englishmen, pp.43-82.
13 Hadfield, Literature, Travel, and Colonial Writing, p. 13 n. 28.
that no single account can be representative for the entirety of Anglo-Ottoman encounters. Instead, each of the three travel accounts discussed here is informed by its specific historical moment and reflects always only the localized experience of the encounter. This is not to say, however, that the Turkish threat is absent. It resurfaces in a variety of forms, above all in anxieties of physical and spiritual harm, the fear of apostasy to Islam which permeates many of the accounts.

I do not want to suggest that the choice of travellers represents a teleological order in which the captive is substituted by the pilgrim and so on. Instead, I want to stress that all these forms of travel co-existed, but in any case emerged at different points in time. What they share, however, is that in the meeting with Ottoman Turks each testifies to a process of cross-cultural encounter in which important aspects of the traveller’s identity and values are tested, examined, reinforced but also questioned. For the relativist Michel de Montaigne this process generally poses a problem in the context of Christian encounters with other cultures. He observes in his essay On the Cannibals:

[w]e have no other criterion of truth or right-reason than the example and form of the opinions and customs of our own country. There we always find the perfect religion, the perfect polity, the most developed and perfect way of doing anything.¹⁶

Just as Montaigne’s ideal that only a ‘man so simple ... wedded to no cause’ could report truthfully about a foreign country contrasts starkly to his contemporaries’ ethnocentric approach, so the travel narratives discussed in this chapter, too, reveal the individual investments of their writers.¹⁷ What is more, Montaigne’s criticism on his contemporary’s ethnocentrism implies a univocal approach while, as we will see,

¹⁷ Ibid. p. 231.
English encounters with the Turks took place largely in circumstances that were marked as poly-vocal - albeit on unequal terms - both in an actual and a textual sense.\(^{18}\)

Each narrative discussed here offers a unique and nuanced view of English encounters with Ottoman Turks and Islam. And sometimes they exhibit a different view to the one advocated by Montaigne, namely that no other criterion of truth exists other than what is found at home. What these travellers recognise is that in religion, customs and politics Ottoman Turks successfully question what Montaigne identifies for Christian encounters with the New World. Intricately related to this exploration is the issue of identity formation. As Gerald MacLean already pointed out 'the study of Anglo-Ottoman encounters is also necessarily an enquiry into the global formations of Englishness itself'.\(^{19}\) In this sense, the *imago Turci* not only serves as the framework in which English identity is played out, but it also functions as one of its formative influences. Before I turn to the narratives themselves, this chapter opens with a brief survey of early travel to the Ottomans, followed by some comments on the art of travel writing, the *ars apodemica* in order to contextualise the following discussion.

3.1 Travel contexts, Ottoman Turks and 'English bodies'\(^{20}\)

According to *The Travels of Sir John Mandeville* (1352?), Englishmen always had a predilection for travel; they are ruled by the moon, 'the traveller's planet'.\(^{21}\) The first destination of the title's eponymous knight from St Alban takes him to the 'Holy

\(^{18}\) See also Carey, 'Travel, Identity', pp. 39-47.

\(^{19}\) MacLean, *The Rise of Oriental Travel*, p. xiii.

\(^{20}\) Joseph Hall, *Quo Vadis? A just censure of travell as it is commonly vndertaken by the gentlemen of our nation* (London: Edward Griffin, 1617), STC 12705a, sig. B6".

Land'; more precisely, on a pilgrimage which he combines with a call to 'each good Christian' to conquer 'this land, and chase out therefrom those who are misbelievers'.

The account itself, however, details his adventures describing the customs and religions encountered in the lands of the Sultan of Egypt, and the Great Khan. Despite the initial hostility, Mandeville’s meeting with the Sultan is amiable and on good terms. In the end the call to crusade vanishes as the narrative progresses.

The text’s gloss on the wanderlust of English travellers not only serves as a useful reminder for the enthusiasm with which they are portrayed pursuing their undertakings, but it also testifies to the long standing interest of travel – albeit in a fictitious mould – to Islamic-ruled countries. Moreover, Mandeville’s fiction obscures a number of other concerns that preoccupied real travellers; for once, travel was by no means easy, and not every traveller to the Ottomans was as fortunate as Sir John. Nonetheless, reprinted throughout the sixteenth century, the text proved popular, and was even included as a Latin translation in Richard Hakluyt’s 1589 edition of the Principal Navigations as evidence for English travel to the East.

The purpose of this section is not to rehearse medieval travel narratives. Nor is it to dwell on extensive discussions of travel writing per se. However, the preliminary remarks that follow seek to provide a contextual framework for the following
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22 The Travels of Sir John Mandeville, pp. 43-4.
24 Mandeville’s fictitious work was reprinted several times 1496, 1499, 1500, 1568, 1582; and in Latin in Richard Hakluyt, The principall navigations, voiages and discoueries of the English nation made by sea or ouer land, to the most remote and farthest distant quarters of the earth at any time within the compass of these 1500 yeeres: deuided into three seuerall parts, according to the positions of the regions wherunto they were directed ... Whereunto is added the last most renowned English navigation, round about the whole globe of the earth (London: George Bishop and Ralph Newberie, 1589), STC 12625, sigs. B6*-G4; henceforth referred to as PN (1589); Mandeville’s text, however, was removed from the second edition (1598-1600).
discussion by outlining a number of problems that informed English travel and travel writing. In particular, I will be looking at some of the circumstances that both fuelled and hindered travel to the Ottomans, and the sources available to travellers who wished to inform themselves prior to their journey. It is important to remember that travel in sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century England was both a source of considerable anxiety and a textual practice. The fact that travels were transmitted and shaped by other textual accounts—a second journey, as it were, with its own rules and realities—was not lost on either readers or writers, and can be glimpsed, to a different extent, in the documents discussed here. For the returned traveller who desired to publish his or her visits, this second journey often served as a means (or opportunity) by which either to forestall or circumvent potential criticism that may or may not be levelled at the itinerary.

I began this section with Mandeville as a reminder that English travel to the Ottomans did not begin ex nihilo in Elizabeth’s reign. Hakluyt recognised this and exploited the significance of such cross-cultural travel for his purposes. The significance of commercial and diplomatic relations between England and the Porte cannot be underestimated as a cause and explanation for England’s increased interest in travel to the Ottomans during the period, but by the same token, it is easy to forget that these cross-cultural encounters with the Turks had taken place before albeit under different circumstances. For the pre-Elizabethan period Gregory O’Malley has shown that English travellers regularly visited the Mediterranean and the Ottoman Empire in different capacities at least since the mid-fifteenth century, long before the onset of

26 Sherman, ‘Stirrings and Searchings’, p. 31.
England's relations with the Porte. The next chapter demonstrates the importance of these early ventures for Hakluyt, who restores a largely muted history of English travel to Muslim-dominated regions in the Mediterranean.

It is worthwhile to return briefly to pilgrimage because it differs significantly from later forms of travel in that it was not a domain exclusively occupied by men, but was open to women alike. As an act of penance or thanksgiving, pilgrims travelled from across Western Christendom to the Holy Land and Jerusalem. Their journeys were dangerous and expensive, but often their accounts would not note such circumstances. One reason for such reservations can be ascribed to the status in which curiosity was held; it was a stigma pilgrims tried to avoid, because it was largely considered a vice. As part of their objective, many pilgrims recorded their journey through a spiritual lens, devoid of anything that deemed unnecessary to the immediate purpose of enacting the passage from birth to salvation. Perhaps the best known example for such an attitude of holy separation is the pilgrim Margery Kempe. She dictated her journey through the Holy Land and to Jerusalem in predominately biblical terms. Oblivious to everything except the landscape of the New Testament Kempe might mention Saracens as her guides, but, Diane Watt observes, 'most of the Muslim context vanishes'.

---

27 Gregory O'Malley, 'Pilgrimage, crusades, trade and embassy: pre-Elizabethan English contacts with the Ottoman Turks', 3 (2004), Crusades, 153-170; see also Schwoebel, The Shadow and the Crescent, pp. 176-201.
28 Howard, Writers and Pilgrims, pp. 17-40.
29 Christian K. Zacher, Curiosity and Pilgrimage: The Literature of Discovery in Fourteenth Century England (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976), p. 4; of course, this does not mean that pilgrims were not curious, or did not indulge in that curiosity which associated them with the image of the travel liar; see Chew, Crescent and the Rose, pp. 3-54.
30 Howard, Writers and Pilgrims, pp. 11-12.
31 Diane Watt, 'Faith in the Landscape: Overseas Pilgrimages in The Book of Margery Kempe', in A Place to Believe In: Locating Medieval Landscapes ed. by
This does not mean, however, that pilgrims' encounters with Muslims are entirely absent. In 1366, for instance, Isolda Parewastel of Bridgwater in Somerset had related to the pope the news of her ordeals in the Holy Land in which, for three years, she had 'visited the Lord's Sepulchre and other holy places' every day. During that time she was captured by Saracens 'stripped and placed head downwards on a rack and beaten', but escaped miraculously from the hands of her captors. There is no specific information on her captors, and she gives no explanation as to why she was punished. Despite this lack of detailed knowledge on Muslims in such accounts, the pilgrim's capacity as purveyor of valuable information was considerable. In 1375, for instance, pilgrims served as authorities to confirm the 'ill estate of the Saracens in the Holy Land and Egypt', an information originally obtained by Nicholas Malavena, 'an apostate, [who] lived many years with them'. Notably, much of the information on medieval travellers' experiences which I have given so far has come down to us in State Papers and other official documents; it hardly ever surfaces in the pilgrim's account.

These few examples illustrate two important points: firstly, the significance of women as travellers, a capacity from which they are absent in the travel narratives of the sixteenth and early seventeenth century; secondly, pilgrimage neatly exemplifies one of the ways in which a traveller's capacity determines the ways in which the

32 Cited in Diana Webb, 'Freedom of movement? Women travellers in the Middle Ages', in Studies on medieval and early modern women – pawns or players? ed. by Christine Meek and Catherine Lawless (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2003), pp. 75-90, p. 87; I am grateful to Diane Watt for this reference.
33 Ibid. p. 87.
journey is viewed and later recalled. With the pilgrim's view squarely on the
significance of holy places the account supersedes the actual journey, and the
attending circumstances. On the other hand there existed a small corpus of texts, both
in manuscript and print, which provided pilgrims with information and advice on
travel to the Holy Land, specifically referring to dangers and potential problems they
could encounter in their journey. Following Henry VIII's break with Rome and the
Reformation, the Catholic institution of pilgrimage was abandoned, and only saw a
brief resurrection under Mary.

Reprinted in Richard Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations, The voyage of M. John
Locke* (1553) recounts the itinerary of this English pilgrim who went to Jerusalem
during Mary's reign. The otherwise unremarkable account makes an interesting
reference to the prophet Muhammad, and the significance of wearing the colour green
in Islamic countries. Preparing for landing to make his way to Jerusalem, Locke was
notified by one of the shippe that had beene a slave in Turkie, that no man might

---

1. William Wey, *The Itineraries of William Wey, Fellow of Eton College. To
Jerusalem, A.D. 1458 and A.D. 1462; and to Saint James of Compostella, A.D.
1456* (London: J.B. Nichols for the Roxburgh Club, 1857); *Information for
pilgrymes vnto the holy londe* (1498?), STC 14081; Anon, *This is the begynynge,
and contynuance of the pylgrymage of Sir Richarde Guylforde Knyght [and]
controuler vnto our late soueraygne lorde kynge Henry the. vij. And howe he went
with his seruanutz and company towards Iherusalem* (London, 1511) STC 12549.

2. Richard Hakluyt, *The principal nauigations, voyages, traffiques and discoueries
of the English nation made by sea or ouer-land, to the remote and farthest distant
quarters of the earth, at any time within the compasse of these 1600. yeres:
divided into three severall volumes, according to the positions of the regions,
whereunto they were directed. The first volume containeth the worthy discoueries,
&c. of the English ... The second volume comprehendeth the principall nauigations
.. to the south and south-east parts of the world* (London: By George Bishop,
Ralph Newberie, and Robert Barker,1598-1600), STC 12626a, II, sigs. I3r-K2v;
hereafter referred to as *PN* (1598-1600); Hakluyt labels Locke's pilgrimage as a
journey, and thus responds to the Protestant rejection of this institution; in fact, the
actual account of the visit to Jerusalem is glossed in Latin while the remainder of
the text is in English.
weare greene in this land, because their prophet *Mahomet* went in greene*. By the
time Locke's account fell into Hakluyt's hands, Anglo-Ottoman relations were
thriving and travellers, by then, regularly visited Ottoman dominions for a variety of
purposes. The information is not only of interest because it is possibly the first
mention of the colour's significance in an English text, but also because it illustrates
the importance of reliable knowledge on Ottoman culture on which a successful
journey depended. While polemical portrayals of Islam serve purposes at home,
their usefulness for travel are rather limited.

Following Elizabeth's accession and the restoration of Protestantism as the
official religion in England, the Catholic institution of pilgrimage was abandoned.
English travel to Ottoman dominions was now largely limited to merchants who
sporadically pursued trade in the Mediterranean. If pilgrimage had been looked at
with suspicion, travel in general continued to be a source of anxiety. For humanists
like Roger Ascham visiting foreign people was a dangerous undertaking exposing the
traveller to vice and corruption; a critique he fully expressed in his posthumously
published *The Scholemaster* (1570). In it, Ascham cautions his readers of the
manifold vices travellers encountered especially in Italy, among them the 'libertie to
embrace all Religions, and becum, if he lust at once, without any let or punishment,
Jewish, Turkish, Papish, and Deuillish'. A similar line of argument was retained by
Joseph Hall who in 1617 still protests against the waywardness of many young men

---

38 Ibid. Sig. 16*.  
39 For example, the traveller Fynes Moryson notes before his departure for Jerusalem
in 1596 'the dangers of wearing the colour green' in Ottoman dominions; *An
Itinerary Containing His Ten Yeeres Travell through the Twelve Dominions of
Germany, Bohmerland, Sweitzerlan, Netherland, Denmarke, Poland, Italy, Turky,
France, England, Scotland & Irleand* 4 vols (Glasgow: James MacLehose and
41 Ibid. sig. K2*.  
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who sought education abroad. He alerts his readers to the dangers that such unnecessary movements corrupt Englishness itself when he laments that only ‘few young travellers have brought home, sound and strong, and (in a word) English bodies’. Yet for him travel is not entirely reprehensible, and he concedes that it is permissible, but only with regard to the ‘[m]atter of Trafique, and Matter of State’.

At the other end of the spectrum we find advocates of travel like John Stell. In his dedication of Nicholas de Nicolay’s translation of The Nauigations, peregrinations and voyages, made into Turkie (1585) to Sir Henry Sidney, he celebrates travellers as men worth of ‘perfect prayse of wisedome and learning’, as they are ‘conuersant in this worlde as in a Theater of mans life’, not by the reading of books alone, but ‘by due triall are taught the diuersities of countries, the differences of peoples manners, the examples of life, and manifold thinges besides’. The traveller is elevated (or ennobled) to a position of worth and honour comparable to other authorities, primarily those of antiquity. As for the worth of the traveller, he is measured:

not onelye to talke by knowledge roundly of such famous Cities, Countries, people, and other strange obiectes as he hath seene; but also to speake their language redily, to learne their manners desirously, to know their religion perfectly, their pollicie throughly, their gouvernment absolutely, and all thinges els, that hee may imploy himselfe about profitably.

John Stell’s choice of de Nicolay’s travels suggests not only that the latter’s account of Turkey is exemplary, and that de Nicolay himself is a role model for such a

---

42 Hall, Quo Vadis?, sig. B6v.
43 Ibid. sig. A6v.
traveller, but also that travel to the dominions of the Ottomans is desirable. Instead of merely reading about such places, though ‘sweete in euery ones eare’, he argues, it is much more pleasantaunt, and profitable ... to view the very things them selues’. 46

Both advocators and opponents of travel stress the impact and influence of the experience of going abroad on the traveller. Their differences in argument hinge on what they consider the shortcomings and advances of such movements, and the imprints these experiences leave on the traveller. The relevant point for this discussion is that these anxieties prepare a horizon of expectations to which returning travellers responded. Travel to the Ottoman Empire presented a particular challenge in this respect, as Robert Burton points out, because:

The Turks at this day count no better of us than of dogs, so they commonly call us giaours, infidels, miscreants, make that their main quarrel and cause of Christian persecution. If he will turn Turk, he shall be entertained as a brother, and had in good esteem, a Mussulman or a believer, which is a greater tie to them than any affinity or consanguinity. 47

The fear of ‘turning Turk’ – or perhaps more broadly, to loss of one’s identity – mark many of the captivity accounts published during the period. Yet despite these fears Englishmen continued to travel to the Ottoman dominions, not only because for reasons of trade, but also because of curiosity.

Travel, however, was by no means a free-for all practice. While trade and matters of state often went hand in hand, educational travel was less easy to justify. Travellers required permission, and, as Sara Warneke notes, ‘the principal argument for educational travel was that it directly benefited the commonwealth or state. It did this in two ways, firstly, by expanding the worldly experience of the young man so

46 Ibid. sig. A2v.
that on his return he would ... be a more useful member of the commonwealth, and, secondly, by allowing him to collect intelligence for the Privy Council'. When travel was a state-controlled exercise, travel was purposeful and directed. Francis Bacon, in his essay ‘On Travel’, reinforces this utilitarian view of travel, and provides a long list of ‘things to be seen and observed’, including ‘the courts of princes, specially when they give audience to ambassadors; the courts of justice ... antiquities and ruins, libraries, colleges, disputations, and lectures, where any are; shipping and navies; ... to conclude, whatsoever is memorable in the places where they go’. The accounts of writers like George Sandys, testify to these principal categories of ‘things to be seen’.

Yet not all travellers were educational travellers. Thomas Palmer, in his treatise on travel, differentiates between two kinds of travellers: ‘Regular or Irregular’, and says of the latter, ‘[o]f Irregular travelling, most men finde by experience what it is’. By contrast, and listed in a complex roster, ‘Regular’ travellers are identified with those who travel for the distinct purpose to serve the commonweal in one way or another. Absent from Palmer’s list of ‘Regular’ travellers, however, is the captive.

Potentially, then, every ‘Regular’ traveller who ventured to the Ottoman dominions could turn into an ‘Irregular’ one. Captivity, after all, was a distinct possibility for every Christian traveller who decided to visit the Ottoman Empire. Captivity reports, then, present an interesting case, because these accounts do not reflect a controlled exercise in travel. In their capacity as irregular travellers, captives experienced the encounter with the Ottoman Empire from a unique vantage point, and, can offer us insights that are not necessarily available in other accounts.

---

48 Warneke, Images of the Educational Traveller, p. 44.
51 Matar, Turks, Moors and Englishmen, pp. 71-81.
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However, on their return home, former captives wrote about their experiences for publication with specific purposes in mind, and, whilst presenting their own identity intact, they would often provide examples which told a different story. One of these travellers was the captive Thomas Saunders whose recollections of his time in the Ottoman galleys will be discussed next.

3.2 English identity, English converts

As one of the earliest and more detailed captivity accounts to be printed, Thomas Saunders, or Sanders' narrative marks an interesting case. The account was published two years after Saunders' release in 1585 as *A true Discription and breefe Discourse of a most lamentable Voiage, made latelie to Tripolie in Barbarie, in a Ship named the IESVS*. At this point it is useful to start with the circumstances that led to Saunders' captivity. Together with a group of London merchants, he had been travelling to Tripoli to purchase 'sweat oiles'. At the point of departure, however, the French factor in Tripoli, Romaine Sonnings, had taken onboard Patrone Norado, a merchant 'indebted vnto a Turke of that Towne'. Unaware of the illegal passenger, the English captain of the *Jesus*, Andrew Dier, set sail, but was soon forced to return to the port after the governor of Tripoli had commanded his gunners to open fire, following the news of Norado's escape. The company was brought to the 'Banio' - a Turkish prison - put in chains and had their goods confiscated, as Saunders reports,

---

52 Thomas Saunders, *A true Discription and breefe Discourse, Of a most lamentable Voiage, made latelie to Tripolie in Barbarie, in a Ship named the IESVS: Set forth by Thomas Savnders, one of those Captiues there at the same time* (London: Richard Jones, 1587), STC 21778.

53 Ibid. sig. A4v.

54 Ibid. sig. B1v.
On the first of March 1584. On the next day, Romaine Sonnings and Andrew Dier were sentenced to death, despite Dier's innocence. Dier's sentence was initially revoked after Richard Skegs, the English factor, pleaded for his life, but it was nonetheless restored by the governor. Sonnings, on the other hand, 'protested to turne Turk, hopynge thereby to haue saued his life'. In contrast to what Burton believed and Sonnings evidently had hoped for, 'turning Turk' was not always a guarantee to 'be entertained as a brother'. Sonnings was hanged immediately after he had converted.

Saunders' account was first printed separately, but later included in Richard Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations* together with a number of relevant state documents reflecting the troubles of the Tripoli affair. His narrative testifies to English movement in the Mediterranean which had, by then, gathered momentum following the formal establishment of commercial relations with the Porte. Moreover, England was not alone in this. France had enjoyed Ottoman capitulations for trade since 1536, which were renewed in 1581; the French now faced competition from the English in these regions, who ultimately supplanted the French as the major trading partner with the Ottomans. As a result, agents of both nations competed fiercely against each other. 

---

55 Ibid. sig. B3'.
56 Ibid. sig. B4'.
57 The merchant-traveller John Sanderson reports a similar incident in his journal. The tributary prince, "Stefano Vivoda ... intreated for life at the place of execution. The bustangebassi tould him, that yf he would become Turke, he should see what he would doe for him". However, the execution continued despite Vivoda having turned Turk and thus hoping to have his life spared; John Sanderson, *The Travels of John Sanderson in the Levant 1584-1602*, ed. by Sir William Foster (London: Hakluyt Society, 1931), 88-90; see also CSPV 1592-1603, 12. April 1597, no 568.
58 Hakluyt, *PN* (1598-1600), II, sigs. Q2'-R1'.
other for the favour of the ‘Great Turk’; many of these tensions surface in Saunders’ report.

Saunders’ description of life on a Turkish galley – arguably one of the earliest English reports on the conditions of English prisoners – is worth quoting at length:

But first to shew our miserable bondage and slaverie, and vnto what small pittance and allowance we were tide, for euerie fiue men had allowance but fiue Asperes of bread in a day, which is but two pence English: and our lodging was to lie on the bare boords, with a very simple cape to couer vs, we were also forceablie and most violentlie shauen, head and beard, and within three daies after, I and six more of my fellows with foure score of Italians and Spaniards, were sent forth in a Galeat to take the Grakish [Greek] Carmosal, which came into Arrabia to steale Negroes, & went out of Tripoli vnto that place, which was two hundred and fortie leagues thence, but wee were cheaned three and three to an oare, and we rowed naked aboue the girdle, and the Boteswaine of the Galley walked abast the Mast and his Mate afore the Maste, and each of them a Bulles pissel dried in their handes, and when their diuellish choler rose, they would strike the Christians for no cause.  

Exposed to the indiscriminate, violent treatment of their captors, Saunders portrays a multi-ethnic group of Christians who had been symbolically deprived of their individual identities, as their clothes are stripped off and they are ‘forceable and most violentlie shauen, head and beard’. However, for Saunders (and presumably for all other captives) ethnic and religious identity remained crucial, as Saunders’ continuing distinction between ‘the Englishmen’ and other nationalities testifies.

