You Say ‘Classical,’ I Say ‘Imperial,’ Let’s Call the Whole Thing Off: Empire, Individual, and Encounter in Travel Narratives of the Ottoman Empire

*Palmira Brummett**

Sen de “Klasik”, Ben Diyeyim “Emperyal”, Sonra Ortada Buluşalım: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu’na Dair Seyahat Anlatılarındaki İmparatorluk, Fert ve “Karşılaşma” Kavramları

Öz ■ Her geçen yıl biraz daha zenginleşen “karşılaşma” literatürü, Osmanlılar’ın kim olduklarına ve kendi “ötekileri”nce nasıl tanımlandıklarına dair bildiklerimizi önemli ölçüde arttırmıştır. Her ne kadar karşılaşma kavramı gruplar, cemaatlar, devletler ve imparatorluklar seviyesinde vuku bulan karşılıklı ilişkileri içerse de, bu mefhum, en belirgin hale fert mertebesinde gelir. Mevzuubahis gruplar, cemaatler, devletler ve imparatorluklar da onları oluşturan fertlerin incelenmesiyle daha iyi anlaşılır. Dolayısıyla bu çalışmada Osmanlı topraklarındaki fertlerin Avrupalı Hristiyan kralların diyarından gelen fertlerce “anlatılması” konu edilmektedir. Makalede, Osmanlı toplumunu oluşturan fertlerin imparatorluklar arasında rekabet ve diyalog bağlamı göz önünde tutularak nasıl “anlatıldığı” yorumlanmakta ve bunun yanında “anlatıcının”, kendi hedef kitlesine anlattığı ferdi “hakikileştirirken” kullandığı tanımlayıcıları bir arada resmetmek amaçlanmaktadır. Çalışmada, üç geç 16. yüzyıl ve iki 18. yüzyıl Avrupalı seyyahı baz alınarak karşılaşma mefhumu işlenmekte ve aynı kavram Avrupalılar’ın Osmanlı tebaasından fertlerle karşılaşmaları ile ilgili olduğundan, kavramın muhtemel dönüşümüne dikkat çekilmektedir. Son olarak kısaca dönemselleştirmeye değinilmekte, yani karşılaşma tür(leri) mevzuubahis olduğunda 18. yüzyılın bir önceki çağdan hangi yönleri bakımından ayrı tutulup tutulamayacağı incelenmektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu, seyahat, etnografi, erken modern, fert

‘Seeing’ the Ottoman

By and large, travelers from the Christian kingdoms of Europe moving into Ottoman territory did not employ the term “Ottoman” for individuals they

* Brown University.

encountered. When they used a term at all, it tended to be "Turk," an amorphous designation that suggested in its most general sense a Muslim resident in Ottoman domains. But "Turk" in the early modern era, was simply a frame-term which encompassed a whole universe of more nuanced descriptors. Any given individual resident in Ottoman lands might be labelled a "Turk" as part of the imperial, regional, or social group, but might not be labelled a "Turk" as an individual.

European Christian sojourners to Ottoman lands used a diverse, if circumscribed, set of designations for those whom they encountered in the well-protected domains (drawing upon what Maurits van den Boogert, in this volume, has called an "Ottoman identity grid"). Although religion is generally considered the default identity in such encounters, often enough a person's religion was not even mentioned in travel narratives (either because it was taken for granted or because the narrator privileged other categories). Travelers classified people by gender, ethnolinguistic identity, occupation, commune, locality, age, status, and association with the "state" or the narrator's own network of associates (or both). That is, an individual was identified by whom he or she knew, the point(s) of contact to the narrator. As with all migrants, travelers encountered Ottoman individuals based in part on that network of contacts (at home and abroad), and in part on their chosen paths of travel (counted in terms of places and persons experienced). For some travelers the paths of encounter were charted in advance and strictly adhered to. For others, serendipity and curiosity provided opportunities for encounter beyond those planned or anticipated. Also, the ways in which Ottoman individuals were told depended very much on the personality of the teller, as well as upon the teller's setting and contacts.[1] Some travelers were flexible and gregarious while others avoided contact with 'strangers' and departed the Ottoman realm with the very same impressions they bore with them when they left home.