This distinction hinges primarily on religious difference. In an earlier episode, Saunders describes how ‘the kings cheefe gunner’ took away a Geneva Bible from ‘our Maisters mate’, ‘who shewed me of it, and I hauing the language, went presentlie to the kings treasurer and told him of it’:

---
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saieng, that sith it was the will of God that we should fall into their hands, yet that they should graunt vs to vse our consciences to our owne discretion, as they suffered the Spaniards and other nations to vse theirs, and he granted vs.\textsuperscript{61}

The Bible was returmed to ‘our Maisters mate’, who, shortly after, was deprived of it again. This time, however, the treasurer warned the gunner to return the book, ‘saying, thou villaine, wilt thou turn to christianitie againe, for he was a Renegod’.\textsuperscript{62} Following a third attempt, the conflict was resolved by the treasurer, who threatened him with torture should he attempt to steal the Bible again. In a marginal note the incident of the Christian-renegade’s spoil is glossed; here, he is referred to as a ‘Turk[s]’ and not as a former Christian, whilst the ‘Geneua Bible’ remains as a stable signifier for the English Protestant identity of ‘our Maisters mate’. This, by extension, is a continuation of the earlier episode in which the French culprit Sonning had ‘turned Turk’ at the prospect of his execution, whilst the honest Englishman, Andrew Dier, died steadfast in his belief in the reformed religion. Here, English identity is constructed in opposition to Islam triangulated by the actions of other Christians: Sonning and the renegade.

Conversion was not just a means to save one’s head. In his \textit{Geographical Historie of Africa} (1600), Leo Africanus, a Moor who had converted to Christianity, suggests a number of reasons why Christians ‘turned Turk’:

Now the Christians become Turkes, partly vpon some extreme & violent passion ... Some abiure the faith to release themselues of torments and cruelties; others for hope of honours and temporall greatness.\textsuperscript{63}

Nabil Matar further points out that many Christians converted to Islam ‘either because of their poor social conditions ..., or because they sought to identify with a powerful

\textsuperscript{61} Ibid. sig. B3\textsuperscript{v}.
\textsuperscript{62} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{63} Africanus, \textit{A Geographical Historie}, sig. 2L1\textsuperscript{v}.
empire'. The first convert in Saunders’ report is a ‘verie unhappie boie’ who had heard of the promises that ‘whosoeuer would tume Turke should be well entertained’. One day, the son of the king of Tripoli, who ruled at the island of ‘Djerby [Djerba]’, came to visit his father where ‘he greatly fancied Rich. Burges, our purser, & James Smith, they were both yoong men, therefore he was verie desirous to have them to tume Turke’. Both captives refused to comply, insisting that they were the king’s slaves and would remain Christians. Prompted by their response, the king had ‘a yeoman of our Queens guard, whom the kings son had inforsed to tume Turke’. John Nelson, brought before the two men asking them ‘will not you beare this our countrimen companie?’ Despite their protest, both Englishmen were carried to Djerba and, ‘within three daies after they were violentlie vsed’, they were forced to convert.

With the exception of the boy, none of the Englishmen appears to have ‘turned Turk’ for the reasons stated by either Africanus or Matar. On the contrary, the use of physical force to convert the Englishmen contrasts starkly with the freedom of conscience proffered to the captives earlier in the account. What triggers these conversions in this case is a seemingly sexual desire of the king’s son for these young Englishmen. Whilst Saunders is silent on the issue of sodomy, other English captives, such as Thomas Sherley, are explicit when he declares that ‘theyre Sodommerye they vse it soe publiquelye & impudentelye as an honest Christian woulde shame to companye with his wyffe as they doe with theyre buggeringe
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Others too had not failed to attack Turks and their treatment of slaves and captives. Turks use their slaves ‘for base service and filthy Lusts, yea the young men are most miserable who forsweare Christ and become Mahometans to avoid slavery of men, so becoming slaves to the divell’, as Fynes Moryson explained. English writings frequently associated sodomy with ‘turning Turk’ *per se* and, as Meredith Hanmer claims, ‘this doctrine [Islam] is the sinke of Sodome’, but ‘the iustice of God threateneth everlasting fire and torments for such Mahometical Sodomites*.

Sexual transgression and ‘turning Turk’ are intimately connected as Daniel Vitkus reminds us. In the case of Richard Burges and John Smith, the visible religious change combined with the implication of sexual transgression not only signals the projection of fears of conversion, but the potential appropriation of traits associated with Turks. This is not to say that captives literally turned into ‘Mahometical Sodomites’, but that conversion implies a loss or corruption of their Englishness and thus of their presumed virtues. By asserting their Christian identity, Burges and Smith attempt to subvert this transgression. The difficulty in preserving such an identity was experienced by both Englishmen following their liberation by Venetians who, seeing they were circumcised, first wanted to kill them, but were prevented to do so by other Christians who excused them for ‘that they were enforced to be Turkes’.
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Jaulstoke in Devonshire' seeking assistance for his release, was finally freed by 'one master Edward Barton, together with a Justice of the greate Turks'.

The primacy of religious difference clearly marks Turks from Christians in this and subsequent accounts. While Saunders' portrayal of his Turkish captors does not allow for much positive response, he does differentiate between Turks and renegades; the latter are portrayed as worse than the Turk not only because of their apostasy, but also because of their ruthlessness. Fears attached to coerced conversion also play a significant role and contribute to this demarcation between Muslims and Turks; they were also made physically visible on the convert's body. Furthermore, anxieties to become like the 'other' are played out in the continuous re-affirmation of a Christian Protestant identity. By reporting on these events, Saunders can claim that his own identity is not compromised, which in turn reinforces his own intact Protestant identity. His reluctant agreement to report on these events in the first place – which he was 'altogether unwilling' to put to paper – suggests as much. Another motive for former captives to publish their experiences was the prospect of profit from the publication of these journeys. Thomas Saunders, seemingly altruistically driven, desired nothing but the show of gratitude to 'Iulius Caesar, doctor of ciuill law, and judge of the Admiralitie'. Caesar, on the other hand, was immensely influential and enjoyed preferment from Francis Walsingham and others, resulting in his appointment as the sole judge in the court of admiralty in November 1587 for life. For a merchant (or former captive), such patronage could be fruitful, indeed.
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Narratives of English encounters with Turks did not exclusively assume the shape of a captivity report. Amongst the many English travellers to venture into the East, merchants were the foremost explorers in these regions. With the strengthening and consolidation of Anglo-Ottoman relations, English travellers confidently began to move through Ottoman ruled areas. Often, in following their mercantile interests, some of these English travellers would take the opportunity to visit Jerusalem; in some cases, such a pilgrimage was the sole purpose of their trip. One of these pilgrims was Henry Timberlake, who published his journey as *A true and strange discourse of the travailes of two English pilgrimes* in 1603.\textsuperscript{80} In contrast to Saunders’ account, Timberlake’s narrative reveals different concerns about English travel to the Ottomans. For one, unlike Saunders, Timberlake explicitly seeks the protection of the Turks.

Together with his companion John Burrell, a merchant from Middlesbrough, the merchant-traveller Timberlake arrived at the west gate of the city on the morning of 25 March 1601. Disguised in a ‘Pilgrimes habit’, they had been travelling in a caravan in the company of ‘Turkes, Iewes, and Christians’.\textsuperscript{81} Shortly before their entrance in the city, Timberlake’s companion advises him to pretend to be a Greek, as it ‘is not lawfull for a Christian to enter vnadmitted’. Timberlake, not having ‘the Greeke tongue’, refused, exclaiming that he ‘would neither denie [his] Countrie nor Religion’. With evident surprise, he is apprehended by the Turks whilst Burrell, who has

\textsuperscript{80} Henry Timberlake, *A true and strange discourse of the travailes of two English pilgrimes what admirable accidents befell them in their iourney to Ierusalem, Gaza, Grand Cayro, Alexandria, and other places* (London: Thomas Archer, 1603), STC 24079; the account was reprinted in 1608, 1609, 1611, 1616, 1620 and 1631.
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command of the 'Greek tongue', enters the city under the protection of the 'Greeke Patriarcke'. Timberlake is sent to prison because, as he says, 'the Turkes flatly denied, that they had euer heard of my Queene or Countrey, or that she paied them any tribute'. For his imprisonment Timberlake shifts the blame squarely unto the Catholic 'Peter Guardian', who had told the Turks that he was 'a spie', 'because I did not offer my selfe vnder his protection, but confidently stood to be rather protected vnder the Turke'.

Timberlake is released after a 'Moore', who had travelled with him on the Trojan from Algiers to Alexandria, had spoken favourably on his behalf to the 'Bashawe of the citie'. Following his newly-found freedom procured by this 'Muzzle-man', Timberlake is offered refuge under the roof of the Patriarch who tells him of other Englishmen who had been here before: 'but (being Catholiques) [they] went to Masse, telling the Turks at the Gates entrance, that they were Frenchmen, for the Turkes knowe not what you meane by the worde Englishman'. Finally, he assures his readers that he was allowed to 'passe as a Protestant, without yielding to any other ceremonie, then carriage of a waxe candle'.

A self-declared pilgrim, the Protestant Timberlake presents an ideological snapshot and a temporary map of Jerusalem as a contentious and contested site. Jerusalem had always been of interest to both Protestants and Catholics, and knowledge about the Holy City was available in a number of printed pamphlets in England, such as the translation of Christiaan van Adrichem's A brief description of Hierusalem. However, for Protestants the meaning of the holy city had been
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radically redefined. To read about Jerusalem was not to encourage or follow idolatry, but to aid 'the better vnderstanding of the storye of the Bible'; as a consequence, the English translator has 'in some measure purged and swept the streets and corners of the same, with the broome of truth'. The distinction between such an illustrative account and that of Timberlake's is important. Whilst the latter presents a dynamic eyewitness report, the former presents a static view of the Holy City's sites rendered entirely through the lens of scripture. In other words: the translation of Adrichem's account eradicates the presence of the Ottoman occupier.

Further, the figure of the Protestant pilgrim is in itself problematic. In the wake of the Reformation, pilgrimage as an institution had been abandoned; the Protestant apologist John Foxe dismisses the 'going on pilgrimage' as a 'good worke' since it is only agreeable to the 'law of the pope'. Yet pilgrimage continued to exist in Protestant vocabulary, albeit in a nominal capacity. Samuel Purchas - whose own collection of travel writings alludes to pilgrimage in its title, defines the Protestant pilgrimage as 'the peaceable way of good conscience to that Jerusalem'. This is set in opposition to 'superstition on the one side and tyrannie on the other', that is, Catholicism and the Turks. That Timberlake would betray neither 'Countrie nor Religion' asserts his sense of an English Protestant identity. In the light of England's commercial and diplomatic relationship with the Porte, it is not surprising that he seeks protection from the Turks rather than the Catholics. But what is also remarkable is that Timberlake embraces the association between himself and the Turks. As we
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have seen in the previous chapter, in religious texts this association was usually a marker for transgression while in this context it is preferred over identification with Catholicism. In other words: the association with the Turk reinforces Timberlake's own English Protestantism. There is, however, another textual strategy which underlies Timberlake's account that merits attention, and which hinges on a triangulation of Turks, Catholics and Protestants.


Their names were M. William Bedle, preacher to the English merchants which are Liegers at Alepo: M. Edward Abbot, seruaunt to the right Worshipfull sir John Spenser: M. Geffrey Kirbie, seruant to the worshipfull M. Paule Banning: and liegers for them in Alepo.⁹¹

One of these travellers, the Protestant preacher William Biddulph, also published a narrative of his journey, The Travels of certaine Englishmen into Africa, Asia, Troy, Bithinia, Thracia and to the Blacke Sea (1609).⁹² Unlike Timberlake he did not report any difficulties at entering the city except that they ‘were searched by an officer (as the manner is)’.⁹³ ‘In the meane time’, Biddulph continues, ‘there came to vs two
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Italian Friers, viz Padre Angelo, and Padre Aurelio’ who ‘bade vs welcome, and told vs that two other Englishmen were at their house, viz. master Timberley, and master Borell’. 94 Biddulph mentions Timberlake only once; however, he explains why difficulties for Christians arise who wish to enter the city. It is the ‘Turks’ fear of treason and insurrection which is the reason why ‘they suffer not Christians to enter into the City weaponed’. 95 This point is never mentioned by Timberlake, who had simply proclaimed that it was unlawful ‘to enter vnadmitted’. Further, he insists that Biddulph and his companions:

(though they sawe not mine imprisonment, nor were with me at the sight of those things in and about Jerusalem) can witnesse that they were acquainted therewith at the gates, and testifie the other truthes beside. 96

Biddulph did not confirm any of Timberlake’s stories in his account; instead, under the pseudonym of ‘Theophilus Lavender’, he lists a number of factual errors in Timberlake’s text which he ascribes to its being an unauthorized publication. According to Gerald MacLean, this strategy helped Biddulph to deflect criticism of travel writing, and enabled him to ensure authority over his own account. 97 Timberlake, of course, assures his readers of the truthfulness of the events he describes. Dismissing the proverb ‘that trauailers may tel leasings by authoritie’, he insists that he is ‘confidently standing on the iustice of [his] cause’, that is, Protestantism. 98
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In his preface, 'Theophilus Lavender' claims that Timberlake’s voyage ‘was imprinted (as I understand) without his consent’.\(^9\) He therefore defends Timberlake as an ‘honest and iudicious man’,\(^10\) shifting the blame for the text’s inaccuracies onto the printer/publisher.\(^11\) However, this distinction between published text and author urges us to speculate as to what Biddulph (alias Theophilus Lavender) actually sought to comment on – especially because the distinction between Biddulph and Lavender is merely a rhetorical one. Indeed, Lavender’s defence of Timberlake is far more ambiguous in a later passage:

Againe, if it were his owne doing [Timberlake’s authorised print], he being both wise and Religious (as hee is accounted) would neuer bee so simple to publish his owne disgrace in Printe, in going to Masse, and observing many other ceremonies as are mentioned in that booke which goeth foorth vnder his name.\(^12\)

While Timberlake had assured his readers of his intact Protestantism by stressing his association with the Turks and his exemption from Mass, Biddulph/Lavender criticises precisely this affirmation and draws his readers’ attentions to the dangerous implications of this agreement:

True it is, that the Turkes giue liberty of conscience vnto all that come thither; but they giue not entertainment vnto any Christians in their houses. And the Greeke Patriarckes are poore ... though they be Papists, yet haue they rich benefactors, and want nothing, and (for the most part) very kinde and curteous to strangers in all things, liberty of conscience only excepted.\(^13\)

The suggestion is that Timberlake was not as innocent as he had pretended. MacLean suggests that the two Englishmen disliked each other, confirming Biddulph’s implied
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accusation of popery.\textsuperscript{104} However, the question remains, why should Timberlake invoke Biddulph as a witness for his misfortunes or his unwavering Protestantism? There is no easy answer to this question. Purchas, clearly, was not concerned with this issue, since in a marginal note to John Sanderson's pilgrimage, he refers to the case of 'Master Timberlic' as an example for the obstacles a Protestant pilgrim in Jerusalem faced, and the steadfastness which he required to overcome them.\textsuperscript{105} In the light of Biddulph's concerns and Timberlake's alliance with the Turks, Jerusalem is marked as a place of Catholic corruption. What Biddulph criticises is the susceptibility of a Protestant identity to religious corruption in this 'holie place', which Timberlake attempts to contain when he claims to have sought protection under the Turks.

Although the accounts of Timberlake and Biddulph differ greatly from those of their fellow Englishmen who wrote as captives, they all share a sense of limitation - a sense defined by Ottoman domination - and by the need to articulate their experiences in appropriate terms largely reflecting expectations at home. Ultimately, what is played out in Timberlake's preferment of the Turks over the Catholic patriarch is not just an acknowledgement of his country's relations with the Ottomans, but also the belief that such an association is preferable to English Protestants at home, rather than an association with Catholicism. The Turks acted as a conduit, or reference point through which Timberlake asserted his identity as an English Protestant.

\textsuperscript{104} MacLean, The Rise of Oriental Travel, p. 108, p. 110.
\textsuperscript{105} Purchas, Purchas His pilgrims (1625), p. 1636; see also Sanderson, The Travels, p. 121.
3.4. Writing the Ottoman Empire

In 1615, George Sandys published his sumptuously illustrated *A Relation of a Journey begun An: Dom: 1610*. The writer and traveller George Sandys emerged from a well-to-do background and attended Oxford and the Middle Temple before marrying Elizabeth Norton. The marriage brought him land and money, but ended when Sandys moved to southern England, deserting his wife. In 1610, he decided to travel to the East. Returning in 1611, Sandys turned his attention to various commercial and colonial ventures in America. As a member of the Virginia Company, his name appears first in 1609 and later again as its treasurer in 1621. Sandys' *A Relation of a Journey* was, like all of his subsequent works, dedicated to Charles I, who appointed him a gentleman of the King's Privy Chamber in 1631. Following the book's first publication, further editions followed in 1621, 1627, 1637, 1652 and 1673.

Sandys' travel account differs in a number of ways from the texts discussed so far. Not only does it include elaborate images, it surpasses other travel accounts in the detail and breadth of its descriptions, and analysis of the countries he travelled. Indeed, for Jonathan Haynes, the book set a new standard for English travel writing, because it 'demonstrates an ability to give form to the foreign and the past, in a deliberate and comprehensive way, to appropriate great tracts of cultural history and
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deliver them to the English reader'. What is significant for the following discussion is what Sandys calls, 'my doubled travels; once with some daunger and toyle performed, and now recorded with sinceritie and diligence'. Sandys reviewed his travels by interlacing them skilfully with excerpts from the poetic oeuvre of Horace, Ovid and other authors of antiquity. The result of these 'doubled travels' approximates what Jerome Turler had deemed the purpose of all travel: 'delight and pleasure [in] ... some ende', here specifically to teach by example.

Sandys describes his project and aims in the dedication to Prince Charles. The principal purposes behind his book are to inculcate virtue by example, and to give instruction in the nature of just government. Following the death of Prince Henry in 1612, public attention shifted to Charles as James' successor indicated by the increase in dedications addressed to the future monarch. For Sandys, 'virtue' was more than a personal ornament; it was 'in a Prince ... a publicke blessing', which, in turn, would bring both 'light and life of ioy through gracious gouernment'. This image of the Prince as a guiding light is contrasted with that of the 'sterne and barbarous Tyrant' who only aims at 'the height of greatnesse and sensuality'. The implication here is that the text can be read as a political guide book.
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Another of Sandys' concerns is the loss of those cities which were 'once the seats of most glorious and triumphant Empires', but which had now fallen to the 'wild beasts of mankind'. These countries referred to are the Holy Land and those of antiquity, the Roman Empire and Greece. With the former learning and civility of these countries now extinguished, he claims, the land:

remain[s] wast and ouergrown with bushes, receptacles of wild beasts, of theeeues and murderers; large territories dispeopled, or thinly inhabited; goodly cities made desolate; sumptuous buildings become ruines; glorious Temples either subuersted, or prostituted to impietie; true religion discountenanced and oppressed; all Nobility extingued; no light of learning permitted, nor Vertue cherished: violence and rapine insulting ouer all, and leauing no security saue to an abiect mind, and vnlookt on pouerty.

These images of decay and barren landscapes reinforce the contrast between past and present state of these regions now under Ottoman rule. In his description of the ruins of Troy, Sandys' paints a mental image of this decay in progress, when he notes that Troy's 'ruines' are 'lessened daily by the Turkes, who carried the pillers and stones vnto Constantinople to adorne the buildings of the Great Bassas'.

Jonathan Haynes argues that the presence of classical texts is neither accidental nor simply a demonstration of the vast knowledge available to the humanist virtuoso: 'they are Sandys' subject matter'. However, such a view is complicated by Sandys' extensive descriptions of and engagement with Ottoman culture. Notably Sandys' textual descriptions are highly derivative, as Haynes and other critics have noted, and include a variety of source material available in England, including Richard Knolles'
For his description of the Turkish slave system, for instance, Sandys most likely consulted Knolles who had written extensively on the subject. There are many more instances, and while Sandys had kept a journal in which he noted down what he originally observed, it would be a cruel task to disentangle all his sources from his diary entries. Instead, it is best to consider the final text as the travel narrative per se: a complex narrative web which demonstrates the shrewdness and artistry of an early seventeenth-century virtuoso.

One of Sandys' tasks is also to recover this world of antiquity under the surface of the Ottoman Empire. A detailed map, based on Abraham Ortelius' *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum* (1570), meets the reader's eye on the first two pages. The map adapts all the former Latin names for the regions of the Holy Land giving the impression of the unperturbed classical locus. With the descriptions following, however, this first impression is gradually supplanted by the actual experience of the current rulers. Nonetheless, Sandys never gives the Turkish name if a Latin name exists; in most cases he simply notes that the place is now under Turkish rule. Constantinople is such an example:

This Citie by destinie appointed, and by nature seated for Soueraigntie, was first the seate of the Romane Emperours, then of the Greeke, as now it
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is of the Turkish: built by Constantine the sonne of Helena, and lost by Constantine the sonne of another Helena (a Gregorie then Bishop was a Gregorie) to Mahomet the second, in the yeare 1453. with the slaughter of her people, and destruction of her magnificent structures.¹²⁵

Further, Sandys sardonically adds a prophecy that the Turks shall lose the city in time. About the city itself he is ambiguous. Looking at it from the distance, Sandys’ attention is captivated by its beauty, prompting him to portray Constantinople’s skyline:

The loftie and beautifull Cyprus trees so intermixed with the buildings, that it seemeth to present a citie in a wood to the pleased beholder. Whose seuen aspiring heads (for on so many hills and no more, they say it is seated) are most of them crowned with magnificent Mosques, all of white marble, round in forme, and coupled aboue; being finished on the top with gilded spires, that reflect the beames they receiue with a maruellous splendour; some hauing two, some foure, some sixe adioyning turrets, exceeding high, and exceeding slender.¹²⁶

In fact, he is so captivated by its impression that he interrupts his praise only to admit that his eyes are insufficient and ‘would but condemne my defectiue relation’.¹²⁷ At closer examination, once he had entered the city, Sandys qualifies his earlier assessment, asserting instead, ‘I thinke there is not in the world an obiect that promiseth so much a farre off to the beholders, and entered, so deceiueth the expectation’.¹²⁸

Oscillation between admiration and condemnation of Turkish culture is a familiar element of English descriptions of the Ottomans. Sandys’ portrayal, however, is comparatively moderate. In contrast to other travel accounts, he provides extensive and detailed information on their history, government and military forces, religion – including a biography of the prophet ‘Mahomet’ – customs, their present ruler and the
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other people living amongst the Ottomans. In fact, the information listed here roughly corresponds to what Francis Bacon had suggested a traveller should observe in his travels. In particular Sandys’ description of food and drinks merits quoting a longer passage, since it not only conveys some detailed observations on Ottoman culture, but also testifies to the English influence on Ottoman culture:

Wine is prohibited them by their Alcoran: they plant none, they buy none: but now to that liberty they are growne (the naturall Turke excepted) that they will quaffe freely when they come to the house of a Christian: insomuch as I haue scene but few go away vnled from the Embassadors table. ... They preferred our beere aboue all other drinkes. And considering that wine is forbidden, that water is with the rawest (especially in this clime) the dearnesse of Sherbets, and plenty of Barley (being here sold not for aboue nine pence a bushel) no doubt but it would proue infinitely profitable to such as should bring in the vse there amongst them. Although they be destitute of Tauerns, yet haue they their Coffahouses, which something resemble them. There sit they chatting most of the day; and sippe of a colde drinke called Coffa (of the berry that it is made of) in little China dishes, as hot as they can suffer it: blacke as soote, and tasting not much vnlike it ... which helpeth, as they say, disgestion, and procureth alacrity: many of the Coffamen keeping beautifull boyes, who serue as stales to procure them customers. ... they also delight in Tobacco; they take it through reeds that haue ioyned vnto them great heads of wood to containe it: I doubt not but lately taught them, as brought them by the English: and were it not sometimes lookt into (for Morat Bassa not long since commanded a pipe to be thrust the nose of a Turke, and so to be led in derision through the Citie) no question but it would proue a principall commodity. Neuerthelesse they will take it in corners, and are so ignorant therein, that that which in England is no saleable, doth passe here amongst them for most excellent.

While the reference to ‘coffa’ is indebted to Biddulph’s account, Sandys’ observations are full of commercial innuendos, and a faintly disguised sense of arrogance.