Another important factor affecting the image of the Ottoman individual is the knowledge-picture of the observer. By this I mean the collage of information (deriving from education, news, and experience among other sources) by which any individual narrator formulated a mental picture of the Ottomans in situ. Eye witness experience was important; but so too were the "voices" of the past that Cem Menguç, in this volume, highlights as a critical element of Ottoman chroniclers' narration of the well-protected domains. Narrators from the Christian kingdoms of Europe made the realm of the "Great Turk" comprehensible to their readers by drawing upon a complex and evolving universe of history, text, and memory. They 'remembered' the Ottoman realm as the site of 'classical' and

1 On personality differences, for example, see Gerald MacLean, *The Rise of Oriental Travel* (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2004).

'imperial' pasts (Greek, Roman, and Biblical) that they claimed as their own. In short, the mental maps of many observers were constructed by their sense of Ottoman space as imperial space and classical space. There are, of course, other frames. Certain travelers when narrating the Ottomans focus very particularly on commercial and strategic interests almost to the exclusion of other frames of reference. The unedited Venetian diplomatic reports *(relazioni)* fit in some ways into this category although the imperial frame was important for them, and they incorporated layers of Venetian history into their narratives of place. By and large, however, one seldom finds an early modern account of Ottoman space which does not fit Ottoman groups or individuals into the imperial and classical modes, one way or another. There is a general, default knowledge-picture for educated individuals of a certain class and nation in each era. It varies by gender, inclination, level of familiarity, genre, and ideology (among other factors). But the 'classical' and 'imperial' remained enduring frames of reference for 'Western' observers throughout the period of Ottoman rule in the Afro-Eurasian oikumene.

The knowledge-picture along with eye-witness experience combined to form a 'vision of reality' that was then transmitted to a European Christian audience through a variety of genres, the travel narrative in particular, used to 'show and tell' the "Turk." The vision of the eighteenth century traveler might simply be the reheated image of a medieval or sixteenth century traveler, because certain tropes of the Turk (his arrogance or lust for example) were recycled so often that the traveler (actual or armchair) might have no idea how dated or 'unoriginal' they actually were.[2] By 1700, the availability of images and narratives on the "Turk" was so expansive that exposure to the "Turk" was widespread, and the ways of speaking about him or her were well rehearsed.[3] The empire and its denizens were incorporated into authoritative sources like compendia of knowledge in ways that transcended direct interest and were simply informational (or educational). Where more direct experience of the Ottomans was concerned, routine contact

---

2 In other cases, of course, narrative and image were plagiarized wholesale and very consciously. MacLean, *The Rise of Oriental Travel*, 73, notes that the English clergyman William Biddulph lifted whole passages directly from Nicolas de Nicolay's *Navigations* (French original 1568, and English translation 1585) and other printed sources for his own *The Travels of a Certaine Englishman into Africa, Asia, Troy, Bithnia, Thracia and to the Blacke Sea* (London, 1609).

3 This is not the kind of familiarity illustrated by Nabil Matar, *Turks, Moors and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), for the sixteenth century. It is, rather, a familiarity created by the accumulation and circulation of text and image.

and conversation had been going on since the fifteenth century. But its scope, numbers of participants, and interpretation had expanded significantly by 1700.

Beyond the standard imperial and classical frames employed to depict Ottomans, travel narratives have varying emphases. For some travelers, the self as sojourner is the primary emphasis (*my* objectives, *my* comfort, *my* endeavors, *my* successes). For others the lessons presented to the reader take primacy (*you* take heed, see how it's done, read and learn). And for other authors it is the Ottoman citizen, him or herself (dress, faith, behavior, culture, politics), that takes center stage. The individual in these early modern visions of Ottoman 'realities' then took a variety of what one might call 'picture-forms': stick figure, cartoon figure, fashion or culture model, and so on. An individual might receive only incidental mention or might appear as a rich-text figure, one presented with a matrix of observed detail. Much less often, an Ottoman individual might appear as someone with thoughts and speech deemed worthy of documentation. That is, the portrait became a personality. Fleshed out, an Ottoman individual might be presented as a normalizing figure, a human being comparable to those the reader was familiar with at home. Or, alternatively, the individual might serve as an exoticizing figure (weird, fabulous, indelibly unlike some assumed "us").