But Sandys also resorts to observations that reflect religious prejudice. For instance, when he explains a recent outbreak of the plague in Constantinople, he ascribes its causes either to ‘the vice of the Clime, or [to] those misbeleeuers’; in any
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case, it 'increased by the superstition of the Mahometans'. In turn, this leads him to link recent outbreaks of the plague in England – 1609 and 1610 – to conjectures about unnoticed conversion: 'some one amongst vs deriued that damnable doctrine; which cost so many liues in the time of our last great infection'. On the other hand, he then stresses similarities between Christianity and Islam – albeit the latter is shown to be derivative. He claims that one of 'the Turkish commandments' is 'drawne originally from our Sauiours, Thou shalt not do what thou wouldst not haue done to thee' stating that therein 'most part [of] their ciuill iustice is grounded'. Perhaps the most notable feature in this context is the toleration of other religions under the Turks. As was discussed earlier in this chapter, Thomas Saunders had pointed out the liberty of conscience granted to Christians even under slavery. At the island of Chios, Sandys had notes the same feature, 'the whole Illand is now gouerned by Turkes, and defiled with their superstitions. Yet have the Christians their Churches, and unreproued exercise of religion'.

But his observations finally circle in on the figure of the sultan, the 'sterne and barbarous Tyrant', who, for Sandys, embodies the current state of the Ottoman Empire. Indeed, his description of Sultan Achmet reflects some of the contradictions he had noted earlier in his account:

He is, in this yeare 1610, about the age of three and twenty, strongly limd, & of a iust stature, yet greatly inclining to be fat: insomuch as sometimes he is ready to choke as he feeds, and some do purposely attend to free him from that danger. His face is full and duely proportioned: onely his eyes are extraordinary great, by them esteemed (as is said before) an excellency in beauty. Fleame hath the predominancy in his complexion.
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For Sandys, as he condescendingly states, ‘[h]is aspect is as hauty as his Empire is large’.\(^{137}\) There is a sense of opulence and decadence running throughout these descriptions, which often amaze by the image of excess they paint of the Sultan and his court:

> His Turbant is like in shape to a pumppion, but thrice as great. His vnnder and vpper garments are lightly of white satin, or cloth of siluer tishued with an eye of greene, and wrought in great branches. He hath not so few as foure thousand persons that feede and liue within his Seraglio.\(^ {138}\)

Daniel Vitkus puts forward the analogy of the seraglio as a ‘microcosm of the empire, where extreme cruelty and sexual excess are both exercised’.\(^ {139}\) Indeed, Sandys portrays Ahmet I as a ruler whose empire, which had inspired fear in its opponents by virtue of its political order and military strength alone, in decline.\(^ {140}\) This is made explicit in Sandys’ analysis of Turkish prowess which he presents in the body politic as disproportionate:

> the body being growne too monstrous for the head; the Sultans vnwarlicke, and neuer accompanying their armies in person; the Souldier corrupted with ease and liberty, drowned in prohibited wine, enfeebled with the continuall conuverse of women, and generally lapsed from their former austerity of life, and simplicity of manners. Their valours now meeting on all sides with opposition; hauing of late giuen no increase to their dominions: & Empire so got, when it ceasseth to increase, doth begin to diminish.\(^ {141}\)

It is perhaps to overstate that there is a sense of regret about this development, but, in common with earlier passages, Sandys also retains a degree of admiration. Architectural beauty and religious toleration are only some of the points discussed here. And although Sandys did not find the land of antiquity where ‘Arts and Sciences

\(^{137}\) Ibid. p. 73.
\(^{138}\) Ibid.
\(^{139}\) Vitkus, ‘Trafficking with the Turk’, p. 48.
\(^{140}\) Valensi, ’The Making of a Political Paradigm’, p. 182.
\(^{141}\) Sandys, A Relation, p. 50.
haue bene inuented, and persited; where wisedome, virtue, policie, and ciuility haue been planted, haue flourished', neither did he travel through the barren landscapes he had projected in his dedication. Instead, what he found was another empire with its own virtues and vices, which, as he predicts, 'hath exceeded the obsuerued period of a Tyrannie, for such is their Empire'.

Finally, in writing this elaborate account of his travels, Sandys had perhaps more mundane motives in mind. Humanist ideals, such as education and learning, easily disguise a practical problem, namely that of patronage or employment. Here, the two principal reasons for travel abroad are again important. As we have seen, the fashioning of a gentlemen and the provision of knowledge for the state were the two instrumental reasons for travel abroad. Since the early efforts of Henry VIII to instigate intellectual exchange between the courts of England and (in particular) Italy, the influence of humanism had gained steadily and with it its status in society. Indeed, as Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine have convincingly argued, to excel in 'the liberal arts' in sixteenth-century England had become more than a mere sign of academic distinction; it was also recognised 'as a means of access to prominent civic position, to the Elizabethan court, to power and influence'. Given Sandys’ preferment from Charles I later in his career, the combination of travel account and humanist learning did not only benefit the king, but, in the long run, the author as well. Further, Sandys’ account not only teaches its reader ‘virtue’ by example; it provides ample information and analysis of an empire, which, even though it showed
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signs of decline, had assumed the power of those nations of antiquity. While Sandys composes a sophisticated account in the hope of preferment and, arguably, employment, he also portrays the Ottomans and their empire as a complex world that resists a mere reduction to a barbarous nation. For Sandys, the world of antiquity remains largely lost in what he observes. However, parallel to this lost world Sandys' journey through Ottoman culture reveals not only ambiguous attitudes towards the new rulers of these regions, but above all it testifies to an increasing, albeit reluctant, accommodation of this new world in Sandys' own thinking.

In conclusion, it is safe to say that the travellers discussed in this chapter all reflect anxieties about their various encounters with the Turk. Thomas Saunders' account reflects concerns about conversion to Islam, either voluntary or coerced. Attendant fears of identity loss and containment mark Saunders' experiences with the Turks, who are largely perceived as a threat to Christian identity. However, we have also seen that Saunders recognises the practice of religious tolerance among his captors, which is temporarily violated by a renegade's attempt to steal a captive's Geneva Bible, a signifier for his Protestant identity. Saunders also emphasises the connection between coerced conversion and sexual transgression, which he witnessed during his captivity in the case of two of his English fellow captives. Set against the background of English commercial relations with the Ottomans, Saundes' account indicates the existing dangers in store for those who chose to engage in trade with the Turks.

By contrast, in his account Henry Timberlake asserts his English identity through a clear association with the Turks on the basis that his Queen was in league
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with the sultan despite the fact that Murad III had failed to support her against the
Armada. On the other hand, this assertion is conspicuous in the context of
Timberlake’s dealings with the Patriarch of Jerusalem. In reading Timberlake’s
account of events in Jerusalem against William Biddulph’s narrative, I have argued
that Timberlake’s Protestant identity is undermined, and that his self-proclaimed
association with the Turk can be read as a strategy through which he attempts to
assure his readers of his Protestant identity. Thus, the figure of the Turk emerges as a
preferable choice over a Catholic association. Finally, George Sandys’ account differs
greatly from the other two accounts both in breadth and length of its narrative. For
Sandys the encounter with the Ottoman Empire is not fraught with dangers to his
person *per se*, but signals an ambiguity between admiration and condemnation for
Ottoman culture.
4. Restoring history, Hakluyt's nation and the 'new trade with Turkes and misbeleueurs'

In the last chapter we saw how English travellers responded to actual encounters with the Turk. In this chapter the focus shifts to another group of travellers, whose accounts were collected and arranged by Richard Hakluyt, the editor of *The Principal Navigations* first published in 1589, and, again, in an extended edition in 1598-1600. Hakluyt's collection of travel and exploration narratives brought together a wealth of distinctly different experiences. Their cumulative effect was not only to celebrate the achievements of England's navigators, merchants and mariners throughout the world, but to prompt imitation by its readers. Referred to by the Victorian critic J.A. Froude as 'the prose epic of the English Nation', the text is a heterogeneous collection of narratives encompassing a variety of narrators, each telling their own story. From a generic point of view, however, Hakluyt's collection is a history that arranges its material according to 'regions first explored to those discovered more recently, and, within each section, a chronological order from earliest to latest'. As a history of English exploration and travel, Hakluyt also exhibits plenty of evidence for English commercial involvement in the Mediterranean, past and present. In particular, he ascribes substantial significance to England's ventures with the Porte during Elizabeth's reign; at least this much is suggested when he asks his readers 'who euer saw before this regiment, an English Ligier in the stately porch of the Grand Signor at Constantinople?'

---


3 Hakluyt, *PN* (1589), sig. 2v.
This emphatic reference to an English presence at the Porte needs to be seen in the larger context of Hakluyt's 'iust commendation [of] our nation'. As an integral part of his agenda to show 'England in action', mercantile relations played a significant part. The argument of this chapter is that England's trade with the Ottomans contributes to and complicates Hakluyt's nationhood project. England's commerce with the Ottomans was problematic when considered in the wider context of England's position in Christendom, and the growing antagonism between England and Spain. For one, since her excommunication in 1570 Elizabeth had become vulnerable to legitimate conquest by Catholic powers. As Matthew Dimmock points out, the same bull that was issued against Elizabeth had also been used to justify war 'against the Turke'. As was discussed in chapter 1, England had sought to enlist the help of the sultan against the Spanish Armada in 1588 and continued to do so thereafter. While these calls for help remained largely unanswered, the political significance of these relations cannot be underestimated. Commercial relations with the Ottomans, in this context, are also always political. Hakluyt, too, is aware of this as we will see. Nonetheless, English movements in the Levant and the Mediterranean are significant to Hakluyt who dedicates the better part of the second volume of his Principal Navigations' (1598-1600) to these ventures. Merchants represented the nation's vanguard in exploration, and, as Richard Helgerson has demonstrated, greatly facilitated Hakluyt's project of writing the nation.
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4.1 Commerce, nation and 'traffique'

I want to open this discussion with a more general discussion of the significance Hakluyt assigns to documents of trade. For this purpose it is worth revisiting the well-known anecdote of his introduction to 'certeine bookes of Cosmographie, with an uniuersal Mappe'. Enraptured by the maps the young Hakluyt saw in his cousin's study-room the latter:

pointed with his wand to all the knowne Seas, Gulfs, Bayes, Straights, Capes, Riviers, Empires, Kingdomes, Dukedomes, and Territories of ech part with declaration also of their speciall commodities, & particular wants, which by the benefit of trafficke, & entercourse of merchants, are plentiful supplied. 9

With reference to the close relationship between geography and trade, polities and merchants, Hakluyt assigns the principal agency in these undertakings to the 'merchants'; the life-blood of 'Empires, Kingdoms and Dukedoms'. They are instrumental for expansion which not only provides 'speciall commodities' for 'particular wants', but gain information necessary to fill the vital arteries of trade. Only if one knows where to go and what to get from the 'benefit of trafficke, & entercourse of merchants', is it possible to sustain and expand commerce and, arguably, 'Kingdomes'. Such activities, however, did not only serve but require a joint venture of various groups.

As Richard Helgerson observes, Hakluyt's name is interchangeable with 'the various intersecting communities for which his name and his book stand as convenient markers'. 10 He is, as Mary Fuller puts it, 'in every sense of the word connected', both, 'by kinship, friendship, economic interests, literary relations ... information, recognition, and patronage flowed back to him along his dense network of affiliation'. 11 Hence, whilst merchants were the active participants in those ventures, Hakluyt, or, more specifically, the intellectual circles in London and elsewhere, engaged in a collective venture to accumulate, evaluate, promote
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and distribute information pertinent to the explorer and merchant alike. In fact, these small
groups of intellectuals were primarily responsible for sustaining the little interest England's
monarchs had shown in overseas expansion, navigation and trade with other nations. In turn,
their curiosity 'owed much to its continental counterparts for its knowledge of geography'.

This multifaceted relationship of dependency and fruitful collaboration is best
exemplified by one of Hakluyt's contemporaries, John Davis. Referring to attempts to
discover a North-West passage to the East Indies, Davies explains that here in particular
'Nauigation must be executed in most exquisite sorte'. As he explores the delicacy of
navigation in these parts of the world, he asserts that he is:

fully perswaded that our Countrie is not inferiour to any for men of rare
knowledge, singuler application, and exquisite execution of the Artes
Mathemick, for what Strangers may be compared with M. Thomas Digges
Esquire, our Countryman the great master of Archmasterie, and for Thericall
speculation and most cunning calculation M. Dee and M. Thomas Heriotts are
hardly to be matched: and for the mecanicall practises drawne from the Artes
Mathemick, our Countrie doth yeeld men of principall excellencie, as M Emery
Mulleneux for the exquisite making of Globus bodies, and M. Nicholas Hellyar
for the singularitie of portraiture hath the praise of Europe, M. Baker for his skill
and surpassing grounded knowledge for the building of Ships aduantageable to all
purpose, hath not in any nation his equal

Indeed, Davis makes another very important point which conjoins all these different groups:

And sith Nauigation is the meane whereby Countries are discouered, and
comunitie drawne betweene nation and nation, the word of God published to the
blessed recoverye of the frowaine of castes from whom it hath pleased his deuine
Maiestie as yet to detaine the brightnes of his glory: and that by nauigation
commonweales through mutual trade are not onely sustained, but mightily
enriched, by whose hard aduentures such excellent benefites are atchieued, for by
his exceeding great hazards the forme of the earth, the quantities of Countries, the
diversitie of nations, and the natures of Zones, Climats, countries and people, are
apparently made known vnto vs

12 John Parker, *Books to Build an Empire* – *A Bibliographical History of English Oversea
13 John Davis, *The Seamans Secrets Deuided into 2. partes, wherein is taught the three kinds
of Sayling, Horizontal, Paradoxall, and sayling vpon a great Circle* (London: Thomas
Dawson, 1595), STC 6368.4, sig. 2".
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Davis' recognises the interlocking mechanisms of commerce and science at work. For Hakluyt, too, successful commerce hinges on this relationship. In 1598, he recalls the obstacles English seafarers encountered through the lack of sufficient knowledge in those fields:

I call to minde, how many noble ships haue bene lost, how many worthy persons haue bene drenched in the sea, and how greatly this Realme hath bene impouerished by losse of great Ordinance and other rich commodities through the ignorance of our Sea-men

Given the complex relationship between the different fields of knowledge and their documentation it is impossible to identify a 'pure' category of commercial writings. As Lisa Jardine notes, '[t]he worlds of the scholar, the technical engineer and the merchant were in practice inseparable'. Davis' pamphlet may not be considered a mercantile writing per se, nonetheless it makes an important point: reports of journeys to centres of commerce in the Mediterranean recounting navigational features can be as useful in assessing the mercantile landscape of the Turks' dominion as a list of goods acquired at the Porte, because they provide the necessary information about conditions and ways of exploiting such trade. Of course, the publication of such writings as The Seamans Secrets or Hakluyt's Principal Navigations was not only an act of commerce itself - their information served as a commodity - but enabled others to acquire goods successfully and stimulate trade. The word Hakluyt, as D.B Quinn put it, 'became a portmanteau expression for the Principal Navigation', in other words, he was, in both senses, a trade mark.

Whilst accounts of directions, interactions, and movements of merchants in the dominions of the Turk are available, information was still limited by the nature of mercantile
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ethics. Ceri Sullivan, in her study of the rhetoric of merchants, outlines this problem and argues for a complex perception of merchants and their role in society. The merchant by trade 'was not simple, and his complexity consisted partly, in the maintenance of a space of privacy, or hidden knowledge. Or spaces, since the line of allegiance and potential rivalry which defined what was concealed, and from whom, were multiple.' This insistence on space or spaces of privacy is understandable in the light of the nature of commerce with its incentive for profit. However, the problem for the present discussion is that this rhetoric of merchants provides and withholds at the same time: it provides, in a sense that the accounts reveal that mercantile exchange took place; it withholds to the extent that it is impossible to retrieve the complexity of its relations within the mercantile allegiances made. For the commercial exchange between Christians and Muslims in the Levant that took place, these 'private spaces' proved permeable enough to allow and accommodate for 'traffique' between Christians and Muslims or between Christians of different denominations. Money here is a great leveller that forged competitive relations.

Hakluyt's praise of the 'English Ligier in the stately porch of the Grand Signior at Constantinople' reflects the importance the Levant played for England, both commercially and politically. Daniel Vitkus also finds in Hakluyt's exclamation a celebration of 'England's newly established role in the Mediterranean' and rightly so. By 1589, trade with the Porte flourished and the Levant Company became a by-word for wealth. Over its first few years, since the granting of the first charter in 1581, a vast increase in the shipping of goods into England was reported, so much that at some point in 1588 the cargo of a single ship realized over £ 70,000. This commercially viable relationship was, however, located within wider concerns about colonial efforts Hakluyt also sought to promote. The dedication to Sir Robert
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Cecil, in the *Principal Navigations*’s second edition, engages with this colonial debate as the narrative turns away from the Turk to England’s ancestors. Their ‘[h]eroical intents and attempts’ for exploration and colonization provide, similar to the Romans’ portrayal of their famous predecessors, an image that would, ideally, exercise the ‘like effect in their posteritie’. 23 Under this premise, Hakluyt exhorts Elizabeth through Cecil to ponder the possibility of an English colony in Virginia – ‘the Inland wherof is found of late to bee so sweete and holesome a climate, so rich and abundant in siluer mines, so apt and capable of all commodities’ 24 and concludes, ‘which action, if vpon a good & godly peace obtained, it shal plese the Almighty to stirre vp her Maiesties heart to continue [...] with transporting of one or two thousand of her people; [...] she shall by God’s assistance, ..., increase her dominions, enrich her cofers, and reduce many Pagans to the faith of Christ’. 25 Hakluyt reminds Cecil that God had ‘stirred vp the spirite of Isabella Queen of Castille to aduance the enterprise of Columbus’; 26 as a consequence the Spanish empire was encompassing most of the West Indies and – under Philip following the annexation of Portugal in 1580 – the East Indies. In contrast, England’s ventures in the West Indies and their activities in the Levant resulted in the ‘enrich[ing] of [Elizabeth’s] cofers’ only; there is no mention to ‘increase her dominions’, or to ‘reduce many Pagans to the faith of Christ’. Instead, Hakluyt continues with the treatise that ‘containeth our auncient trade and traffique with English shipping to the Islands of Sicilie [Sicily], Candie [Crete], and Sio’ which he relates to ‘the happie renuing and much increasing of our interrupted trade in all the Leuant’. 27 Neither conquest nor conversion is of primary concern in this context, indicating that relations with the Levant in Hakluyt are primarily limited to trade.
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The Mediterranean and its commercial landscape produced its own power relations which allowed participation, but never complete dominance of any nation. The rise of the English and Dutch in the later part of the sixteenth century at the expense of the traditional powerful Venetian-Ottoman trade neatly exemplifies this. Daniel Vitkus further characterises the Mediterranean as 'an unruly context, lacking the 'order' and 'stability' that comes from the asymmetry of power that we typically associate with the colonizer-colonized relationship'.\(^{28}\) Yet this was not a space of conquest for Europeans, but a place where power was continuously re-negotiated. Vitkus shrewdly observes that, 'the Ottoman empire was an institution to be feared and appeased'.\(^{29}\) It was also an institution to be jealous of, if as a nation one was not associated with it in commercial terms. Such preference was, as Halil Inalcik argues, dependent on 'the favor and political decision of the Porte'.\(^{30}\) It is in this context that Hakluyt justifies charges voiced by other nations against, what he calls, 'our new trade with Turkes and misbeleeuers'.\(^{31}\) The phrase itself is striking since it sustains the ambiguity between partner in trade and religious enemy; more importantly, Hakluyt even defends this apparent contradiction. This defence hinges on past commercial exchanges between Christians and Muslims:

> For who knoweth not, that king Salomon of old, entred into league vpon necessitie with Hiram the king of Tyris, a gentile? Or who is ignorant that the French, the Genouois, Florentines, Raguseans, Venetians, and Polonians are at this day in league with the Grand Signior, and haue beene these many yeeres, and haue vsed trade and traffike in his dominions? Who can deny that the Emperor of Christendome hath had league with the Turke, and payd him a long while a pension for a part of Hungarie? And who doth not acknowledge, that either hath trauailed the remote parts of the world, or read the Histories of this later age, that the Spaniards and Portugales in Barbarie, in the Indies, and elsewhere, haue ordinarie confederacie and traffike with the Moores, and many kindes of Gentiles and Pagans, and that which is more, doe pay them pensions, and vse them in their seruice and warres?\(^{32}\)

\(^{28}\) Vitkus, Turning Turk, p. 30.  
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This apology for England’s trade with the Turk makes two important points: first, it seems difficult to clearly demarcate Muslim or Christian trade as such. Group diffusion instead of clear-cut division prevails on the marketplace. The second point relates to the phrase ‘our newe trade with Turkes and misbeleeuers’. Here the religious (and hence political) aspect of trade is ambivalent: on the one hand, Hakluyt argues that trade with the Turk is perfectly legitimate for Christians (‘our newe trade with Turkes’), at the same time he recognises other nations’ critique of precisely this religious dilemma (‘misbeleeuers’) and responds to it accordingly: ‘Why then should that be blamed in vs, which is vsuall and common to the most part of other Christian nations?’ His rhetorical question calls into question England’s critics and concludes: ‘[t]herefore let our neighbours, which haue found most fault with this new league and traffike, thanke themselues and their owne foolish pride, whereby we were vrged to seeke further to prouide vent for our naturall commodities’.33 In other words: (Catholic) Christians who had been trading with the Turk long before the English are partly responsible for the trade England enjoys now. Its merchants, or, on a more patriotic note, England itself was denied access to other markets, there was no choice but to turn to the ‘Turkes and misbeleeuers’ for trade. Ironically, Catholics set the precedent but subsequently criticise England for doing the same. From Hakluyt’s point of view, at least, the argument secures a moral high ground from which to identify and justify England’s role. It is then, with a sense of Schadenfreude, that he concludes his defence of the Anglo-Ottoman trade: ‘And herein the old Greeke prouerbe was most truely verified, That euill counsaile proueth worst to the author and deuiser of the same’.34 The tension between religious affiliation and commercial practice seems to be considered as essentially valid in this context, but nonetheless its alleged transgression is justified as a result of mercantile or national requirements justified on
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Catholic precedent. As a result, Hakluyt defines England's conduct in the Levant against other Christians, but not against the actual object of the dispute: the Turk.

Hakluyt's apology reveals a number of issues: first, it reflects the significance of Ottoman trade for Europe and England specifically; secondly, trade with the Turk was also always a site of religious and political struggle, and thirdly, Hakluyt assigns England a special role in that trade. This latter point is linked to Hakluyt's overall project of promoting the English nation and its role in the world. Consider for example the dedication to Francis Walsingham in the 1589 edition of the Principal Navigations

To harpe no longer vpon this string & to speak a word of that iust commendation which our nation doe indeed deserue: it can not be denied, but as in all former ages, they have bene men full of activity, stirrers abroad, and searchers of the remote parts of the world, so in this most famous and peerlesse gouernment of her most excellent Maiesty, her subjects through the speciall assistance, and blessing of God, in searching the most opposite corners and quarters of the world, and to speake plainly, in compassing the vaste globe of the earth more then once, haue excelled all the nations and people of the earth.35

To write 'our nation' Hakluyt relies on the narratives of, 'men full of activity, stirrers abroad, and searchers of the remote parts of the world'. Indeed, he does not seem to differentiate clearly between 'our nation' and 'they' – the 'men full of activity'. Instead he conflates 'our nation' with the subject of the following sentence 'they' and associates present and past achievements ('as in all former ages') with 'this most famous and peerlesse gouernment of her most excellent Maiesty'. Hakluyt evokes a discourse which has as its principal subject matter the English nation constructed around the actions of the English people; the latter signifying both object ('our nation') and subject ('men full of activity'). For the text to constitute a discourse of nationhood, however, Hakluyt needs to accommodate the ambivalence of its people's status as both object and subject. Homi Bhabha has theorized this writing of the nation and refers to it as a 'double narrative movement', where people are not

35 Haklyut, PN (1589), sig. 2', my emphasis.
'simply historical events or parts of a patriotic body politic', but represent a 'complex rhetorical strategy of social reference'. Here people must be thought in a 'double time': the people are the historical 'objects' of a nationalist pedagogy giving the discourse an authority that is based on the pre-given or constituted historical origin or event, but they are also 'the 'subjects' of a process of signification that must erase any prior or originary presence of the nation-people'. What Bhabha suggests is that a people's history of achievements bestows and shapes the authority of the present discourse of nationhood. Paradoxically the people in the present must be somehow disconnected from that origin and yet continue and perpetuate that legacy. The paradox, as such, cannot be dissolved, but as Benedict Anderson suggests, in the development of imagined communities, to 'think the nation' was only possible with a certain way of apprehending the world. He argues that '[w]hat has come to take place of the medieval conception of simultaneity-along-time is ... an idea of 'homogenous, empty time''; here simultaneity is 'transverse, cross-time, marked not by prefiguring and fulfilment, but by the temporal coincidence, and measured by clock and calendar'. Hakluyt's narrative, and indeed the discourse of the nation he seeks to establish hinges on such a perception of simultaneity.

Studies examining Hakluyt's strategies to write the English nation and identity, such as those by Richard Helgerson or Mary Fuller, have focused on forms and perceptions of Hakluyt's epic respectively. In the process of defining a form of national identity Helgerson, in particular, stresses that 'England necessarily defined itself ... in terms of its relation to Spain'. Something similar is also true for the trade with the Ottomans: Spanish and other
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Christian nations’ allegations are rejected as their precedent serves England’s ‘happie rening and much increasing of our interrupted trade in all the Levant’. Helgerson ignores this, but usefully draws attention to the importance of merchants for Hakluyt’s purposes. By examining the conventions of the epic form Hakluyt employs, Helgerson identifies a rhetoric which ‘brings merchants into the nations and ... gentry into trade’. However, while the merchant is given an elevated position in Hakluyt, Helgerson also recognises the usefulness of mercantile documents for Hakluyt’s overarching nationhood project, because merchants lacked ‘a conceptual vocabulary that would have permitted them to assign special value to their own activities’. Another problem regards the ways in which identity could be asserted. Whereas an English identity is easily affirmed against, for instance, Spanish competition, it is less easy in the buzz of the Ottoman marketplace. Furthermore the strategic role of the Turk in the Mediterranean and Christian trade with Islamic nations in general, required justification in case accusations arose from other European nations. The complex process of negotiations revolving around the Turk and the interests of England, other Christian nations and the ‘Great Turk’, assumed, in theory, a myriad of combinations of trade between all participants. In practice, however, these aligned themselves to political and, more importantly, commercial interest of the provider of amans. Hakluyt’s collected writings on the Ottomans represent a valuable resource to examine these processes and English perceptions of those who participated in these Mediterranean ventures.

Arguably, the significant presence of documents related to Anglo-Ottoman interaction and trade make them an invaluable resource for the strategies through which Hakluyt construes his English nation. The accounts that portray the Turk in Hakluyt’s text mostly
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invite ambivalent readings of the ways in which the English nation is written. At the same
time they restore or recover a history of Anglo-Ottoman interaction that, perhaps, might have
been lost otherwise. In collecting these narratives Hakluyt provided Englishmen and women
easy access to a number of texts that did not only help to exhibit his nation's merits, but also
provided a rich and influential source that informed other writers, such as Leo Africanus,
Samuel Purchas, or William Shakespeare.45 Domestic constructions of Turks found on the
London stage often differed greatly from the portrayals found in some of their sources; they
often reflected current influences, but also served as a means by which English identity could
be explored. In this context, Vitkus remarks that on the stage 'this construction of a national
identity, in contrast to and in correspondence with various alien identities, was not the self-
conscious, propagandistic 'writing of England' described by Richard Helgerson and Claire
McEachern in their studies of England's emerging nationhood'.46

A similar point, with methodological implications, can be raised for the reports
collected by Hakluyt. Instead of focusing on the fact that there was an English presence in the
Mediterranean as evidence for the achievements of the English nation, what Bhabha terms
'the historical 'objects' of a nationalist pedagogy', the following discussion seeks to
foreground aspects of Anglo-Ottoman cultural exchange which focus on the individual
account in relation to Hakluyt's overall agenda. The underlying assumption here is that trade
was not performed along the lines of nation states, but by individuals or joint stock
companies.47 Hakluyt suggests as much when he explains in his editorial method that each
document may speak for itself: 'to the ende that those men which were the paynfull and
personall trauallers might reape that good opinion and iust commendations which they haue
deserued, and further, that euery man might answere for himself, iustifie his reports, and stand

45 D.B. Quinn, C.E. Armstrong, R.A. Skelton, 'Work's in which Hakluyt's influence is known
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accountable for his owne doings'. In this sense, the following discussion aims to explore the relationship between some of these accounts and Hakluyt’s own nationhood project.

4.2 The pilgrimage of trade - early English trade with the East and Islam

From the beginning, the merchant’s eye was firmly fixed on the East Indies in establishing trade in the Mediterranean. The earliest documents Hakluyt includes in his Principal Navigations depict an English presence primarily in the East, such as India, and less so in the Mediterranean. Their ventures are often not commercially inflected, but report on pilgrimage, travel and crusade. As evidence for his nation’s presence in those regions, Hakluyt recovers the ‘Britons’ who ‘accompanied the Cimbrians and Gaules in those expeditions to Italy and Greece’ as the first Englishmen to have entered the Mediterranean. Further examples include ‘Helena Flauia Augusta’, the mother of Constantine the Great, who was the daughter of Coelus, ‘sometime the most excellent king of Britaine’ and Constantine. These early narratives not only serve as reference points for England’s wider commercial interests in the East, but link these past ventures with actual concerns of Hakluyt’s contemporaries in the late 1590s. The main obstacle for Hakluyt’s countrymen, then, was that they did not have direct access to those goods and markets, until the foundation of the East India Company in 1600. Indeed, for many merchants through the early 1500s into the 1560s, direct access to these goods was not a requirement if most of the coveted goods could be easily obtained from Antwerp, rather than making the hazardous journey to the Mediterranean. It was primarily by these means that England exported its wool and kerseys, and obtained their luxury, exotic
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goods: from Venice via the land routes to Antwerp, Cadiz or directly from Lisbon. Antwerp, however, ceased to exist as an entrepôt with the escalating conflict in the Low Countries and finally fell to Spain in 1572. Also, economic and political conditions had changed in England and, which Hakluyt recognised, required new strategies to compete in the new markets. The significance of these early accounts should be seen from Hakluyt’s vantage point, rather than from a point of view informed by the economic situation of the early 1500s. This, of course, does not mean there was no interest in finding a route to India. Long before Martin Frobisher’s attempt to find a passage to the Pacific Ocean in 1576, merchants had already directed requests to their monarchs to promote access to these rich regions in India. In 1527 Robert Thorne, a Bristol merchant living in Spain, addressed Dr. Lee, ambassador of Henry VIII in Spain with a plea to search for a North-West passage to the East Indies in his *The booke made by the right worshipful M. Robert Thorne in the yeere 1527*. Thorne, writing from Spain, reports on the flourishing ‘trade of Spicery of the Emperor’ declaring the riches of these countries, which could be profitable to Henry VIII, ‘if, as the king of Portingal doth, he would become a merchant, and prouide shippes and their lading, and trade thither alone’ (sig. t6r). A passage along a north-west route to the Indies, according to Thorne, would set England in more promising competition with Portugal since ‘we should goe to these Islands a shorter way by more then 2000. leagues’.

Vasco da Gama’s circumnavigation of the Cape of Good Horn and Portugal’s subsequent establishment of its monopoly in the spice trade with the East Indies is perhaps the most significant economical event in this context bearing directly on England’s and other European markets. Spice prices suddenly soared and the old entrepôts like Antwerp, but especially Venice, from which England derived most of its oriental imports, suffered in the early 1500s. The venture Thorne had proposed never
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materialized, nor was his book published at the time, but Hakluyt perpetuated his writings and saved him from obscurity first in his *Divers voyages* (1582) and later in both editions of his *Prinicipal Navigations*. The allure of the Indies was powerful and produced further attempts to find a route, as the Willoughby-Chancellor expedition demonstrated. Although the venture failed to achieve its actual objective, the subsequent foundation of the Muscovy Company in 1555 made possible further attempts to seek overland routes through Persia into India. 55

Indeed, trade with the Ottomans should be seen through England’s attempts to gain direct access to the East Indies. 56

The Ottomans commanded a strategic position at the point of intersection of trade routes between the East Indies and Europe. 57 Joint ventures of European nations with the Ottomans thus naturally produced political tensions in the highly competitive climate of the Eastern trade. As Kenneth Andrews suggests the ‘opening of the Turkey trade was the most important event between the forging of the sea link with the Muscovy and the founding of the East India Company’. 58 But Hakluyt’s documents do not form a homogenous body portraying Anglo-Ottoman trade alone. Rather, they present glimpses of events and ideas that informed his nation’s commercial and cultural exchange with the Turk. To afford a view of these perceptions, the following discussion of Anglo-Turkish encounters will take as a starting point the dichotomy that underlies the ‘pilgrimage of trade’: religious encounters and commercial exchange. It will soon become clear, however, that this binary opposition is untenable in the light of Hakluyt’s evidence.

According to Hakluyt, England’s earliest recorded trade with the Levant took place in the years ‘1511, 1512, &c till yeer 1534’. Hakluyt’s sober assessment of the scarce commercial activities in these early days is encapsulated in his *The antiquitie of the trade with English ships into the Leuant*. The account neatly follows the report of the siege of Rhodes and the plea for military aid against the Turk by Don Ferdinando. If read in chronological order, the contrast between demonisation and commercial merit of the Turk could not be greater. However, Hakluyt allows for different ways of reading and perhaps, as Anthony Payne suggests, should be read as a large commonplace book where the Levant could simply be considered a commonplace of riches, a bazaar of opportunities. Hakluyt’s list of imported goods contains the most coveted products: ‘Silks, Chamlets, Rubarbe, Malmesies, Muskadels and other wines, sweete oyles, cotton wooll, Turkie carpets, Galles, Pepper, Cinamon, and someother spices’. In the search for these goods they ‘had an ordinarie and usuall trade to Sicilia, Candie, Chio, and somewhat to Cyprus, as also to Tripolis and Barutti in Syria’ and conducted ‘traffique with Jewes, Turkes, and other forreiners’.

An anonymous pamphleteer writing sometime between 1519 and 1535 concurs with Hakluyt but implies an earlier date for trade when he recalls that merchants ‘abowt a thirty six yere agoo was first occupieng to Turkye, Scio, and all thos partes, alle which now are cowtid but as common recourses’. But how was this ‘traffique’ conducted?

Religious antagonism between Christians and Turks is a complicating factor. Merchants were in potential danger of transgressing these religious boundaries simply by trading with members of a different religious denomination; as a result, they needed to legitimise their business. Richard Eden, in his *A Treatyse of the Newe India* (1553), provides an often repeated motive for commerce abroad, as it serves for ‘the glorye of God & comoditie of our
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Another problem was to find a way to trade safely given the exclusion of English merchants from the acquisition of safe-conducts at the time. What traders into these regions took advantage of was a religious tenet in Islam, which prescribed to 'leave the management of the affairs of the 'People of the Book' ... that is, the Christians and Jews under the protection of Islam, to their heads of their own churches'. In other words, Christians, as the 'People of the Book', travelling to the sepulchre of Jesus were given amnesty under Islamic law. Some of the earliest English trade was taking advantage of such protection, and, under the pretext of pilgrimage, sporadically conducted commercial activities in the Mediterranean. In 1446 Robert Sturmy, a Bristol citizen and former merchant, acquired a licence to send staple goods to the Mediterranean, a privilege of which he took advantage soon after when he sent out his ship, the Cog Anne to export wool, tin and cloth. Alongside its precious commercial cargo the ship also took on board 160 pilgrims for their way to the Holy Sepulchre. The Cog Anne was to make its way to the East and to collect spices, such as pepper and ginger, once the pilgrims had been safely transferred. Since the ship was destroyed in a storm off the island of Modon it remains impossible to say if those goods were actually exchanged.

Early English conduct of commercial activities in the dominions of the Ottomans without any safety assurance was a dangerous undertaking. The self-penned report by Roger Bodenham, an English merchant who lived in Seville and traded in the Mediterranean, illustrates the nature of many of these early commercial ventures Hakluyt included in his editions. Embarking from Gravesend to the islands of Chios and Candia [Crete] on 13 November 1550, the barke Aucher, under the command of Bodenham, set off on a perilous,
but commercially promising project. Laden with 'certaine merchandise', the ship was to go to Messina first before continuing its journey into the dominions of the Ottomans. The venture was risky, because Bodenham undertook it without an issued safe-conduct: a document, he was promised by a fellow merchant, he would be able to obtain at Messina before continuing their journey for Chios and Candia. To Bodenham’s disappointment, the paper was not produced; instead it had to be procured directly from the Ottoman authorities in Chios. This second attempt proved fruitless too when an unnamed messenger returned from the island with word that 'the Turke would giue none'. Bodenham’s circumstances did not improve: with a gathering Turkish fleet returning from Tripoli, his obligation to deliver the goods to Chios, and the merchant’s pressing demand to continue the journey, he set sail towards the two islands. At their arrival in Chios, Bodenham sent a boat to the harbour, asking the locals to ‘send for their goods out of hand’. However, pressured by his own merchants, he decided ‘to come into the harbour’ in which he ‘had a safe assurance for 20 dayes against the Turkes army’, which was granted for a protection fee of 12,000 ducats’. Bodenham hastily finished his business, fearing the coming of the ‘Turkes nauie’, and departed, albeit delayed, for Candia before the arrival of the Turkish fleet. In the haste, however, he had to leave behind some unfortunate merchants who were, after the ‘Turks’ had set foot on the island, ‘put ... into the Gallies’.

While many of these early accounts on Anglo-Ottoman commerce revolve predominately around the dangers experienced during their voyages, Hakluyt also provides the first detailed observation of a merchant, Anthony Jenkinson, on an actual Anglo-Ottoman encounter. The same year that saw John Locke set out for Jerusalem, the English merchant Jenkinson was on his way to obtain the first ‘safeconduct or priuiledge’ to trade feely in the
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realm of the Ottoman sultan Suleyman. Preceding the printed text of the safe-conduct, Hakluyt recounts Jenkinson’s account of Suleyman’s magnificent procession into Aleppo. On his way to war with Persia, Suleyman and his army, enter Aleppo on the ‘fourth of November, 1553’. Jenkinson’s observations of the spectacle oscillate between awe for the military prowess exhibited and the sumptuousness and splendour displayed by the parade. The staggering numbers of soldiers alone must have incited wonder and, possibly, fear in Hakluyt’s readers: ‘6000 Esperes, otherwise called light horsemen very braue, clothed all in scarlet’, marched before the ‘Grand Signior’, ‘[a]fter marched 10000 men, called Nortans, which be tributaries to the great Turk, clothed all in yellow veluet’, and later followed by 16000 Ionizaries, called the slaues of the Grand Signior’. The total number of participants Jenkinson gives for the events amounts to a staggering company of 300,000 men, which includes, ‘[t]he rest of his armie passed out ouer the mountains of Armenia’. It is with a merchant’s eye that the formation of soldiers and the sultan himself is being examined. The order of the procession follows that of military and political rank, but for Jenkinson it is also one of economical value: soldiers are clad in velvet or silk, pages of honour are dressed in silver and gold, according to their rank, and finally, Suleyman’s arrival is described as follows:

Immediately after them came the great Turke himselfe with great pompe & magnificence, vsing in his countenance and gesture a wonderfull maiestie, hauing onely on each side of his person one page clothed with cloth of gold: he himselfe was mounted vpon a goodly white horse, adorned with a robe of cloth of gold, embroidered most richly with the most precious stones, and vpon his head a goodly white tucke, containing in length by estimation fittene yards, which was of silke and linnen wouen together, resembling something Callicut cloth, but is much more fine and rich, and in the top of his crowne, a litle pinnach of white Ostrich feathers, and his horse most richly apparelld in all points correspondent to the same.
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Most of the materials the 'great Turke' was shown to wear embodied some of England's most coveted goods. Silk and precious gems were highly esteemed in Western Europe and could be found regularly on the lists of imported commodities. Moreover, such visible wealth was continuously recreated through the bestowal of luxurious gifts to the sultan. A note attached to Jenkinson's report testifies to this. The authority of the 'great Turk' was asserted by his tributaries' gifts: 'the Basha of Aleppo ... presented 100. garments of cloth of gold, and 25. horses'; '[t]he Basha of Aman presented 100 garments of cloth of gold, 20. horses, and a cup of gold with two hundred duckets'. More importantly for foreign merchants, however, was the observation that not only Ottoman tributaries were expected to bestow such gifts, but Christians trading in his realms: 'The Consul of the company of the Venetians in Tripolis, came to kiss the grand Signiors hand, and presented him a great basin of gold, the therein 4000. duckets Venetians'. It is thus that foreign merchants not only contributed to the sultan's coffers, but demonstratively submitted to his authority. Foreigners later complained strongly about such practice, known as avanias in the form of gifts or extortionate fees since it was not only restricted to the 'grand Signior', but was expected even by local authorities.

Despite these costs the privileges granted to the holder of such a document offered compensation, and a sense of security.

[to] arriue in our ports and hauens, with his ship or ships, or other vessels whatsoeuer, that you suffer him to lade or vnlade his merchandise wheresoeuer it shall seeme good vnto him, traffiking for himselfe in all our countryes and dominions, without hindering or any way disturbing of him, his ship, his people or merchandise, and without enforcing him to pay any other custome or toll whatsoeuer, in any sort, or to any persons whatsoeuer they be, saue onely our ordinarie duties contained in our custome houses, which when he hath paied, we will that he be franke and free, as well for himselfe as for his people, merchandise, ship or ships, and all other vessels whatsoeuer
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From the documents Hakluyt included, it is not possible to tell whether Jenkinson's trade was successful. What is evident from the safe-conduct, however, is that he was in the company of other Christians trading in these dominions: 'he may traffike, bargaine, sell and buy, lade and vnadle, in all our foresayd Countreys, lands and dominions, in like sort, and with the like liberties and priuiledges, as the Frenchmen and Venetians vse, and enjoy'. Such potential rivalry would later impair the first official English ambassador's work in Constantinople in the mid 1570s and early 1580s.

The prosperous, but short-lived, trade Hakluyt outlines for the period between 1511 and 1534 was by no means comparable to the concerted efforts of later ventures. Even though the dealings of merchants like Bodenharn or Jenkinson suggests a degree of success in trading in these regions, English commerce with the Turk came to a halt soon after. Reasons for this withdrawal from the Mediterranean can be located in different areas: notably the fall of Chios and Cyprus in 1566 and 1577 respectively which made access to the Mediterranean even more dangerous. A second reason, Fernand Braudel argues, was a general recession in the world economy which, in England, led to the formation of the Merchant Adventurers' Company and redirected mercantile interests. Another, more weighty reason, concerns the attempts to gain access to India directly, and thus to circumnavigate the trade with the Mediterranean. The result was the foundation of the Muscovy Company in 1555. Despite these developments, some merchants saw opportunities where others opted for different alternatives. For instance, the fall of Chios and its subsequent submission to Ottoman hegemony was welcome by the English merchant 'Gaspar Campion'.

Campion's account is remarkable for two reasons: on the one hand it is not only one of the earliest guides to the acquisition of a safe-conduct, but it also acknowledges Ottoman
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occupation as a beneficiary outcome at the expense of Christian territory. The island itself, as Campion asserts, is tributary to the Ottomans. Formerly an entrepôt of the Genoese, they submitted to the authority of the Turk and agreed to ‘pay him 14000 thousand ducats yeerely’.

However, on this island was a certain ‘Pedro Doria (being a Genouois)’ who, in the service of Philip, had waged war against the Turk. As a consequence, the ‘great Turk’ occupied the island and installed his own authorities. For Campion this strategic move was welcome, because ‘now it will be more easie for vs to obtaine our safeconduct then euer it was before’. For the merchant Campion, Turkish occupation is regarded as a positive since it essentially means less payment of customs:

For if the [Christian] townsmen of Chio did know that we would trade thither ... they themselues, and also the customer ... would be the chiefest procurer of this our safeconduit for his owne gaine. ... for we can pay no lesse then ten in the hundred thorowout the Turks whole dominion. Insomuch, that if one of our shippes should go thither, it would be for the customers profit 4000 ducats as least, whereas if we should not trade thither, he should lose so much.

These considerations succinctly illustrate the readiness of merchants to exploit and to adapt to the changing geo-political situation in the Mediterranean. It also offers a glimpse into the politics that underlie the use and resourcefulness of those who possess a safe-conduct. At the heart of Christian-Ottoman trade in general, and Anglo-Ottoman trade in particular, is the safe-conduct as the document that enabled merchants to pursue their profitable business. But this document is not merely a ticket for trade to the Ottomans, it reflects the fundamental power relations between Ottomans and Christians at the time; an aspect I want to examine more closely in the next section.
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4.3. Representation and Politics in Anglo-Ottoman trade

In 1569, the Porte issued the first verifiable French capitulations and thus gave permission to a Christian nation and its merchants to conduct trade safely in Ottoman dominions. Twenty seven years later, in 1596, the French consul to Alexandria and Cairo, a Signor Paulo Mariani, was 'hanged by the necke in his redd velvet goune under the chiefest gate of Cairo' on the command of the Vizir and Cadie. According to Marco Venier, the Venetian ambassador in Constantinople, Mariani was charged by the French ambassador with supplying information about Turkish forces to Spain. Both events, even though seemingly unrelated, do share a common denominator: their legislation and execution is dependent on Ottoman law. The capitulation was the legal basis from which foreign consuls, or ambassadors, derived their legitimacy and that of their nation's merchants to trade and travel peacefully in the realms of the Ottoman Empire. These documents belonged to the category of the so-called ahdnames: 'a written pledge under oath by the sultan granting a privilege, immunities or authority to a community, ruler or person'. What is significant about them is that they were given unilaterally. As Niels Steensgaard observes, such a concession was revocable only on the prince's part, but not on the merchants'. Hence Mariani's execution had to be performed by Muslim authorities rather than by the French. Until the beginning of the seventeenth century, capitulations did not guarantee any immunity on the Christian consul's side, but placed them squarely on equal footing with everyone else.
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This brief digression into Ottoman legislation charts some of the most important legal aspects involved in the renewed Anglo-Ottoman trade. It also outlines the close nature of the relations observed amongst English and Muslim subjects as they engage in ‘a written pledge under oath’. As a reference point for the examination of Hakluyt’s documents recording these official, mercantile encounters, it locates their interpretation in a system of unilateral power emanating from the Ottoman authorities. This, in turn, suggests a required re-evaluation of the valencies assigned by Westerners to the distributors of these safe-conducts.

To illustrate: the welcomed change of regime on Chios from Christian to Islamic ruler relies on a positive perception of Islam as opposed to the negative role ascribed to the Turk as an occupying force on Rhodes. It is the nature of the safe-conduct which can account for the frequently experienced gap to meet the conditions set out in the formal agreement, and the actual trade registered in the documents of Anglo-Ottoman trade. The safe-conduct presented to its bearer a privilege and a risk. Potentially the unilateral nature of the document made it difficult, if not impossible to predict the outcome of the ventures associated with it. Indeed, much relied on the good-will and the interests the Ottoman ruler and his local representatives held at a time. In the case of Mariani, Ottoman and French interests harmonized and the execution was in the interest of both parties. It identifies, in legal terms, the position of foreigners possessing a safe-conduct as identical to its Muslim inhabitants. This status, however, changed over time and unilateralism was increasingly interpreted as bilateralism concomitant with the rise of European powers over the Ottomans in the eighteenth century.