In travel narratives, we see individual men much more than women, elites more than commons, and we tend not to see much of children at all. Often what we get are the hints and fragments, a kaleidoscopic vision of sultans, *kuls*, traders, renegades, scholars, commanders, shopkeepers --- and then the big and amorphous everyone else, a *reaya* (flock) of sorts. Sometimes we hear (or seem to hear) "their" voices. And that raises the question of what we hear as well as what we see of the individual. Virginia Aksan has suggested some of the difficulties we encounter in trying to assess the Ottoman individual, comparing the historian's task to "listening to silence;" and noting how "the community in the Middle East often effaces the individual."[4]

4 Virginia Aksan, "The Question of Writing Premodern Biographies of the Middle East," 191-200, in *Autobiography and the Construction of Identity and Community in the Middle East*, Mary Ann Fay, ed. (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2001), 195, 198. See also, Derin Terzioğlu, "Autobiography in Fragments: Reading Ottoman Personal Miscellanies in the Early Modern Era," 1-20, in *Autobiographical Themes in Turkish Literature: Theoretical and Comparative Perspectives*, *Istanbuler Texte und Studien* 6, eds. Okay Akyildiz, et. al., (Würzberg, Ergon, 2007), 4, 9-10, 13, on Ottoman "practices of reading and writing that were conducive to autobiography...," and on how one glimpses the individual Ottoman author.

The Travel Narrative

In the languages of encounter literature we find the 'remembered' and constructed interactions of elite travelers with elite Ottomans, or glimpses of the people behind the major players that we might wish to 'see' more thoroughly. There is little enough in our texts of what one might actually call conversation; but there are plenty of allusions to the situations in which conversations clearly could and did take place (whether those conversations were the brief, anonymous exchanges required of logistics on the docks, or the relaxed and familiar ones that took place among friends and acquaintances over dinner and a bottle of wine). Walter Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı have suggested some of those situations in the settings and sociabilities of the literary salon, a Mediterranean-wide phenomenon that shared characteristics across commune and class.[5] And Kate Fleet, Ebru Boyar, and Fariba Zarinebaf have suggested more of the possibilities in the context of the street, the bar, and the house of ill repute.[6] Each of these settings is one in which the circle of conversation might extend from Ottoman groups and individuals to outsiders.

But the fact is that the modes of telling employed in the early modern European travel account do not tend to include the repetition of conversations. At best they might include a highly stylized and formulaic sense of communications. But more commonly they provide a matrix of relationships that suggest the types of conversation that took place among individuals. These types are the formal (e.g., the courtly audience, treaty negotiations), the semi-formal (conversation that took place within set parameters of juridical or commercial negotiation and exchange), the casual (unplanned or unscripted encounters), and the intimate or convivial (the type of conversation that took place between people who were friends, or at least more than acquaintances). In these latter contexts we can envision the participants eating, drinking, chatting, sharing experiences and memories, having sex, laughing.

Language, of course, is always an issue in the assessment of encounter and its conversational possibilities. Participants needed to share a language or some vehicle of translation in order to share a true conversation. Sometimes translators

5 Walter Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı , *The Age of Beloveds* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005), 28, 57-58, 353.

6 Ebru Boyar and Kate Fleet, *A Social History of Ottoman Istanbul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 99-193, 111-114; Fariba Zarinebaf, *Crime and Punishment in Istanbul, 1700-1800* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010), 86-111; also Eric Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople: Nation, Identity, and Coexistence in the Early Modern Mediterranean* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), 174-185.

are mentioned in the encounter story, but often enough we must simply assume that they were present. Disregarding language barriers, there is the question of who, in any given situation, was available for the traveler to interact with or speak to in the first place. Once available, did a given individual feel free to speak to the visiting traveler, and if so, in what ways? Age and status affected access to sociability. Travel encounters are also clearly conditioned by divisions of gender (which are of course affected by age, social position, and the potential for desire). Our narrators are overwhelmingly male. And even when we have such a narrator as Lady Mary Wortly Montagu (1689-1762), wife of the British ambassador to the Porte, and a woman famous for her 'access' to the sights and voices of Ottoman women, we find that her scripted narratives of harem visits suggest stiff, highly structured relationships, rather than some version of female intimacy.[7] Indeed the soror-sociability exhibited in Montagu's *Letters* is not at all comparable to the homosociability that one finds in Andrews and Kalpaklı's literary salons, or, in the account of a Hapsburg adolescent named Wenceslas Wratislaw who will be treated below.[8] Wratislaw and Montagu are useful bookends to our treatment of travel encounter, conversation, and the individual since both are rather unusual authors. Both spent extended time