For England’s first official representative in Constantinople, William Harborne, circumstances were different. He was still subjected to the conditions of the safe-conducts that

---

93 Inalcik, Economic and Social History, I, p. 189.
94 Sanderson, on the other hand, does not specify the allegation levelled at Mariani; instead he ascribes French bribery of the Ottoman authorities as the cause for his execution: ‘[w]ith the said crouns the French wrought means for com[mandment] from the Vizier and Cadie to hang up Signor Paulo’, The Travels of John Sanderson, p. 13.
95 Inalcik, Economic and Social History, I, p. 191.
had made possible the execution of Paulo Mariani. On the other hand, England was in a far more valued position than most other European nations, including France at the time. Usually Ottoman sultans sought to secure certain political allegiances with the nations to whom they granted capitulations and England.96 With Elizabeth's excommunication in 1570, and Philip of Spain's annexation of Portugal in 1580, England provided the Ottomans with a suitable ally against their own enemies, above all Spain and the Habsburg Empire. English merchants became efficient suppliers of goods required for the Ottoman wars. In this section the focus is on the ways in which English merchants perceived of the Turk under these new conditions of trade. Whereas the previous section relied to a great deal on indirect, tentative evidence, this last section draws on documents providing specific advice on conduct, trade agreements, descriptions of encounters and competition.

The document which marks the watershed between England's early trade to the Levant, and the prospering ventures of the later sixteenth century, is The letters sent from the Imperiall Musulmanlike highnesse of Zuldan Murad Can, to the sacred regall maiestie of Elizabeth Queene of England.97 These are preceded by Hakluyt's assessment of The reneuing and increasing of an ancient and commodious trade vnto diuers places in the Leuant seas.98

After a brief recapitulation of past ventures, Hakluyt outlines the principal events which led to the establishment of these first officially granted privileges since Anthony Jenkinson in 1553. The absence of English ships in the Mediterranean between the late 1550s and the early 1570s is often ascribed to a variety of reasons, but above all it was the convenience of obtaining goods from Antwerp. It was Antwerp's fall in 1572 and the Battle of Lepanto in 1571 that had ushered in a 'new age in the history of relations between the northern countries and the Ottoman Empire'.99 The old trading routes and commercial transit centres either ceased to
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exist, or were embroiled in war with the Ottomans. England’s attempts to gain direct access to new markets became a necessity and an opportunity. Former middlemen in trade like Venice and Antwerp could be avoided, and profits made without paying additional customs. That the new, direct trade was a relief for the isolated Protestant nation must have appeared even more so after Philip’s annexation of Portugal in 1580. In other words, the rapprochement with the Turk after the early trade, was taking place under entirely different conditions in Christendom as well as for the Ottomans.

The way to these first privileges, Murad’s letter, was paved by two merchants: Edward Osborne and Richard Staper. It was for the benefits of the commonwealth, ‘the inlarging of her Maiesties customes, the furthering of nauigation, the venting of diuerse generall commodities of this Realme’, that they decided to renew the trade to the Levant, which had been neglected over the passed 20 years. At their expenses, they sent John Wright and Joseph Clements to Constantinople in 1575 for the purpose of obtaining a safe-conduct for William Harborne, who, in turn, would later negotiate the privileges Murad III grants to an unnamed merchant and two others; the latter Hakluyt identifies as Staper and Osborne in the margin of the letter to Elizabeth. The unknown merchant, it is generally acknowledged, is Harborne, since Elizabeth names him as the business’ principal conveyor in her reply to Murad’s letter (sig. M4'). As for the printed letter-exchange between Elizabeth and the Turkish ruler in Hakluyt, the Turk is addressed in a tone of respect, illustrated in Elizabeth’s reply to his first safe-conduct where she refers to Murad as ‘most Imperiall and most invincible prince, ..., the most mightie ryalder of the kingdome of Turkie, sole and aboue all, and most souereigne Monarch of the East Empire’. The textual history of this first conduct merits some attention here, because it describes some of the difficulties this cultural exchange entailed on an official level, and, as in this case, were open to manipulation.
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Susan Skilliter’s invaluable study of documents relating to the first Anglo-Ottoman relations offers astute observations on many documents Hakluyt reprinted in his *Principal Navigations*, including Murad’s first letter to Elizabeth. The document, as printed in Hakluyt, is based on a Latin translation of the Turkish original. However, both, the original Turkish document and its Latin translation sent to England are lost. There exist, though, many copies of the Latin translation, but only a copy of the original letter made in Constantinople, now preserved in Vienna.103 Another textual artefact that survives is a short note in the Register of the Ottoman Chancery, which provides a glimpse of what the real Turkish document must have contained.104 It is in this context, that Skilliter notes the absence of a clearly addressed agent, who, in the name of the Queen requested the safe-conduct in the first place, since this, ‘would certainly have been stated’ in the register.105 The result, Murad’s letter to Elizabeth, which opened the Anglo-Ottoman relationship, is itself a curiosity, since it was unusual for Ottoman procedure to open up correspondence.106 Furthermore, she argues that in the process of translation from Turkish to Latin, by the imperial translator Mustafa, this flaw was exploited by either Harborne in Constantinople, or Osborne or Staper in London by inserting or changing phrases as to limit a generous offer of trade to a whole nation into a seeming grant for a monopoly trade.107 Hakluyt’s passage reads as follows:

In most friendly manner we giue you to vnderstand, that a certaine man hath come vnto vs in the name of your most excellent Regall Maiestie, commending vnto vs from you all kindnesse, curtesie and friendly offices on your part, and did humbly require that our Imperiall highnesse would vouchsafe to giue leaue and libertie to him and vnto two other merchants of your kingdome, to resort hither and returne againe, and that by way of trafficke they might be suffered to trade
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hither with their goods and merchandizes to our Imperiall dominions, and in like sort to make their returne.\textsuperscript{108}

Elizabeth’s reply reflects the confusion about the grant when she requests that, ‘wee desire of your highnesse that the commendation of such singular courtesie may not bee so narrowly restrained to two or three men onely, but may be inlarged to all our subiects in generall’.\textsuperscript{109}

Skilliter’s analysis offers a glimpse of the problems attached to these documents and their cultural exchange in the process of translation. Harborne later complains about ‘dishonest dealing in translating of three of the \textit{Grand Signor} his commandments’ in a letter to Mustapha.\textsuperscript{110} Whether one assumes responsibility for the alterations on the merchants’ side or not, relations were set in motion and shortly after, Murad granted the requested privileges to the English. These privileges which were issued in June 1580 form the legal basis for Anglo-Ottoman relations and are based almost verbatim on the French capitulations from 1569.\textsuperscript{111}

The capitulation stresses, amongst the showing of mutual respect, the openness of the Ottoman market, ‘which is a refuge and Sanctuary to all princes of the world’.\textsuperscript{112} The key to these markets is ‘the obedience shewed’ to the Turk by Elizabeth’s subjects. Indeed, as is manifest by the ‘excellent kings and princes our confederates, shewing their deuotion, and obedience or services towards our stately Porch’ – the French king, the Venetians, the king of Poland, the same is expected by the Queen.\textsuperscript{113} In accepting those terms, Elizabeth, in the first charter of the Turkey Company in 1581, granted a monopoly trade to Richard Staper, Edward Osborne and other merchants appointed by the former two, ‘not exceeding the number of twelue’, for seven years.\textsuperscript{114} This, effectively, subservient position to the Porte was, of course,

\textsuperscript{108} Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1598-1600), II, sig. M3\textsuperscript{r}, my emphasis.
\textsuperscript{109} Ibid. sig. M4\textsuperscript{v}.
\textsuperscript{110} Ibid. sig. P3\textsuperscript{v}.
\textsuperscript{112} Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1598-1600), II, sig. M6\textsuperscript{r}.
\textsuperscript{113} Ibid. sig. M6\textsuperscript{r}.
\textsuperscript{114} Hakluyt, \textit{PN} (1598-1600), II, sig. N1\textsuperscript{v}.
not highlighted in the text of the charter itself; instead, the privileges are merely procured under the auspices of Elizabeth.

One important motive for English merchants to trade into the Levant was, according to Hakluyt, 'the venting of diuere generall commodities of this Realme'. England's main export goods included, 'Kersies of all sorts and colours, cloths, the like dyed and dressed, cottons, tin in bars, conyskins, pewter'.\(^{115}\) It was often pointed out that cloth export, like the merchandise with tin, was a concealed trade of arms. A list of goods which included the so-called 'prohibited goods' can be found in a Mühimme Defteri order of 1590: 'Grain, gunpowder, arms, horses, cotton, cotton yarn, lead, beeswax, morocco leather, tallow, hides, soft (sheep’s) leather, sheepskins and pitch'.\(^{116}\) Apart from this political use of commodities, technological aspects concerned with the processing of wool played a vital role in the exchange of goods with the Levant. The improvement of English wool-products was close to merchants' interests, since higher profits could be made by selling them off as finished goods, but would also provide work at home for England's workforce. Hakluyt reprints two documents which, in a modern sense, we might consider as industrial espionage. A Brief Remembrance of things to be indeuoured at Constantinople, which was given to an unnamed friend by Hakluyt 'sent into Turkie [in] 1582',\(^{117}\) lists a number of instructions for the collection of information. Hakluyt tells his friend to bring 'Anile [Indigo] wherewith we colour Blew' into 'this realme [England] by seede or roote'.\(^{118}\) He further asks him to obtain knowledge of 'the Arte of compounding the same'. Apart from plants and the know-how of using them, other items he requests concern information with regard to materials required in dying or 'to note all kindes of clothing [cloth-making] in Turkie'. Above all, he is meant to promote and sale 'of such our clothes as hee coloured with our owne naturall colours, ... rather then such as be coloured

\(^{115}\) Quoted in Susan Skilliter, 'William Harborne', p. 13.

\(^{116}\) Skilliter, Harborne and the Trade with Turkey, p. 56.

\(^{117}\) Hakluyt, PN(1598-1600), II, sig. O2".

\(^{118}\) Ibid. sig. O2".
with forren colours'. The latter point in particular demonstrates the persistent efforts not only to tap those markets, but to establish an English market for English cloths only. On the other hand, Hakluyt's recommendations show the competitiveness between English and Ottoman merchants.

Another document written for the expressed purpose to instruct those who 'seeke the common commoditie of their Countrey' was composed by Hakluyt himself. The short note is addressed to 'master S.', but is designed for any 'principall English Factor at Constantinople'. The tract emphasises the competitiveness for the vent of wool and cloth amongst Ottoman and Christian merchants. After praising English wool as 'Iesse subiect to mothes, or to fretting in presse then this', Hakluyt concludes that its full potential can only be revealed in its 'ample and full Uent'. However, he notes that other nations, whose wools are inferior to England's, turn theirs into 'truer and more excellent made cloth'. He hopes that by acquiring Ottoman expertise and, preferably, 'deuise to amend the Dying of England, by carrying hence an apte young man brought vp in the Arte', sales will increase and the English commonwealth be strengthened. Ottoman craftsmanship is valued, but even more so for the good such knowledge can bestow on the English nation.

At the beginning of the Levant trade, merchants were the principal agents in the relations with the Ottomans. This fact cannot be overemphasized since the difference between English merchants and English nation is not always observed, but often conflated in recent literatures. Jonathan Burton, for example, views Anglo-Ottoman relations in purely political terms and seems to equate English shipping with English nation. In printing the Anglo-
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Ottoman letter exchange, Hakluyt institutionalizes a relation that was effectively initiated, conducted and maintained by merchants conjoined in joint-stock companies, but only officially backed by Elizabeth. Nonetheless the government was crucial for these ventures. Through bestowing on its London merchants 'a whole series of chartered companies with monopoly rights over branches of foreign trade' the government not only supported but gained, in the form of customs flowing into the Queen's coffers. After all, English merchants, even though they traded far away from England, were nonetheless under English jurisdiction and required, for their ventures, royal consent. For some English subjects, as Nabil Matar has shown, such legal restrictions were often a reason to move into regions seemingly out of reach of their native country's jurisdiction. This relationship, on the other hand, knew limits. Expenses for Harborne, Elizabeth's official representative in Constantinople, were not paid by the crown, but by the merchants of the Turkey Company. It was through the channels of the mercantile community that governmental policy would be conducted, or at least attempted to enact. Overtly political motives entered this relationship with considerations that led to Harborne's appointment as ambassador. A letter from Dr. Thomas Wilson, the Elizabethan spymaster, to Harborne outlines the possibility of Harborne's appointment as ambassador: 'which graunt being assented unto, it is reason that those who were the principall dealers hitherto should have the chiefe pre-eminence tyme after'. As for politics, '[i]f anie thing be said unto you for an amitie or league to be concluded, [...] stand as ignorant what to say'.

Harborne's promotion to ambassador followed in 1582. Before then, he had secretly negotiated at the Porte for the Turkey Company and consolidated his position as an English envoy. But as Francis Walsingham had anticipated in his *Memorandum on the Turkey trade*
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129 Reprinted in Skilliter, *Harborne and the Trade with Turkey*, p. 75.
130 Ibid. p. 75.
(1578?) there were those 'who will seeke to impeache the traffique ... the Italians especiallie the Venetians, and the frenche'. 131 It was their abiding influence which, after the envoy’s return to London from Constantinople, achieved the repeal of the charter of privileges given to England shortly before. 132 On his return to the Porte, however, Harborne secured all the cancelled privileges. Furthermore, English merchants became the favoured aliens in the Ottoman Empire with a reduced customs duty of 3 instead of 5 percent paid by other nations. 133 Harborne’s diplomatic skills and detailed knowledge of customs and decorum in the presence of Turkish authorities is well attested. After his arrival at the sultan’s court in Constantinople on 24 April 1582, England’s ambassador finally met the ‘great Turk’ himself:

After the Ambassadour with his gentlemen had sitten an houre and more, there came three or foure chauses, and brought them into the great Turkes presence. At the Priuy chamber doore two noble men tooke the Ambassadour by ech anne one, and put their fingers within his sleeues, and so brought him to the great Turke where he sumptuously sate alone. He kissed his hand and stood by vntill all the gentlemen were brought before him in like maner, one by one, and ledde backewards againe his face towards the Turke; for they might neither tarry nor turne their backs, and in like maner returned the Ambassadour. 134

The demonstration of humility and respect in the face of the Ottoman sultan, which, as was said before, informs the contract between English merchants and Ottomans, is staged in a ceremonious act confirming the now fully official relations between England and the Ottoman Empire. A letter of directions addressed to his cousin, Richard Forster, appointed consul at Tripolis, gives a more detailed account of Harborne’s in-depth knowledge of local customs and conduct with authorities. He recommends to his cousin that at arrival, ‘giue it out that you be crazed and not well disposed’, ‘during which time, you and those there are most wisely to determine in what maner you are to present your selwe to the Beglerbi, Cadi, and other officers: who euer of them are to be presented according to the order accustomed of others

131 Ibid. pp. 28-30.
133 Inalcik, Economic and Social History, I, p. 368.
134 Hakluyt, PN (1598-1600), II, sig. PⅠ".
formerly in like office'. Moreover, the Ottoman officials 'are to giue you there also another lanizarie' whose 'outward proceedings', as Harborne suggests, 'you are to imitate and follow, in such sort as you bee not his inferiour'. Further advice concerns the dealings with other local foreign merchants, such as the French and Venetians, who are described as 'subtile, malicious, and dissembling people' and must thus be heeded. Consequently, '[t]ouching your dealings in their affaires of marchandise, you are not to deale otherwise then in secret and counsel'. Equipped with this set of instructions Harborne's cousin would commence his career as consul in Tripolis. Unlike Harborne, at the sultan's court, the new consul is encouraged to show a certain degree of confidence. The care and effort with which these official meetings are planned suggests the delicacy of conduct in order to achieve the desired aims. Furthermore, the distrust recommended towards the Venetians and French is significant as it implies that relations with the Turk are to be preferred to those with the Christians. It is, then, not surprising that other nations may have felt the need to criticise the English and Hakluyt to defend his nation's conduct in the preface of his Principall Naviagtions as discussed earlier.

But Hakluyt also reprints material related to practical problems in a number of notes concerned with trade in various commercial centres across the Ottoman Empire. These notes give useful advice and information on issues of availability of goods, local weights and measurements, currencies, and, most importantly, custom rates. Spice trade is best conducted in Alexandria with the 'Moores ... which be good people and not ill disposed'. It is also a good place for vending 'all sorts of kersies, but the most part blew, and of clothes all colours except mingled colours and blacks'. The opportunities of such rich trading grounds could
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only be impaired by the decision of Turkish authorities not to adhere or accept the safe-conducts under which English merchants were trading. In a letter Hakluyt reprints in his Principal Navigations, a group of English merchants in Alger complained to Harborne that the king of Alger refused 'any safe conduct nor commission to his men of war not to meddle up with them [English merchant ships] for that he trusted to take some of them this yere, ... and although they [the English] haue the Grand Signiors commandement [would] care not therefore'. Repeated attempts to soften tensions and differences arising from this refusal to accept the safe-conduct led Edward Osborne to address the issue personally to the king of Alger. The tone of the letter sustains courtesy and respect and is careful in addressing the issue of 'one of our ships, ..., laden with corants and other merchandize, ... sunke by 2. gallies of your citie of Alger'. The authorities of Alger would not submit on behalf of English authority and their articles of privilege granted by the grand Signior. It was only after William Harborne had obtained another commandment from Murad that the king of Alger finally submitted to the sultan's authority.

Osborne's letter, the different sets of advice given on trade and customs to be observed by new consuls, all express the dependency of English merchants on Turkish good-will. Even though England was given predominance in trade over the French or Venetians, the Turk remained an uneasy ally whose position was dictating the rules by which trade was conducted. Trade undoubtedly prospered and the increase in English profit without the employment of Venetian middlemen demonstrated the viability of this new relationship. Nonetheless, from the first official letter granting a safe-conduct to English merchants to the repeated requests to follow these privileges, the Turk was perceived as the law, regulating the conditions under which trade was performed. The desired exchange of commodities helped each party involved – the Ottomans gained the required goods for their warfare, the English
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the various exotic commodities, such as spices or silk. Moreover, new knowledge could be gained, as suggested by Hakluyt in his note of cloth dying, which, in turn, would not only help English merchants to sell their wool more profitably, but, indeed, the English commonweal by providing new employment at home. Another official document Hakluyt reproduces is Harborne's travel home at the end of his ambassadorship. The account is short and unspectacular. It describes the route Harborne took over land from Constantinople to London in 1588. Following his departure from Danzig, he remarked that the people of Danzig 'caused the Marchants to pay custome for the goods they brought with them in my company, which none other towne neither Infidels nor Christians on the way euer demanded'. In another letter Hakluyt did not publish, Harborne provides a glimpse into the still pronounced prejudices and religious antagonism that lurk beneath the official accounts. In this letter, Harborne ponders the dissatisfaction about his salary as ambassador which he contrasts with the 'perverse condition of those turquishe infidel & with whom forcedlie so long I was Conversante perfectlie to finishe this trade now firmlie established'. The last remark could easily be dismissed as a comment made by one of Elizabeth's many underpaid officials, yet Harborne was paid by the Levant Company. The felt anger was not simply a statement of insufficient payment, though it must have contributed, but it expresses attitudes officials and merchants may have held about the Turk in their commercial encounters.

In conclusion, Richard Hakluyt's collection of documents testifies to his nation's involvement in Ottoman dominions (and beyond). The documents offer a complex and uneven narrative of prejudice, religious antagonism, and commercial opportunities. At the same time, England's involvement with the Ottoman Empire is a key element through which Hakluyt can narrate his nation's achievements. However this narrative relies on an ambiguity he needs to efface, or at least justify through the conduct of those who criticise him. This is of

143 Ibid. sig. 2B1f.
course possible, because many other Christian nations traded with the Porte The Spanish Empire, especially following the annexation of Portugal, and the disappearance of many old entrepôts on the continent, required many nations to make compromises as to either extend or sustain the often already established trade with the Ottomans. In this mercantile context the Turk is given a new significance. The stark contrast between the early commercial, though admittedly often blurry ventures to the Mediterranean and the later concerted efforts reassign new associations or values to the Turk. Whereas religiously demonised concepts continue to circulate, they are often modified or suppressed in favour of more promising money-making ventures. Of course, these new relations with the Turk were always also political as we have seen in first chapter.
5. Old anxieties, new influences – the valiant Turk of romance fiction

For if the Christian Princes euer striue
To win faire Greece out of the tyrants hands,
And those vsurping Ismalites depriue
Of wofull Thrace, which now captiued stands,
You must from realms and seas the Turkes forth driue,
As Godfrey chased them from Iudais lands,
And in this legend, all that glorious deede
Read, whil’st you arme you; arme you, whil’st you reed.¹

The texts discussed in the previous chapters all recognise a plurality of different literary forms through which Englishmen and women viewed the Ottoman Turks, and, in turn, themselves. In these documents, a number of recurring motifs reflect the pervasiveness of the discourse of a Turkish threat, such as the fear of Ottoman military incursions, the association of the Turk with Antichrist, or conversion to Islam. Furthermore, these motifs could be muted, emphasised, confirmed or questioned in a number of ways: political expediency, religious difference, affirmation of identity, travel or trade, and the internal and external religious struggle in England and Western Christendom. This final chapter turns to romance fictions as a genre that portrays Turks, or perhaps more generally Muslims, in significantly different ways from those discussed in previous narratives. As a form, romance not only crosses period boundaries, and those of class and gender, but it is also interesting because it absorbs elements from other forms such as travel or the fantastic. The general argument put forward here is that while the portrayal of Turks and Muslims in romance fictions helped to perpetuate the discursive reality of a Turkish threat, the form also offered a textual site in which this threat could be resolved. Torquato Tasso’s allegorical epic Gerusalem Liberatta (1581) usefully exemplifies this.

First published ten years after the battle of Lepanto, Tasso’s poem portrays another, earlier moment in the history of Christian-Muslim encounters, the First Crusade. While Tasso’s poem elides both the political and religious divisions that had festered in Europe at the time, the Christian-Muslim conflict that frames the poem’s narrative continued to evoke topical concerns of a continuing Turkish threat to Christendom. This is perhaps best illustrated in Tasso’s observation, quoted above, that should ‘Christian Princes euer striue / to win faire Greece out of the tyrants hands’, they first ‘must from realms and seas the Turkes forth driue’. Such an acknowledgement of contemporary Ottoman hegemony is sharply contrasted with an earlier Christian victory, here the recovery of Jerusalem during the First Crusade by Godfrey of Boulogne in 1099. The marked incongruity between past and present is acknowledged in the poem and articulated as a gap illustrated by the contrast between past achievements and present state of affairs; a gap Tasso seeks to bridge by encouraging both military and spiritual opposition to the Turks: ‘Read, whil’st you arme you; arme you, whil’st you reed’. The image invoked here, the reader who simultaneously puts on physical and mental amour in preparation for battle by reading the legend of Godfrey, promotes both a call to crusade against the Turks and the spiritual edification and strengthening of Christian faith.

While the motif of a united Christendom and the poem’s setting during the First Crusade expresses a pan-Christian nostalgia for Christian successes, the poem also portrays Muslims as idol-worshipping pagans. Alongside representations of Muslims as tyrannical, cruel and blood-thirsty, especially their leaders – Aladine, Soliman – Tasso’s Jerusalem is inhabited by Christians and heathens, ‘The lesser part on Christ beleueed well, / On Termagan’t the more and on Mahowne’. However, by the time Tasso had composed his poem, Islam had long been acknowledged as a religion, with Muhammad as its prophet.

2 Termagan, or Termagaunt is the name given to a fictitious deity supposed to be worshipped by Moslems and is also a pagan God; Middle English Dictionary, ed. by Hans Kurath and associate ed. Sherman M. Kuhn (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1954-).

3 Tasso, Godfrey of Bulloigne, Canto 1, 84.
irrespective of the Christian belief that it was anathema to their own faith. Sixteenth-century Christendom saw a conflict between Muslims and Christians, not between pagans and Christians. As we have seen in the previous chapter, Queen Elizabeth, in her correspondence with Murad III, exploited this axis of faith through their shared iconoclasm. Tasso employs a motif closely linked to the idea of paganism, magic. This is exemplified in the poem by the figures of Ismeno and Armida: the former is a sorcerer who was ‘[a] Christian once, Macon he now adores’, and the latter a seductive enchantress, who, as Tasso explains, ‘is that temptation which laieth siege to the power of our desires’.

Tasso’s poem acknowledges the threat posed by the Turks in his own days, but the epic itself eludes this threat by presenting a world largely free from Christian disunity. As his example also indicates, representations of Muslims in romances – whilst certainly overdetermined – only rarely echo those I have discussed so far; instead, they derive their portrayals and vocabulary from an earlier tradition, and multiple cultural centres and forms. In this chapter I explore this tradition first, and then consider some of its ramifications for the portrayal and use of Turks in romances in sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century England.

One problem in interpreting portrayals of Turks in sixteenth-century romance rests with their origins. Their marked difference from more recent portrayals allows for no easy inference as to the various influences that have shaped their inception. This much is suggested by Matthew Dimmock’s observation on the concept of the Turk in sixteenth-century romance:

Unlike those texts centred upon diplomatic interaction or historical narrative, the variant romance forms through which the ‘turke’ is constructed are, by definition, less dependant upon the signifiers of religious and ideological difference and rather reflect the prominence of location and genre convention that defines their sources.
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4 Watt, Muslim-Christian Encounters, pp. 83-88; Matar, Islam in Britain, p. 73.
5 Tasso, Godfrey of Bulloigne, Canto 2, 2.
6 Ibid. p. 90.
8 Dimmock, New Turkes, p. 93, my emphasis.
Dimmock's definition of the 'turke' also recognises the disparity between other genres and romance. However, he ascribes the construction of the 'turke' in romances to location and convention rather than to ideological and religious variables. Largely based on the assumption of 'religious and ideological difference', Dimmock's approach highlights the influence of conceptual changes in the available forms of the Turk during the early modern period. But while he recognises that "the romance 'turke'" emerges from a different tradition, he does not follow or explain this any further. 9 It is perhaps helpful then to review some of the earlier developments that contributed to the constructions of the Turk in romance. Here it is important to remember that the Turkish threat and representations of the Turk were not exclusively the result of Christian engagement with Muslims in the sixteenth century, but that they are rooted in different, earlier moments. The Turks portrayed in romance fiction are part of a narrative tradition that represents a continuation of images rooted in earlier moments of Christian-Muslim encounters. Of course, these portrayals underwent new influences, but, to a certain extent, retained their conceptual difference to portrayals of Turks that were informed by more recent ideological variables. There is, then, a convergence of old anxieties with new influences. The point is that the imago Turci of the mid-sixteenth and early seventeenth century should be understood not only in the ways in which it reflects more recent ideological and religious differences, but also in the ways in which it continues to perpetuate earlier traditions preserved in the romance tradition.

The next section of this chapter sketches some of the portrayals of Muslims that arose in this tradition and relates them to the changing contexts in which they were produced.

9 Ibid.; Dimmock's discussion of the 'turke' relies, to a large extent, on his initial observation of the 'turke' as a satirical metaphor which he develops further into a complex signifier expressing a wide range of associations related to a real and imagined Turkish threat. This in turn made available a variety of models English writers could employ. He does not, however, consider earlier, existing concepts and traditions that might have had a bearing on the documents he examines; see New Turkes, pp. 20-86.
Following from this, it is useful to ask what appealed to authors or translators who continued to resort to such earlier portrayals of Turks and Islam if more recent images were available. As we will see there is no easy answer to this, but I want to suggest that, as Tasso’s example indicates, writers, both English and continental, often gave expression to shared values when they addressed the Turkish threat through the use of earlier portrayals. Further, while the combination of a pan-European expressed sense of the Turkish threat and its containment in these fictions implies a disengagement with recent religious and cultural issues, these shared images nonetheless responded to their specific contexts. In other words, they enabled writers to express and explore other topical concerns.

On a final note, some further explanation as to what I understand by the term romance in this chapter is required. Both romance and Turks are not inventions of the sixteenth or seventeenth century, but have a long and interconnected history that can be traced to the First Crusade.\(^\text{10}\) By no means should this imply that romance has its roots in this particular point in time;\(^\text{11}\) rather, I wish to stress the long-existing and productive relationship between romance and history. This last point is readily made by George Puttenham who implies that they are synonymous when he writes of ‘a little brief Romance or historicall ditty in the English tong’\(^\text{12}\). Further, romance has a capacity to incorporate or to be incorporated within other texts. Again, Tasso’s poem illustrates this in its attempt to synthesise romance elements with the epic form. One problem, then, is to identify texts as romances. Here it is useful to spell out some of its features which I will be following: romance is characterised by exotic settings, the action’s location or setting, which takes place in a distant time or place; in contrast to other forms such as the *chanson de geste*, romance-narratives are not anchored in a precise time and


space; further they includes quests, magic and the supernatural and above all a concern for the hero’s inward thoughts, feelings, aspirations, and, frequently, those of the heroine. This list suggests a clearly defined and recognisable form, but as Helen Cooper also points out ‘no single [feature] is essential for definition or recognition taken individually’. In this sense the possibilities as to what counts as romance are vast. For the purposes of this chapter I propose to look at romance as an open form that absorbs a vast number of influences and elements, and remakes them as a hybrid form. It is an inclusive mode of writing, a textual strategy which responds to historical events by drawing on a wide range of sources while being part of that history.

5.1 Romance, Saracens and the location of Turkish threat

Before turning to late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century portrayals of Turks and Saracens in romances, a brief survey of medieval romances provides a useful context for recognising the continuities and divergences that emerge in early modern romances and the ways in which they represent Turks. This is important for three main reasons: first, the continuing fashion for works exhibiting motifs of romance, indicated by their reprinting throughout much of the sixteenth century, stresses the popularity and relevance of these medieval works for early modern English culture. The underlying assumption here is that
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14 Ibid. p. 9.
15 Geraldine Heng, in rather cumbersome terms, defines romance as ‘a desiring narrational modality that coalesces from the extant cultural matrix at hand, poaching and cannibalizing from a hybridity of all and any available resources, to transact a magical relationship with history, of which it is in fact a consuming part’; Geraldine Heng, Empire of Magic Medieval Romance and the Politics of Cultural Fantasy (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), p. 9.
continuities between the medieval and early modern period exist and that they matter, in particular, the resilience of allegedly fading literary forms, such as the romance. In her study on the relationship between chivalry and exploration, Jennifer Goodman questions the devaluation of romance and the long-accepted belief of the ‘death’ of European chivalry in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. This view is further endorsed by Helen Cooper’s recent assessment that ‘the continuities between medieval and Renaissance culture in England are exceptionally strong’ by comparison to other nations, such as France and Italy. This section seeks to recover some of the medieval portrayals of Muslims which, in many cases, exhibit longevity throughout the sixteenth century and beyond. Secondly, in recovering earlier representations, the overview seeks to illustrate some of the coded representations of Muslims available to writers of romance at the time. In doing so, I want to draw attention to the vast potential of meanings that the early modern period inherited from the medieval past and which coexisted with the more recent portrayals of Muslims in the sixteenth century. Finally, this overview indicates the contextual changes which attended the development of these portrayals of Muslims and sketches their relationship with history as a source of inspiration, reflection and examination.

The clash between East and West during the First Crusade in 1095, according to R.W. Southern, was a key moment in the development of portrayals of Muslims. As one of the earliest literary works to deal with this confrontation, the Chanson de Roland, written circa
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re-imagines the events of the Spanish campaign led by the legendary Emperor Charles
or Charlemagne (742-814) in 778 and the death of his nephew Roland at Roncevaux. Set
amid the unfolding conflict between Muslims and Christians, the poem depicts Saracens as
pagans, here represented by ‘King Marsile’ who simultaneously ‘serves Mohammed and
prays to Apollo’. Notably, in contrast to many early modern renderings of Muslims, Marsile
and his followers are explicitly inferior in military strength, ‘I have no army capable of giving
him battle’. Further, they lack moral virtue: ‘one of the most cunning pagans’ (24) suggests
that it is appropriate to deceive Charlemagne in order to achieve victory. A wealth of other
qualities characterise the Saracens, such as their inclination to sorcery; further they are proud,
haughty and possessed by the devil. Their depravity contrasts starkly with the assumed
moral (and physical) superiority of Christians throughout the geste. While the events of the
poem do not correspond to what had actually happened, the poem illustrates a strategy
which, according to John Tolan, allowed crusaders and ecclesiastical authorities to justify war
against the Saracens. Located within an eschatological framework, Tolan explains, the
casting of Muslims as pagans allowed crusaders to re-enact their roles as ‘the new apostles’
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22 The Song of Roland, I, pp. 1-3; see also Henri Pirenne, Mohammed and Charlemagne
23 The Song of Roland, II, (1, II. 7-8).
24 Ibid. p. 18.
25 The Song of Roland, I, 108-10; Tolan, Saracens, pp. 120-134.
26 For a brief summary of the actual events see Jo Ann Hoeppner Cruz, ‘Popular Attitudes
Towards Islam in Medieval Europe’ Blanks and Frassetto (eds.) Western Views of Islam,
pp. 55-81, at p. 56; Dorothee Metlitzki, The Matter of Araby in Medieval England (New
who, in turn, would punish the ‘pagan Roman persecutors’. This kind of backward projection enabled Crusaders to justify past and future ventures in the East.

Despite the negative portrayals of Saracens, they were often accredited with qualities that made them worthy ‘opponents to the Christians’. Some were even held in high regard, for instance the Sultan of Egypt and Syria, Salah al-Din (1137-1193) who became a chivalric hero and the subject matter of many legends. Further, a number of medieval writers contributed to a more refined imagery of Saracens in the Middle Ages: Dante Alighieri, in his *Inferno*, casts Muslim philosophers and Saladin in Limbo, the first circle of Hell, where ‘the sad shades of the virtuous non-Christians dwell’. In his *Decameron*, Giovanni Boccaccio (1313-1375), shows an even more accommodating attitude towards Muslims when he depicts Saladin as a noble ruler and, more importantly, as someone who is not prepared to enforce violence at any cost. The author of *The Travels of Sir John Mandeville* (c. 1357), too, portrays the Saracens in a positive light. Mandeville describes the sultan as an apt ruler, with whom he is able to engage in private debate over questions of religion, customs, and trade.
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28 Ibid. p. 112.
29 The *Chansons de Croisade* were used to promote Crusade. Such was the case with the *Chanson d’Antioche*, which made Crusade central to its argument; Tolan, *Saracens*, pp. 120-3; for other examples Bisaha, *Creating East and West* pp. 32-34, at p. 33.
30 Cruz, ‘Popular Attitudes’, p. 56.
33 The story Boccaccio tells is that of Saladin who, in need of money, seeks to ‘obtain what he needed’ from a ‘rich Jew, Melchizedek’. Saladin refuses to enforce his will through violence in order to extract the money; instead he uses ‘force in the guise of reason’; Giovanni Boccaccio, *The Decameron*, trans. by G.H.McWilliam (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972), p. 87.
Nonetheless, this deceptively amiable portrayal is framed by an initial call for Christian recovery of the Holy Land.\(^{35}\)

While romances dealing with Charlemagne and his paladins continued to enjoy popularity in the Italian literature of the Middle Ages – and would remain an ‘enduring example of chivalry, service to the faith, and crusading zeal’ in the Renaissance – English writing, too, testifies to their influence.\(^{36}\) Among the ten extant metrical romances emerging from the Carolingian tradition in England, seven have Saracens as their principal protagonists.\(^{37}\) A possible influence on Shakespeare’s Othello,\(^{38}\) the romance of *Otuel and Roland* (c.1330) narrates Charlemagne’s conquest of Gallicia, but focuses considerably on Otuel, a Saracen. Otuel, after his arrival at the court of Charlemagne, challenges Charlemagne and Roland to a fight:

> Garcy sent me the tylle,  
> And sayde that he wyl thy bodye spylle,  
> ffor the wynnyng off Spayne.  
> By-leue on hys god mahoun,  
> Iubiter, & syre platoun!\(^{39}\)

Charlemagne does not convert, Roland accepts the challenge and defeats Otuel who, in turn, converts to Christianity and joins forces with Charlemagne defending his new faith. The episode is not only noteworthy for its focus on a Saracen character; but also for Otuel’s conversion to Christianity as a way of containing Islam. Moreover, the shift in emphasis from


\(^{36}\) Bisaha, *Creating East and West*, pp. 30-42.

\(^{37}\) Metlitzki, *The Matter of Araby*, 120; H.M.Smyser, ‘Charlemagne’s Legends’ in *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1500* ed. by J.Burke Severs (New Haven: The Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1967), I, pp. 80-100; other titles include *King Horn* (c. 1225); *Charlemagne and Roland* (1330-40); *Roland and Vernagu* (before 1330-40); *The Ashmole Sir Firumbras* (c. 1380); *Sowdon of Babylon* (c. 1400); *The Siege of Melayne* (c. 1400); *Charles the Grete* (1485).


the figure of Charlemagne to the Saracen, Dorothee Metlitzki explains, is the result of the emergence of other national figures in Britain, above all the repatriation of Arthur of Britain by Thomas Malory in the fifteenth century. As a result, there was no need to praise a French national hero in English rewriting.\footnote{Metlitzki, *The Matter of Araby*, p. 120; Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation – The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984), pp. 159-203, at p. 160.}

The branch of romance known as ‘the matter of Britain’ produced its own heroes. While ‘the matter of France’ remained influential throughout the period from post-conquest Britain to Chaucer,\footnote{Rosalind Field, ‘Romance in England, 1066-1400’ in *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature* ed. by David Wallace (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 152-178, at p. 154; Barron, *English Medieval Romance*, pp. 89-131.} pre-conquest lore ensured that many an English knight would face perils abroad and at home. *King Horn* (c 1225), for instance, rooted in Anglo-Saxon folklore, derives its social and historical context not from the earliest crusade, but from the period of the Viking raids before the Norman Conquest.\footnote{Barron, *English Medieval Romance*, p. 65.} As a result, W.R.J Barron suggests that the Saracen pirates Horn encounters as a child are late substitutes for these Vikings.\footnote{Ibid. p. 65.} In a number of romances written about the year 1300, amongst them *Guy of Warwick*, *Bevis of Hampton* and *Richard Coeur de Lyon*, English heroes engage with enemies who are distinctly Muslim.\footnote{Robert Allen Rouse, *The Idea of Anglo-Saxon England in Middle English Romance* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2005), pp. 75-84.} One of the most ambivalent of these renowned figures was Richard I (1157-99) who joined the third crusade, captured Acre, fought Saladin and was imprisoned by the Duke of Austria and later ransomed. His legendary (but grossly fictitious) adventures are extant in *Richard Coeur de Lyon* and remained popular until the sixteenth century.\footnote{Anon., *Kynge Rycharde cuer du lyon*, (London, n.pub.1509), STC 21007; reprinted, 1520 and 1528.} Combining the zeal of a crusader with religious piety, Richard is presented as a Christian in the romance in an unorthodox way by showing him developing, infamously, a taste for roast Saracens. On
one occasion, he has a boiled head, ‘upward hys vys [face], the teeth grennand’ and labelled with the victim’s name, served to each ambassador sent by his foe.\textsuperscript{46} Richard’s diet might be shocking to a modern readership, but was endorsed by the romance’s narrative and, as Geraldine Heng writes, even considered ‘\textit{a joke in a popular romance}'.\textsuperscript{47} However, Heng argues elsewhere, this joke is an aggressive yet healing one; it is part of a ‘cultural rescue in the aftermath of the first crusade’ not to justify, but to come to terms with the atrocities committed by crusaders amongst the Saracens in the early crusades, in particular Christian cannibalism.\textsuperscript{48}

As some of these portrayals of Saracens enabled writers to deflect attention away from Christian atrocities, others promoted and explored Christian values, above all Malory’s \textit{Le Morte Darthur}.\textsuperscript{49} The legendary but fictitious deeds of Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table were well known, not least because of a Welsh monk who had aided their circulation. Edward III’s foundation of the Order of Garter in 1348, which was modelled on Arthur’s famous Round Table also helped to institutionalize its chivalric values.\textsuperscript{50} Malory’s critical vision of Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table adds an equally complex knight to this illustrious company: the Saracen knight Palomides.\textsuperscript{51} For this Saracen, the fourth-best knight after Lancelot, Tristram and Lamorak, Malory adapts three qualities: he is renowned throughout the world for his prowess, he is eloquent and, most remarkably, he is humble.\textsuperscript{52}


\textsuperscript{47} Heng, \textit{Empire of Magic}, p. 65, original emphasis.

\textsuperscript{48} Ibid. p. 2; p. 65.

\textsuperscript{49} Thomas Malory, \textit{Thus endeth thys book entitled le morte Darthur} (London: Caxton, 1485); STC? This title was reprinted in 1498, 1529, 1557, 1582, 1620, 1634.


\textsuperscript{51} Nina Dulin-Mallory, ‘“Seven trewe bataylis for Jesus sake”: The Long-Suffering Saracen Palomides’, in \textit{Western Views of Islam}, pp. 165-172.

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid. p. 170.
Humility – a quality generally not associated with Saracens in Christian writings – marks his actions following his defeat by Tristram. Despite these positive, Christian qualities, Palomides’ fate is to suffer in both his pursuit of the Christian faith and in his quest for his ultimately unrequited love for ‘La Beale Isoud’, the love-interest of Tristram. Palomides has to face Tristram in a combat over Isoud. This will be his final battle; through it, he seeks to prove himself worthy of the Christian faith. At his encounter with Tristram, the latter asks Palomides why, being ‘soo good a knyghte’, yet he ‘wold not be chrystened’\(^3\) to which Palomides replies that ‘I haue but one batail to do, and when that is done I wil be baptysed with a good wille’.\(^4\) From the fight for Isoud, Palomides emerges defeated but reconciled with Tristram; what remains to be done is to undergo baptism. Palomides’ virtues are highlighted in this final conflict while his potentially threatening religious identity is contained.

Turkish and other Islamic characters, then, exhibit a range of qualities in medieval works, often fulfilling specific ideological and cultural purposes. Charlemagne’s exploits, both in the original *chanson* and in later romances, mirror, idealise and justify early Christian crusade through the empowering rhetoric of self-indulgent victory. Richard’s macabre diet returns events to the battlefield, compensating for the defeat Christians suffered in later crusades as well as to sublimating the atrocities they committed into culturally accepted forms. In both cases, these Christian representations of Muslims are complex responses to external events that inspired and shaped them. Notably, the figure of the Saracen rather than the Turk dominates these medieval texts. However, the range of associations attached to the Saracens – from its earliest incarnations as a pagan people in Charlemagne’s adventures to

\(^4\) Ibid. p. 424.
late-medieval representations of the valiant infidel – changed in line with the circumstances that were largely responsible for their creation during the crusades.

If early crusading success had left its mark on the portrayals of Muslims, the emergence of a new discourse on the Turks finally dislocated them from their original contexts. Disunity among Christians and the growing power and expansion of the Ottoman Empire had made Christian warfare against Muslims an increasingly difficult endeavour. The disastrous crusade of Varna in 1444 is a case in point. But it was the fall of Constantinople in 1453 – as we have seen in the first chapter – that signalled a change in the ways Christian crusade against Muslims would be conducted and invoked. If the fall had invited humanists to realign the rhetoric of crusade for purposes of marking the Turks as the enemy, they also contributed to this sense of a Turkish threat by their detailed descriptions of atrocities committed to Christians. The humanist and later Pope Pius II, Aeneas Piccolomini, delivers a vivid comment on the alleged cruelties committed by Mehmed II in the aftermath of the capture of Constantinople:

Those who were present say that the foul leader of the Turks, or to speak more aptly, that most repulsive beast, raped on the high altar of Hagia Sophia, before everyone's eyes, the most noble, royal maiden, and her young brother, and then ordered them killed.

As was mentioned in chapter 1 already Piccolomini's rhetoric helped shape a discourse on the Turkish threat and which anticipates the demonising portrayals found in English writing on the Turk. In particular, his identification of Mehmed as the deviant, sexually transgressive and barbarous Turk retained its currency throughout the sixteenth century. This imagery developed a life of its own, while its historicity was more than questionable. For once,

56 'Aiunt, qui praesentes fuere, spurcissimus illum Turchorum ducem, sive ut aptius loquar, teterrimam bestiam apud summam aram sanctae Sophiae propalam videntibus omnibus nobilissimam virginem ac fratem eius adolescentem regalis sanguinis construprasse ac deinde necari iussisse', cited in Bisaha, East and West, p. 63.
Mehemed's alleged violations, Bisaha points out, are unlikely, given that the Byzantine emperor was unmarried and childless.\textsuperscript{57}

In concluding this preliminary survey I want to draw attention to three important points that have a direct bearing on the following discussion: first, the images of Muslims in medieval romances reprinted in later centuries manifest earlier responses to Christian-Muslim encounters. Like later representations of Turks, these responses were the result of real and imagined encounters expressing both accommodating and demonising attitudes. Secondly, while the original topicality that informed these earlier representations of Saracens and Turks had largely disappeared, some of their portrayals survived in the reprinted materials for a new readership in sixteenth-century England. The valiant Turk we encounter in Palomides is not exclusively the result of generic conventions, but reflects earlier, topical concerns that had informed its inception. With new information on Turks arriving slowly in England during the first half of the sixteenth century, these representations had already created a backdrop and source for many of the anxieties, expectations and perceptions Englishmen and women had about Muslims.

Finally, open warfare under the banner of a united Christendom had become an ideal, encapsulated by the idea of a \textit{unitas Christiana} and left inscribed in the \textit{chansons de gestes} and romances of this literary tradition. In the context of a spreading Turkish threat, these images perpetuated the ideal of the successful assimilation (or defeat) of the Turk which was continuously betrayed by encounters with Turks as a result of Christian \textit{realpolitik}. While the \textit{unitas Christiana} offered a common point of reference to which Christians subscribed, romances offered relatively unproblematic, but fictional solutions to tensions that were real among Christians. In other words, if the Turkish threat is understood as a discursive process,

romance was a locus in which shared Christian values could be preserved or negotiated irrespective of a specific Christian denomination.

5.2 The Italian Turk – crisis and virtue

Thus far in this chapter, I have considered portrayals of Saracens and Turks in medieval romances. The example with which I opened – Tasso’s *Gerusalem Liberatta* – is both a result and a continuation of this tradition. However, by invoking the nostalgia of a successful first Crusade, Tasso also responds to the current Turkish threat, urging his readers to arm both mentally and physically for another, more imminent crusade against the Turks in their own time. The actual portrayal of the Turk resorts to a repertoire of medieval images that clearly belong to, and represent a continuation of this earlier romance tradition. Not all writers of romance fictions were so self-conscious in addressing military ventures against the Turk, and often explored other agendas. The following discussion turns to texts compiled by two English writers, William Painter and Barnaby Riche, who were both involved in military dealings, the former as a master of Ordinance, the latter a soldier in Ireland. Their portrayal and use of the Turk is also informed by the romance tradition outlined above, but their respective aims express concerns close to England. Notably, while the Turk as a figure of anxiety reflects the topicality of a Turkish threat, romance itself had been a source of anxiety.

An influential novella collection published in two parts in 1566 and 1567 respectively, William Painter’s *The Palace of Pleasure* contains translated works from Italian and French authors such as Boccaccio and Bandello.⁵⁸ The two texts have received critical attention both
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⁵⁸ William Painter, *The palace of pleasure beautified, adorned and well furnished, with pleasaunt histories and excellent novelles, selected out of divers good and commendable authors* (London: John Kingston and Henry Denham, 1566), STC 19121; *The second tome of the Palace of pleasure conteyning store of goodly histories, tragicall matters, and other morall argument* (London: Henry Bynneman, 1567), STC 19124.
as a source for Elizabethan playwrights and works of political subversion. Dedicated to the master of Ordinance Ambrose Earl of Warwick and Sir George Howard respectively, Painter’s collection presents to its readers ‘the great valiance of noble Gentlemen’ and ‘virtuous mindes of noble dames’. Painter’s references to novella as alternately ‘histories’ and ‘news’ suggests a degree of authenticity, promising his aimed readership – ‘the noble Gentlemen’ – that these novella are ‘both profitable and pleasant’. While pleasant to ‘recreate and refresh weried mindes’, the profit of each story for ‘both olde and yong’, Painter argues, is self evident, if ‘throughly read and well considered’; they are a guide through which the readers ‘may learne howe to auoyde the ruine, ouerthrow, inconuenience, and displeasure, that lasciuious desire, and wanton will, doth bring to the suters and pursuers of the same’.

Painter’s careful exposition is not unjustified. It needs to be seen in the context of humanists’ criticism of Italian texts and romances, a topic comprehensively addressed by Roger Ascham in his posthumously published The Schoolmaster (1570). Ascham’s well-known attack criticises romances such as Malory’s Morte Darthur for their representation of ‘open mans slaughter, and bold bawdrye’, pointing out that ‘yet ten Morte Arthures do not the tenth part so much harme, as one of these bookes, made in Italie, and translated in England’. He argues that these works achieve ‘such sutle, cunning, new, and diverse shiftes, to cary

---
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yong wille to vanitie, and yong wittes to mischief; indeed, these books, Ascham fears, will 'soone displace all bookes of godly learning' and corrupt the mind with 'false judgement in doctrine'. The criticism levelled at romance concerns religious values and accepted norms of behaviour. Ascham's reference to Malory's 'open mans slaughter' marks the gap between a new humanist sensibility and the old martial virility, while indicating a change in the ways in which young aristocrats should prove their worth. In the light of England's break with Rome, Ascham's condemnation of books that will 'soone displace all bookes of godly learning' clearly articulates attending fears of the spread of Catholic values. However, while Ascham is silent about the representations of Muslims in these works, his comments mark romance fictions as texts of considerable anxiety.

Within his framework of self-censorship, William Painter's most remarkable narrative to engage with Muslims is the short novella 'Hyrence the faier Greke'. Originally composed by Matteo Bandello, the story was translated by Painter from a French source, Pierre Boaistuau's *Histoires tragiques extraites des oeuvres italiennes de Bandel* (1559). Set against the backdrop of the conquest of Constantinople in 1453, the story tells of 'Hirenee of the age of sixteen or seuentene yeres' who was presented to 'Mahomet' the conqueror, who, we are told, is 'yonge and wanton beyonde measure'. Sexual rapacity for the Christian woman leads Mahomet to neglect his duties and as a result, disorder and corruption emerge during the following three years. The blame, however, is placed on Mahomet's passion for the
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69 Painter, *The palace of pleasure* (1566), sig. 2D3v-2E4v.
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'beautie of the Greke'. It is only after the emperor's advisor Mustapha addresses concerns about Mahomet's conduct and its consequences for the empire that he responds in an act of both defiance and self-assertion: he decapitates Hyrence in the presence of his Bashas.

Advertised as a story of 'the beastlie crueltie of an Infidell lover, towards his Ladie', the novella situates its action recognizably in the context of a key event in the Christian-Ottoman conflict, the fall of Constantinople. Painter's choice of this subject indicates its appeal and contemporary relevance to the translator and his readership. Here again the idea of unitas Christiana is invoked as Painter deplores 'the shame and eternall infamie, of all Christian princes of this tyme' at the loss of Constantinople. To avoid any ambiguity he notes that this Mahomet is 'the great grandfather of Soliman Ottoman Emperor of the Turkes' and not 'the false Prophete'. While the preface to this novella recalls the usual antagonism expressed towards Muslims, Mustapha's daring (and potentially suicidal) address to the emperor also signals a significant shift in emphasis. His speech is a long account of Ottoman imperial success, expansionism and future ambitions which he contrasts with Mahomet's neglect of his duties. This list reflects Christian fears and also resonates with contemporaneous events in Painter's time, such as the Ottoman siege of Malta in 1565 or Ottoman incursions into Hungary, advertised in the Newes from Vienna the 5. Day of August 1566. However, in the light of Mustapha's speech and Mahomet's evident neglect of his duties, this list can also be read as a moment of imagined Ottoman crisis.

These fears are rooted in threats to the empire which were coming both from within and without. Above all, as Mustapha recognises, it stems from Mahomet's obsession for 'Hyrence' who has deprived him of 'the ardent desire, whiche boiled in you from your
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72 Ibid. sig. 2D4v.
73 Ibid. sig. 2D3v.
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75 Anon., Newes from Vienna the .5 Day of August. 1566. of the strong Towne and Castell of Iula in Hungary (London: John Awdeley, 1566), STC 24716; Dimmock, New Turkes, pp. 70-1.
infancie, to make Italie tributarie'.\textsuperscript{76} Further, he explains, 'There bee many of your subiectes and vassalles at this daie, which doe obeye and honour your Maiestie (more for feare, then, good loue thei beate you) that would rebel against you, if fortune would tourne her backe'.\textsuperscript{77} Mustapha here articulates Christian anxieties related to the idea of the tyrannous Turk seemingly revealing the internal mechanisms of the Ottoman Empire. In particular, he echoes the image of the Turkish tyrant who, as Fulke Greville remarks, 'allowes no Law, / mens liues and states depend on his behest'.\textsuperscript{78} But Mustapha also points out the external threat that is coming from '[t]he Christians [who] of long time (as you knowe) haue sworne your ruine and distruccion' as well as from 'the Persian Sophi', or 'the Souldan of Aegipte'.\textsuperscript{79} Their crusading spirit, he warns Mahomet, has been rekindled in the light of the emperor's neglect, and the Pope already 'hath conuocated all his prelates to vnite, and reconcile the Princes and Monarches of Christendome together, to ouer runne you, and to take the scepter out of your handes, & to dispoile you of your Empire'.\textsuperscript{80}

The dual threats of internal sedition and Christian crusade are the political ramifications of the novella's domestic concerns. Like many of the other anxieties expressed in it they are the result of the novella's subject matter. But there is an important detail here that deserves closer attention. Painter's translation not only presents its readers with an unfamiliar Turkish perspective on this fictional crisis, but it does so through a Catholic lens. This much is suggested by Mustapha's warning to Mahomet that the pope was preparing a crusade against him under the banner of a united Christendom. As I have shown in chapter 2, John Foxe had linked successful resistance against the Turks to efforts for reformation of the Protestant Church. For Foxe, the Turk could only be defeated through Christ and 'he that bringeth S

\textsuperscript{76} Ibid. sig. 2E1'.
\textsuperscript{77} Ibid. sig. 2E2'.
\textsuperscript{79} Painter, The palace of pleasure (1566), sig. 2E2'.
\textsuperscript{80} Ibid.
George or S Denise, as patrons to the field to fight agaynste the Turke, leaveeth Christ (no
doubt) at home'. Even though Mustapha's concerns about Christian invasion were probably
viewed by Christian readers with a mixture of incredulity and gratification, such a force under
the leadership of the pope would have been problematic in an English context. These details
were not lost to others as later adaptations of the story demonstrate, above all Richard
Knolles. The otherwise credulous Knolles incorporates this narrative in his The Generall
Historie of the Turkes (1603) repeating Painter's story at times. However, not once does he
mention any Ottoman concerns about a Christian invasion and omits Mustapha's reference to
such a league. In fact, the pope is entirely absent from his account.

According to the Letterio di Francia, 'Hyrenee' is Bandello's invention while the
novella's historical background is derived from Paolo Giovio's Turcicarum rerum
commentarius (1537). As we have seen, after the fall of Constantinople, humanists such as
Aeneas Piccolomini portrayed the Turks as barbarians, an image that probably owed more to
humanists' readings of classical works than actual events. The story of 'Hyreene' can be
read as a variation (and continuation) of Piccolimini's imagined account of Mehmed's
violation of the 'royal maiden'. According to Robert Schwoebel, this theme circulated in a
variety of narratives after the fall and continued to be exploited throughout the sixteenth
century. Indeed, it is arguably one of Painter's merits to have contributed to the
dissemination of this topos in England.

The significance of Hyrenee for the story cannot be underestimated. Although silent
throughout, she is the sign against which the martial and sexual energies of Mahomet are
portrayed, negotiated and, finally, reasserted in her violent death. On this level, she works as a
displacement of a conflict that arises between competing male interests, Mahomet and his

82 Knolles, Historie, sigs. 2H1'-2H3'.
83 Pruvost, Matteo Bandello, p. 25.
84 Smith, 'Pope Pius', p. 411.
85 Schwoebel, Shadow of the Crescent, pp. 12-3.
ruling elite. In this sense, the novella is a textual exploration of the failure to rule and fits seamlessly within the educational rationale underlying Painter's work. The martial reader – here Painter's dedicatees – can see the possible consequences should they neglect their duties. As Helen Hackett points out, women in these fictions were often assigned the role of a 'pleasurable distraction from duty'. This much is suggested to Mahomet for whom disaster can only be averted if he follows Mustapha's advice to '[a]ttende to the gouernement of your Empire. [and] Leaue of this effeminate life'. As we will see, Barnaby Riche also identifies and criticises this 'effeminate life' as a symptom of his own society and in the writing of fiction itself. While the Turkish threat to Christendom remains manifest in the conquest of Constantinople, Mahomet's sexual possession and ultimately physical violation of the Greek girl returns him to his former state of martial virtue and prevents the earlier crisis. Clearly Painter's aim is that through a negative example the same lesson should be learnt by the Christian gentlemen.

Finally, the image of the 'the beastlie crueltie of an Infidell louer, towards his Ladie' became a familiar sight on the early modern stage. While Hyrenee's appropriation is contained by Christian success – Mahomet is defeated at Belgrade – the story marks a point in which 'infidelity' and sexual deviancy were closely associated in England. English playwrights, in particular, were attracted to this theme which helped shape the stereotypical image of the Turk as libidinous and cruel. Strongly influenced by this fictitious episode, George Peele wrote a now lost play, a heroic romance called *The Turkish Mahomet and Hyrin the Fair Greek* (1581-94) which can probably be identified with *The Love of a Grecian Lady*
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Among the playwrights to make use of what had become by 1600 a familiar motif we also find Shakespeare, who invites his audience to recall the story of 'Hyrence the faier Greke' in Desdemona's death at the hands of Othello. It is reasonable to assume that the reader of this novella is given an interpretative choice between reading the novella either as an exploration of the politics of rule, or as an overdetermined portrayal of an infidel's cruelty towards a Christian woman.

Another novella included by Painter that merits attention here eludes such choices; instead, it emphasises educational values. Painter's translation of Boccaccio's novella *Of M. Thorello and Saladine* is set against the preparations for the third Crusade in which the reader encounters one of Islam's best known rulers, Salah al-Din, or Saladin and who travels through Europe in order to gather intelligence on Christian preparations. Arriving at Pavia one night, Saladin, disguised as a merchant, seeks shelter which he finds at the house of Master Thorello of Strà, a Christian merchant. Later Thorello, having joined the crusade, is captured at Acre but recognised by Saladin amongst the prisoners and is released. As a gesture of thankfulness for the hospitality granted earlier, Saladin returns the same courtesies. Thorello remains at the court of Saladin before returning to Pavia with the help of one of Saladin's 'Necromancers'.

From the beginning, Christians and Muslims exhibit similar virtues. While the setting during the third Crusade echoes contemporary concerns about Ottoman invasion, the crisis is muted in favour of exploring an ethos of honour and hospitality. Prefaced by a brief survey on the significance attached to those 'noble mens houses' that are 'open to Noble guests and straugers', Painter asserts that 'Hospitalitie is a thing so diuine, as in the law of Nature and
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Christ, it was well and brotherly observed'. 94 The religious difference of the 'mightie Souldan, an enemy of God' is noted, but compensated for because Saladin is 'a friend to those that favoured good entertainment and housekeeping'. 95 From the beginning Saladin's role is to corroborate Christian values, which in turn confirms his role as the exceptional Muslim familiar from medieval romances.

This image is complemented by Saladin as a traveller. In the context of a mounting crusade, however, these journeys through Europe also resonate with more cautious attitudes. Norman Daniel cites a medieval legend which has it that Saladin was travelling incognito through Europe, initially convinced by Christian doctrine only to abjure it immediately after he witnessed the behaviour of the clergy. 96 An attack on clerical vices, this legend conveys the potentially threatening possibility of Muslims journeying disguised either as merchants or otherwise through Christian territory gathering intelligence. For Painter, Saladin's presence in Christian lands serves to reinforce Christian values by showing Saladin's initial admiration for and affirmation of them. Having experienced the hospitality of Thorello, Saladin swears by God that 'there was never a more liberall Gentleman, more courteous or better conditioned than this is.' 97 From this he infers that should 'Christian kings for their part be suche, I meane indued with such kingly qualities as this gentleman is, the Souldan of Babilon shall have inough to doe to deale with one, and not to attend for all those which we see to be in preparation for invasion of his Countrie'. 98 Saladin's words demonstrate an awareness of the complex and intricate system that exists between hospitality and honour, and these forms of behaviour, he insinuates are, essential qualities for military success. More importantly, the novella establishes that this attitude is shared by both Muslims and Christians.

94 Ibid. sig. 2I4v.
95 Ibid. sigs. 2K1v-2K2r.
97 Painter, *The second tome* (1567), sig. 2K4v.
98 Ibid. sig. 2K4r.
For an English readership these values were of a larger significance. 'Honour is not in his hand who is honoured, but in the hearts and opinions of other men', James Cleland states in 1607.99 He stresses that honour is not intrinsic, but depends on those who bestow it on the receiver. Painter deems this an important enough point when he directs his English readership towards what he considers a cultural asset in the education of a gentleman or gentlewoman, hospitality: Felicity Heal has examined the ways in which hospitality and honour are linked. While her nuanced argument demonstrates the complexity between the two, she usefully draws attention to an awareness of certain cultural values in the aristocratic society which dominated early modern England.100 These values are the heritage of a medieval ideal of honour that was largely based on generosity.101 Rendered in more specific terms, she argues, 'good entertainment was the particular prerogative of the English gentlemen', since according to a mid-sixteenth century publication, *Institucion of a Gentleman*, which states, that it is 'good housekeeping' which attracts the Englishman to friendship.102

Whether or not Painter had in mind this particular title when he composed his preface to the translation remains open to debate. But it is unquestionable that he considered hospitality important and evidently believed his readers did so too. On one level, then, Saladin triggers a discussion which is indeed 'both profitable and pleasant'.103 On another level, his identity as a Muslim reinforces the significance of these values which, paradoxically, seem to exist independently from a specific religion. In the discourse of a Turkish threat, on the other hand, anxieties concerning either the ability of Muslims to travel unrecognised through Christendom or the threat of invasion are suspended resulting in a more favourable portrayal of Saladin. However, this idealism becomes complicated if we consider travel narratives
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which report actual encounters. William Biddulph, to whom I referred in chapter 3, noted during his visit to Jerusalem that the ‘Turkes giue liberty of conscience vnto all’, but they ‘giue not entertainment vnto any Christians in their houses’. Juxtaposing these different representations here serves to demonstrate the inherent contradictions that exist in the *imago Turci*. Further, I do not wish to imply that Painter’s fiction promotes a tolerant view of Muslims simply because they are imagined to share similar values with Christians. As I mentioned before, hospitality was intricately bound to Christian doctrine and Saladin’s religious identity excludes him from such a community.

The portrayal of Muslims in the *Palace of Pleasure* is replete with cultural and textual anxieties. Again, it is worth noting that Painter derives his representations of Turks from continental fictions which he defends against humanist charges of moral subversion within a framework of self-censorship. Accommodated in an agenda which mediates social attitudes through example, the portrayals of Turks – Mahomet and Saladin – reflect not only different historical moments, but combine starkly contrasting images of Muslims. While Mahomet is employed as a negative example of tyrannical rule, Saladin serves as a positive precedent for hospitality. In what is a convergence of medieval sources and recent concerns, the Turk is an eclectic figure which mediates not only English but also continental investments. Notably, religious difference, while acknowledged, seems of less concern than in the writings discussed in the previous chapters. But it is this uncomplicated assimilation of the Turk that merits attention in another romance which, it can be argued, further serves to domesticate the Turk for an English readership.

105 See also Heal, ‘Hospitality and Honor’, pp. 321-3.
Barnaby Riche (1542-1617), a professional soldier and an expert on military matters, earned his literary credentials as a prolific writer of some twenty-six tracts and treatises. As an outspoken advocate of soldiery, he wrote several texts on military matters in an attempt to rectify the professions decay in England. In his *Allarme to England* (1578) he criticised England's current neglect of its soldiers and warns his readers that 'where Mars is had in no accompt, no state may long endure'. The text which concerns me here, the short novella *Of Aramanthus borne a Leper*, is included in *His Farewell to Military Profession* (1581). In it, Riche recounts the fictional events surrounding Aramanthus who, though born a Christian, is raised by a Turkish fisherman and rises in the ranks of the Turkish army.

Like Painter, Riche prefaxes his work with an apology, but rejects the apologetic tenor of Painter's self-imposed censorship. Instead, he engages with critique in his two dedications, the first to 'the right courteous gentlewomen, bothe of Englande and Irelande', and the second to the soldiers of England and Ireland. By courting a female readership—a move, he says, that was prompted by his desire to consecrate my self wholly vnto Uenus—he seeks to promote a marketable text designed to 'discourse pleauntly to driue awaie the tyme', which, however, he rejects in his second dedication. Having explored the pastimes of women such as 'dauncyng' or the playing of instruments, he then deplores these in his
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dedication to the soldiers, maintaining that 'the abuse of this present age is suche, that follies are better esteemed then matters of greater waight'. 114 Instead, he complains, 'the Militarie profession, by meanes whereof menne were aduaunced to the greatest renowne, is now become of so slender estimation'. 115

According to Helen Hackett, these two dedications indicate Riche's fears of effeminacy and anxieties about a 'general emasculation of society'. 116 While Painter designed and justified his collection on a didactic premise, Riche composed his as a pastime to keep him from 'Idelnesse'. 117 His rationale is devoid of any profitable end other than to entertain, but also alerts his readers to both England's defective moral state and its precarious situation as an 'eye sore' to others in this world. 118 As evidence he lists threats to England, among them France and Spain, ironically recognising what the friendship between 'the Pope, the Turke, and the Deuill' as a significant cause for concern for the English. 119 His expertise clearly informs his positions in these two dedications while his reference to the Turk in this context expresses a view held by other Protestant Englishmen. For example, in 1576 the poet Philip Sidney articulated his dislike towards idleness when he commented on the Elizabethan court in a letter to his friend Thomas Lenormand, complaining 'we are doing nothing here'; instead, he says, he longs for military combat with the Turk. 120

Riche does not promote war against the Turk, but his comments indicate martial anxieties. His novellas describe the rise of a distinguished heroic character who earns prestige and admiration through martial achievements and military skills. The Turk features in three of
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Riche’s eight novellas and usually serves to indicate the narrative’s setting, or as a benchmark for Christian prowess. The first novella – or ‘history’ as Riche calls it – *Sapho Duke of Mantona* is a case in point. It invokes the figure of the Turk to corroborate the eponymous hero’s martial achievements, but is devoid of any of the other characteristics. *Of Apolonius and Silla* continues this trend and employs the Turk as a measure for military success.

Notably, in contrast to Painter, Riche does not simply translate his sources. When discussing *Of Aramanthus borne a Leper*, the seventh of eight novellas, he says that these are ‘tales that are but forged onely for delight, neither credible to be beleued, nor hurtfiall to be perused’, thus marking this story as his own invention.\(^\text{121}\) In it, he recalls the adventures of Aramanthus who is noble by birth, but born a leper and sent to Crete for cure. However, following a shipwreck after his sojourn in Crete, he grew up on the coast of ‘Turkie’ where he was raised by a fisherman. Given his noble origins, he soon proves not only ‘of a verie comely personage, but [also] of a moste excellent and perfecte witte’.\(^\text{122}\) These qualities come to the fore after he entered the services of the sultan – Riche simply refers to him as the Turk – as a soldier, since he grew in his commander’s estimation until:

> Aramanthus onely gaue hym [the Turk] counsaill in all his affaires, and there with all had so good sucesse, that his practises still preuailed, and came to happie ende, that the Turke by his aduise, had dooen wonderfull spoiles vpon the Christians, and had taken from them many Cities, Tounes, and Prouinces.\(^\text{123}\)

Riche blends the themes of Ottoman warfare with the romance topos of an undisclosed, noble origin. He balances military exploits with the formal features of romance and, although there are no references to a specific time, the choice of the Turk and the narrative’s setting invokes
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a certain realism which resonates with what Riche felt would have been familiar to his readership.\textsuperscript{124}

The novella follows its teleological course and, in the end, finds Aramanthus recognising his true Christian identity, and the Turkish threat dissolved. As we have seen earlier, Muslims in romance, either as Saracens or Turks, could only be contained through defeat or conversion. Riche follows this convention when the Turk and his retinue finally convert 'for the loue that he [the Turk] bare to Aramanthus, and for the likyng that he sawe to bee in his daughter towards hym, whom he hym self had appointed to bee her spouse, became in deede to be Christened'.\textsuperscript{125} Indeed, this final conversion episode of the Turks to Christianity at once echoes earlier and anticipates later conversion narratives by ecclesiasts such as John Foxe and Meredith Hanmer which I have discussed in the previous chapter.

Riche's fantasy, however, does not aim at plausibility. Preceding this happy ending, an earlier conversion scene complicates this neat reading and serves, on the one hand to emphasise the cunning military ventures of Aramanthus, while, on the other hand, anticipating the eventual conversion of the Turks. Following a plan devised by Aramanthus to enter the city of Tolosia – Armanathus’s real home and seat of his father’s kingdom – under pretence of a ‘league, and perfect amitie with the Christians’,\textsuperscript{126} the Turk ‘receiued the true and Catholike faithe’.\textsuperscript{127} Soon after, the city is conquered, the king of Tolosia put into prison and Christians ‘whipped, racked, and tormented to the death, vnlesse thei would forsake their faithe’.\textsuperscript{128} This scene vividly expresses both the uncertainties (and consequences) associated with conversion from Islam to Christianity, as it describes horrific scenes which the Christian

\textsuperscript{124} ‘The novella, by definition, insisted upon a displacement of materials toward a contemporary realism’, \textit{Barnabe Riche His Farewell to Military Profession} ed. by Donald Beecher (Ottawa: Dovehouse Editions, Inc, 1992), pp. 27-44, at p. 29.
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\textsuperscript{128} Ibid. sig. Y3\textsuperscript{v}.
imagination associated with forced conversion to Islam.\textsuperscript{129} In a Protestant context, voluntary conversion to Catholicism – accommodated here without any tension – seems problematic given the ongoing religious debates which argued that successful conversion of the Turks to Protestantism is possible only through reformation of the Church. Here it is worthwhile to reconsider the actual reasons given by the Turk for his final conversion.

The Turk declares that he converts because of the 'loue' he bears to Aramanthus as a result of the latter's 'vertues, valiaunce, and worthie exploites'.\textsuperscript{130} Further, he gives the love between his daughter and Aramanthus as a cause that facilitated his decision. None of these reasons are religiously motivated, but, I suggest, relate to what Riche considers England's precarious moral state and general effeminisation. For Riche the writing of romance was an occupation he undertook merely to avoid 'Idlenesse', but there is a conspicuous emphasis on military ventures, and the restoration of family and order that marks the outcome of the narrative, which is completed by the Turk's conversion. The reasons behind the Turk's conversion are not religious; instead they reflect the secular ideals Riche had identified in his preface and whose decline he deplored.

5.3 Chivalric Turks and the romance of captivity

The texts of Painter and Riche represent a variety of distinct images from romance writing. Both authors resort to continental sources for their depictions of Turks, and avoid the more recent influences that inform the imagery of the Turks elsewhere. Instead, they respond to matters closer to home and the criticism levelled at romance. In doing so, both writers subsume religious differences some way in favour of mediating their respective ideological and moral attitudes. In this final section I want to explore the \textit{imago Turci} in two very different chivalric romances by Anthony Munday and Miguel de Cervantes respectively.

\textsuperscript{129} Matar, \textit{Islam and Britain}, pp. 21-49.
\textsuperscript{130} Riche, \textit{Riche his Farewell}, sig. Y4'.
Although not an English author, Cervantes is of interest here not only for his personal experiences with the Turks—he fought at the battle of Lepanto (1571) and was later captured by Algerian pirates in 1575—but also for the ways in which his own use of romance impinges on his portrayals of Turks. Of course, another reason is the work’s popularity in Jacobean England. For my discussion I focus on the Captivity Tale in part one of Don Quixote (1612) as a concluding episode to this chapter. Anthony Munday’s merits as translator of continental romances, writer of prose fiction, playwright of pageants and author of a wide range of treatises and pamphlets make him an important but much neglected author. Perhaps best known for his vast corpus of Iberian romances and Jacobean pageants, he is also the author of the English chivalric romance Zelauto (1580) which dedicates its second part to the portrayal of Turks. Both authors, as I want to show, demonstrate that the presentation of Turks in romance could be at once at a remove and intricately bound to the cultural issues that had been at stake at the time.

The richly illustrated Zelauto welcomes, as the author says, ‘Euphues into England’ merging Lily’s fashionable and highly artificial style with an intricate chivalric romance narrative. Dedicating his work to Edward de Vere, the seventeenth earl of Oxford, Munday frames the action with a travel narrative in which each adventure is preceded and followed by a dialogue between the eponymous hero and a knight called Astraepho. Zelauto, the son of Gonzallo Guicciardo, the Duke of Venice, had sought permission to ‘visite straunge Countries’ to which his father happily consented for the term of six years. Accompanied by
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a knight, the hero travels to Spain where he encounters English merchants whom he joins for England after they had told him of the "happy estate of England, & how worthy Princes gouerned their common weale". After his departure from England he ships to Persia where he "sustayned many and wonderfull iniuryes among the Turkes". At his arrival at "Zebaia", Zelauto notes that "the people so gazed vpon me, as though they would haue eaten me". From here his adventures in Persia revolve around his chivalric recovery of Mica Sheffola's sister, the Soldan's niece, who is condemned to death because of her "Christian beleefe".

While the inhabitants of Persia are referred to as Turks as a general designation for Muslims – the distinction between Sunni and Shi'ite is often conflated in this period – it is the theme of tyranny and suppression that predominates their representation. This aspect is given considerable weight given that nearly all distressed characters in this romance are either Christians, or Turks who are willing to convert to Christianity. In fact, the only two steadfast Muslims, it seems, are the Soldan and his son. This theme of religious suppression is somewhat inconsistently handled and it seems to trigger only the chivalric motif of rescue rather than a debate on ecclesiastical positions. Of course, the religious polarisation between Christians and Muslims maintains a distinct dividing line that serves to idealise Zelauto's actions in the face of adversity. In turn, the Soldan is portrayed not only as an infidel, but also (and probably worse) as violating the chivalric code by which both parties, Christians and Turks, abide. To illustrate: it is agreed between Zelauto and the Soldan that Mica Sheffola's sister shall be redeemed provided Zelauto defeats the Turkish champion, Terolfo, the Soldan's son. In mutual agreement, Terolfo and Zelauto solemnly declare under the oath of "Lawes of Armes" to "forgiue him that dooth the deede". The Soldan breaks

---

135 Ibid. sig A2'.
136 Ibid. sig. H3r-v.
137 Ibid. sig. I4r.
138 For a different reading see Hamilton, Munday, pp. 11-18.
139 Munday, Zelauto, sig. M1v.
140 Ibid. sig. L4r.
this code when in the end, Terolfo, is killed, the Lady redeemed, and Zelauto sentenced to death and put into prison. The theme of religious persecution is concluded when Zelauto’s host, Manniko Rigustello, is first imprisoned, but then martyred ‘for the woordes hee vsed in my [Zelauto’s] cause’. Finally, Zelauto, with the help of Mica Sheffola, escapes from prison.

Like the other romances discussed, Zelauto does not aim at an accurate representation of Muslims. Instead, the tradition of chivalric romance, commercial reasons and, perhaps, personal experiences seem to have guided Munday’s pen. For example, Munday’s travels to Italy, which he had visited the year before the publication of Zelauto, might have contributed to his portrayal of Zelauto. As a Protestant travelling to Catholic Rome, he had, perhaps, initially hesitated, as it seems that the suggestion to go abroad probably came from his patron, Edward de Vere. While this is, of course, speculation, Zelauto exhibits a similar problem and lack of motivation to leave England. Astraepho shows himself surprised at Zelauto’s decision ‘to put your selfe, in hazard of lyfe among those cruell and bloody Turkes’. Zelauto, equally baffled, admits that it was ‘more upon pleasure than any other cause’ that he put himself to ‘God and good Fortune on that behalfe’. By contrast, at the end of his adventures in Persia he has sufficient reason to leave. Further, according to John O’Connor, many of the motifs in Zelauto follow the Iberian romance Palmerin of England. Among those other Iberian chivalric romances which preceded and followed Palmerin of England was the Amadis de Gaule, which enjoyed great popularity in England; so much so, in fact, that Philip Sidney commended it, but conceded that ‘God knoweth [it] wanteth much of a perfect Poesie’, but can move hearts ‘to the exercise of courtesie, liberalitie, and especially
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courage'.\textsuperscript{146} Within this framework of chivalry and travel, then, Zelauto's encounter with the Turks in Persia can be read as a test and promotion of his virtues as a Christian and nobleman.

Munday's use of the Turk was not limited to the writing of chivalric texts. The image of the Turkish tyrant in \textit{Zelauto} serves to reinforce the hero's Christian qualities and thus owes more to literary fashion and the influence of Iberian romances than the burgeoning Anglo-Ottoman relations of the 1580s. However, Munday's oeuvre indicates a wider engagement with the Turk throughout his literary output and provides an intriguing example for the manifold ways in which the Turk intersects with the author's publishing career. Here we find a large number of diverse and heterogeneous images that suggest a more refined perspective on the Turk than \textit{Zelauto} would lead us to believe. Two examples will suffice.

Desiring 'to see straunge Countreies' and driven by the 'affection to leame the languages', Munday had left England for Italy in early 1579.\textsuperscript{147} Under an alias he stayed at the English College in Rome from which he was soon expelled and returned to London, where he composed \textit{Zelauto}.\textsuperscript{148} In 1582, he published his experiences under the title of \textit{The English Romayne lyfe} pointing out the many blasphemous words levelled at the Queen and 'craftie iuglings of the Pope'.\textsuperscript{149} Having witnessed the Roman carnival from which the pope abstains, Munday then turns to the papal proceedings on 'Maunde Thursday' at which 'there he [the pope] cursseth the Turke, and her Maiestie, our most gratious Princesse and Gouernesse, affirming her to be farre wurse then the Turke, or the cruellest Tiraunt that is'.\textsuperscript{150} While none of these religiously informed views are echoed in his \textit{Zelauto}, it shows Munday's awareness of the Protestant-Catholic debates that used the Turk as a rhetorical benchmark for alleged deviancy from the Christian faith.

\textsuperscript{146} Sidney, \textit{An apologie for poetrie}, sigs. E4\textsuperscript{v}-F1\textsuperscript{v}.
\textsuperscript{147} Anthony Munday, \textit{The English Romayne lyfe Discovering: the liues of the Englishmen at Roome} (London: John Charlewood, 1582), STC 18272, sig. B1\textsuperscript{v}.
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A change of tenor occurs in another of Munday's publications: *The admirable deliverance of 266 Christians by John Reynard* (1608). First entered in the Stationer's Register for Thomas Dawson and Stephen Peele on 23 July 1579, Dawson did not print the text until 1608. According to the Short Title Catalogue, the 1608-text was purportedly written by Anthony Munday (although no name appears in the quarto). However, Richard Hakluyt had already printed a similar report with the title *The worthie enterprise of John Fox* in his 1589 edition of the *Principal Navigations*. The account describes John Fox's escape from Turkish captivity in 1577 and his following rescue of 266 Christians. Munday was clearly familiar with the documents since he had contributed commendatory verses to Fox's account in Hakluyt's collection; moreover he claims to have met Foxe in Rome in 1577 and 'receiued his letters', which he then turned into his own account. Since we know that Munday had not been to Rome before 1579, it seems unlikely that he met Fox there. However, it is worthwhile speculating that he met him in England, because Fox returned home in 1579 where he received a pension from Elizabeth. Furthermore, as the Stationer's entry indicates, the story of Fox's ordeal was already known by late July.

Apart from the above discrepancies there are also significant differences between Munday's text and Fox's narrative reprinted in Hakluyt's editions. The original account of John Fox's captivity is largely presented as a test of Christian faith in the face of adversity. It is only through God's providence that he successfully escapes his captors and rescues the 266 prisoners. The significantly different version of 1608 presents, as Daniel Vitkus alerts us, no
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'references to Scripture'; instead, its 'tone is nationalistic and romantic'. Moreover, the text advocates James I's ecumenical policy with Spain following the treaty of London in 1604. Where the 1589 version recounts events that began in 1563, a time of peaceful trade between England and Spain, the 1608 version overtly stresses this peace 'concluded betwene the two great and opulent kingdoms of England and Spaine'. Given the subject matter, the escape of Christians from Turkish captivity, this shift from providence to nationalistic sentiment signals a different way in which opposition to the Turk was now constructed.

This romancing of John Fox's providentialist captivity account shifts the emphasis from a single outstanding English subject, John Fox, to a nationwide opposition to the Turk which now includes Spain. This much is suggested by James I's own policy towards the Turks which saw him seek reconciliation with Spain, at the expense of Anglo-Ottoman relations. Admittedly, John Reynard remains the hero, but the important point I want to make is that in the new climate of Anglo-Spanish relations the Turk was cast as the common enemy of both. This topical reading is further strengthened by the fact that the 1608 edition erased all references to dates from the 1589 text. The absence of references to specific times, of course, is also a feature of romance. Disconnected from its original context, the action of this romanticised captivity report becomes a heroic rescue of 266 Christians under the guidance of John Reynard, an Englishman. While the portrayal of the Turk remains the same, the author's experimentation with genre results in a redefined viewpoint which responds to a changed and changing political situation. The previous two examples demonstrate Munday's awareness of the many meanings and uses to which the Turk could be put. Munday seems aware of recent ideological differences which informed the Turk at the time of Zelauto's composition. It is tempting to read Zelauto's escape from prison as an echo from Fox's captivity narrative, or to imagine that his visit to Rome had influenced his portrayal of the oppressive Turk. But
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perhaps this is to overstate the case. Instead, it is the play with romance conventions that can
determine the ways meanings and readings of the Turk signify. While the Turk in Zelauto
serves to exploit the printing market, the Turk in the idealised captivity narrative mirrors the
now symbolically united nations of Spain and England in opposition to a Turkish threat.

Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra (1547-1616) masterfully juggles the conventions of
chivalric romance in his *Don Quixote* (1605, 1615). While Munday’s romanticising of
Fox’s captivity report fixed the Turk as a benchmark for Anglo-Spanish unity and Christian
idealisation, Cervantes’ representations are also idealistic, but, more importantly, he aims at
verisimilitude in his portrayal of Turks. Translated into English by Thomas Shelton, the work
was first published in England in 1612, and was followed by its sequel in 1620. From the
beginning, the work had been influential outside Spain, and can be traced as a source for both
Francis Beaumont’s *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* (1607-10) and Philip Massinger’s *The
Renegado* (1623-4). As a burlesque of and a comment on chivalric romance, Cervantes
creates his would-be-hero Don Quixote as a reader gone mad. Indulging in idle reading of
romances Don Quixote ‘was breaking his braines’, and, in the end, ‘these toyes did so
firmly possesse his imagination with an infallible opinion, that all that Machine of dreamed
inventions which he read was true, as he accounted no History in the world to be so certaine
and sincere as they were’. Subsequently, the reader follows the knight errant on his
chivalric adventures. These, in turn, are, of course, inspired by the romances that inhabit Don
Quixote’s mind. The resulting tension between the real and the ideal, the dividing line
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between what he imagines and what is turns the world of romance inside-out. He is, as Michel Foucault put it, 'nothing but language, text, printed pages, stories that have already been written down'.

Like Barnaby Riche and Anthony Munday, Cervantes too had a wide range of experience upon which to draw the material for his work. A soldier and a writer, Cervantes invests Don Quixote’s adventures with the panache that informed the contemporary literary fashion and his own conflict with the Turks. The episode with which I am concerned here is the tale of Captain Ruy Perez of Viedma who recounts his captivity in Algiers and return to Spain with the help of the beautiful Zorayda, a Moorish lady eager to convert to Christianity. Having arrived at the inn, the captive narrates his story to an attentive audience, including Don Quixote, who, at the end of the story, attributes these adventures to ‘the Chimeras, which he imagined to be incident to Chivalrie’. In other words, Don Quixote argues away the incredulity he feels while listening to the captive’s story by virtue of his chivalric imagination. What the captive narrates, however, is a story about the unrelenting Turkish cruelty he experienced during his thraldom.

The captive’s ordeals originate in the battle of Lepanto (1571). Cervantes himself had famously taken part in the conflict, but was ill with fever and thus unable to engage in combat. The narrative avoids lengthy descriptions of the battle; instead the captive dwells on the significance of the event:

And that very day which was so fortunate to all Christendome: for therein the whole world was vndeceiued, and al the nations thereof freed of al the error they held, and believe they had, that the Turke was incincible at Sea: in that very day I say, wherin the swelling stomacke, and Ottomanicall pride was broken among so many happy men as were there (for the Christians that were slaine were much more happy then those which they left victorious aliue) I alone was vnfortunate,
seeing that in exchange of some *Naual crowne*, which I might expect, had I liued in the times of the auncient *Romanes*, I found my selte the night ensuing, that so famous a day with my legges chained, and my hands manacled \(^{168}\)

At this stage it should be noted that the name of the captive is not given until the narrative has finished. This is significant; as the narrator’s temporary anonymity gives his report a certain degree of exchangeability. In other words, this captive’s fate might be substituted for that of other Christian captives who had been rowing on Muslim ships, like John Fox or Thomas Saunders. While it is, of course, tempting to read these events as autobiographical – in fact Cervantes was not captured at Lepanto – I suggest it is particularly useful to consider them as attitudes expressed towards the Turkish threat which exist in both Don Quixote’s and his contemporary readers’ worlds. Despite Cervantes’ many allusions to real events, the naming of historical individuals associated with this significant battle, and the authority of his own experiences, the narrative remains a fiction.

Like Painter in ‘Hyrenee, the faire Greeke’, Cervantes presents a view from inside the Ottoman Empire. This time, however, it is not from the centre of Ottoman power, but from the rowing-bench of a captive. The captive’s observations on the Turk’s movements follow the defeat at Lepanto and reflect an informed Christian perspective. In England, readers of Knolles’ *The Generall Historie of the Turks* (1603, 1610, 1621) could have followed and verified many of the events Cervantes’ captive recounts if they had wished. Despite a strong claim to historicity, the depiction of events shift increasingly towards the personal, everyday routine of the captive and on those who have converted, the renegades. The career of Uchali, or Uluch Ali, the captive’s first master, is an interesting example. With a certain sense of admiration for Uchali’s career and actions, the captive recalls the past of ‘this scuruie fellow’ who rowed for 14 years as ‘the great Turkes slaeue’. \(^{169}\) His apostasy to Islam is somewhat softened (and perhaps ironic) by his underlying motivation, as he ‘did renounce his faith, ...,

\(^{168}\) Cervantes, *The history*, I, sig. 2F1r.

\(^{169}\) Ibid. I, sig. 2F4v.
for despight, and because he might be revenged on a *Turke*, that gave him a cuffe on the face as he rowed'.

What followed was a meteoric rise of the renegade who first came 'to be King of Argiers, and after to be Generall of the Sea, which is the third most Noble charge and dignitie of all the Turkish Empire'.

The allurements and promises of wealth following apostasy have been widely noted and discussed. While Uchali's success echoes many of the views Christian polemicists sought to dispel in their warnings against conversion to Islam, the captive draws another significant distinction between Turks and renegades. The latter is defined by exceeding cruelty that excels that of the Turks. As the narrative progresses towards Algiers, the captive is passed on to a new master, a Venetian renegade called Azanga. The arbitrariness of his cruelty is recalled in the relentlessness with which he treats the Christian prisoners incarcerated there:

> Every day he hanged up one, he set this man on a stake, and would cut off the others' ears, and that, for so little occasion, or wholly without it, as the very Turks themselves perceived, that he did it not for any other cause, but because he had a will to do it, and that it was his natural inclination to be a homicide of all humane kind.

Robert Davies points out that the slaves of Algiers demonstrated their resentment towards those who had taken the 'Turban' by refusing even to dress in the same way. Further, the distinction the captive makes between Turks and renegades is important, because it introduces a hierarchy which marks the renegade as more despicable than the Turk. Clearly, Cervantes' own experiences as a captive in Algiers informs this report, which here attempts to convey the hopelessness of the captive's situation.

---

170 Ibid. I, sig. 2F4v.
171 Ibid. I, sig. 2F5r.
173 Cervantes, *The history*, I, sig. 2F5v.
175 Byron, pp. 185-247.
The bleakness of the captive’s circumstances is resolved at the moment Zorayda enters the story. The daughter of the wealthy Moor Aguirnorato, she was instructed by a Christian slave about the Christian religion and ‘Lela Marien’, the Virgin Mary. It seems that since she had encountered Christianity, Zorayda had decided to escape Algiers and to convert to Christianity. She took her opportunity with the captive whom she provided with money, betraying her father and escaping for Spain with him. Her story is relevant to my argument because it represents the miraculous solution to the captive’s dire prospects. Similarly, Munday’s noble Zelauto was freed from prison with the help of Turks who were keen to convert. It has been suggested by L.A. Murillo that this idealised girl is a modern variation of an earlier medieval legend, found in Carolingian epics. In this earlier version a Saracen princess falls in love with a Christian captive and redeems him by betraying both her religion and her father.176 Her questionable ethical behaviour, as Barbara Fuchs points out, does not seem to impede her conversion to Christianity, which, by the time the captive has finished his story, is yet to be realised.177

Both the Turk and the renegade in the captive’s narrative serve as measures for the captive’s personal desolation. On the other hand, this narrative can stand in for the fate of many other captives. For an early seventeenth-century English and Spanish readership, this narrative of Turkish thraldom and perhaps its verisimilitude reflected topical concerns. Turkish captivity had always been a problem for Christians of any denomination who made a living by sea, particularly in the Mediterranean. For James I, however, the capture of his subjects by Algerian pirates posed an increasingly difficult problem as his reign progressed. Following the peace with Spain and the resumption of commercial activities between the two nations, the situation had worsened so much that, in 1621, King James decided to initiate an attack on Algiers in order to oppose the threat of Muslim pirates and to recover Christian

176 Louis A. Murillo, A Critical Introduction to Don Quixote (New York: Peter Lang, 1990), p. 117.
177 Fuchs, Mimesis, p. 160.
captives.\textsuperscript{178} For Cervantes as for many others, the spectre of a Turkish threat was epitomised not only by Turkish invasion, but by the figure of the Christian apostate or renegade. It is this threat which the captive’s tale encapsulates.

At the beginning of the second part of \textit{Don Quixote}, the barber and the priest arrive to see whether Don Quixote has recovered his wit. They allege that the Turk has prepared an armada to sail not only against Spain, but against all Christendom. Don Quixote expressed his concerns about the news and demands to counsel the king on this matter. Desiring to know what it was he wants to tell him, Don Quixote reveals his policy to the barber and the priest:

\begin{quote}
the King cause proclamation to be made that on a prefixed day, all the Knights Errants that roue up and downe Spaine, repaire to the Court and if there came but half a dozen, yet such an one there might be amongst them as would as would destroy all the Turkes power\textsuperscript{179}
\end{quote}

While Don Quixote’s answer is at best comical and at worst tragic, his reply also indicates the incongruity between romance and reality. Furthermore, the Turkish threat remained an acute problem to Christendom and the captive’s tale represents a timely expression of this threat exemplified primarily in the figure of the renegade. Quixote’s suggested solution, however, seems ludicrous. Confusing romance with reality, the belief that men of chivalry, or indeed a single knight errant could ward off the power of the Turk is hopelessly naïve. But in the logic of Don Quixote’s imagination such a scenario seems a feasible option. After all, as we have seen, his explanation for the captive’s escape from Algiers follows a similar logic.\textsuperscript{180} In a sense, the romance-solution which Don Quixote embraces is another example of the type of fictional nostalgia with which this chapter began. As we have seen, Tasso’s \textit{Gerusalem Liberatta} invoked the example of Godfrey of Boulogne precisely because he wanted his

\textsuperscript{178} Matar, \textit{Englishmen}, pp. 150-51.
\textsuperscript{179} Cervantes, \textit{The history}, II, sig. B2’.
\textsuperscript{180} Ian Watt takes this argument further when he maintains that in Don Quixote’s logic ‘the present degenerate state of the world’ needs all ‘the admirable values of the past’; Watt, p. 67.
readers to prepare for the Turkish threat in his own days by reading about the deeds of this successful crusader. *Don Quixote* signals the end of such a belief.

In this chapter I have examined a variety of portrayals of Turks in a number of English prose romances. I have argued that their diversity reflects the sources from which they derived. Romances, in their portrayals of Turks, do not reflect the same topical concerns as I have shown are characteristic of other genres. Instead, the images of the romance Turk in England (and continental Europe) are invested with secular and religious themes. As I hope to have shown, they are the product of earlier moments in Christian-Muslim encounters and a medieval literary tradition that subsequently shaped them. These medieval romance portrayals of Saracens and Turks continued, to varying degrees, to circulate in the medieval romances reprinted in sixteenth-century England, but also arrived as translations from French and Italian works. Rather than reflect recent ideological upheavals – as is characteristic of historical and religious writings, for example – they often offered imaginative solutions to a Turkish threat that was tangibly more threatening in the writings of others. More importantly, the continued use of these earlier, medieval portrayals throughout Elizabeth’s and James’ reign, I argue, indicates that the *imago Turci* should not only be exclusively understood in terms of recent ideological differences, but also as a narrative of continuity.
Conclusion

In 1593, the Jesuit Robert Parson published a short tract—Newes from Spayne and Holland—in which he alerts his English readership to 'the great hatred & obloquie' with which England was perceived by its Christian neighbours. Following a brief list of accusations against England's ruler Elizabeth, Parson finally states his main objection: England's 'open dealings with the Turke the publique enemye of al christian profession'. He elaborates on this point; in particular, he says, England's dealing with the Turk 'inuitinge & styrring him to tume his forces vppon Christendome therby to hurt the king of Spayne' weigh heavy on England's reputation. The incriminating evidence is a letter sent by the sultan to Elizabeth:

not only by the often embassages letters & presents sent vnto this professed enemye of Christs name, from Ingland thes later yeares: but also by a playne letter written by the Turk himselfe about three or fowers yeares agoone, to the Queene about this matter soone after the defeat of the spanish Armada, which letter being intercepted in Germany & printed ther both in the Latin & germane tonges, was afterwards published agayne, and inserted into an History of our tymes

The politics of anxiety at work here reflect investments I have been tracing throughout this project: the articulation of competing ideologies and religious interests through an association with the Turks. Parson's condemnation refers as much to the close relations between England and the Porte as it dismisses the Turks as enemies of the Christian faith. In this sense, he denounces both the Turk and the practices of Christians dealing with the Ottomans. Notably the evidence he mentions—'letters & presents sent vnto this professed enemye', 'a playne letter written by the Turk'—reflects a wider awareness of these associations. This is the same letter that was quoted by Richard Knolles in his The Generall Historie of the Turkes (1603) as

1 Robert Parsons, Newes from Spayne and Holland conteyning. An information of Inglish affayres in Spayne vvith a conference made thereupon in Amsterdame of Holland (Antwerp: A. Conincx, 1593), STC 22994, sig. C3'.
2 Ibid. sig. C3'.
3 Ibid.
evidence for the sultan’s unreliability, and lack of aid before and after the events of the Spanish Armada.

The central thesis of this project is that the *imago Turci* in early modern English prose emerges as a complex discursive site in which a variety of competing interests are negotiated. As we have seen throughout these five chapters, these interests were wide ranging and often reflect a number of concerns that relate to both Turks and Christians. They also demonstrate the central significance of the *imago Turci* for early modern English culture as a lens through which to identify and negotiate faultlines and competing ideologies.
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