7 On the composition of "The Turkish Embassy Letters," see Mary Wortley Montagu, *The Complete Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, ed., Robert Halsband, v. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), xiv-xv. Halsband suggests that the letters Montagu published derived from "the full and interesting letters she was sending to her friends and relations," although some of the material seems to have been extracted from a journal she kept during her travels. Halsband has also published a biography, *The Life of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960). See also, Anita Desai, introduction, *The Turkish Embassy Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, Malcolm Jack, ed. (London: Virago, 2000), vi-xxxvii. For the Poetry Foundation's interesting summary on Montagu's publications, see http://www.poetryfoundation.org/bio/lady-mary-wortley-montagu.

8 Wenceslas Wratislaw, *Adventures of Baron Wenceslas Wratislaw: What He Saw in Constantinople, in his Captivity, Committed to Writing in 1599*, Albert Henry Wratislaw, trans. (London: Bell and Daldy, 1862). For German and Czech versions, see Václav Vratislav z Mitrovic, *Des Freyherrn von Wratislaw merkwürdige Gesandtschaftsreise von Wien nach Konstantinopel: so gut als aus dem Englischen übersetzt* (Leipzig: Schönfeldschen Buchhandlung, 1786); and Václav Vratislav z Mitrovic, *Príhody,* Milada Nedvědová, ed. (Praha: n.p. , 1976), unnumbered front matter, which provides a short biography of Wratislaw (1576-1635), and a description of the various editions (217). For background on the Czech literary milieu in Wratislaw's time see James Naughton, University Lecturer at Oxford, "Czech and Slovak Literature Resources: Renaissance and Humanism," ttp://users.ox.ac.uk/~tayl0010/lit_renais.htm.

in Ottoman domains, and together they frame what one might call the long seventeenth century of travel narratives.[9]

But before we examine encounters of individuals, there is the question of how the individual does or does not emerge from the group. Often enough "Turks" are narrated only as members of that very large amorphous group, or as a segment thereof: officials, robbers, harem ladies, pashas, merchants, etc., that is, as a collective rather than as a set of named individuals. The "Turks," for the traveler, are those anonymous people who occupy the residences (and streets) at one's stopping places, supplying housing, services, and food; they are those who provide protection and resources or act as obstacles along the journey. They let one in, or keep one out. They watch one eat, marvel at ones possessions, pay no attention to one at all, explain regulations, or provide hospitality. They may or may not be described in terms of gender or class. Their dress and mores may be of great interest to the narrator or of no interest at all. They represent the empire in the form of soldiers or administrators. Or they stand as ethnographic types representing the present or the past (a warrior, a nomad, a 'Scythian,' a secluded maiden). Such possibilities for designating people by group are certainly not limited to early modern European Christian narratives. They are ubiquitous across time, space, and commune, for example, in the *Seyahatname* of the Ottoman traveler Evliya Çelebi (1611-1682), who frequently narrated his journeys in terms of ethnic, religious, occupational, or other group categories. But because of the ubiquity of such lumping categories, it becomes important to note when individuals are named and, if so, whether that naming expresses actual familiarity or simply the repetition of a narrative (or narratives) to which names have already been attached.

Five Travelers

By way of presenting some of the narrative possibilities, I treat here a set of travelers who witnessed Ottoman domains and culture and set their observations down in writing. While the intentions of each author may be more or less apparent as he (or she) constructs a vision of the Ottomans for particular audience(s), language and tone help reveal what the author sees and wants his readers to see. Our first traveler is Giovanni Alcarotti, a cleric from Novara (located west

9 Bernadette Andrea, *Women and Islam in Early Modern English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 77, classifies Montagu as an "early feminist," who "challenged the projection of patriarchal abuses onto the Islamic world." That may be an apt characterization, though imperialism, and more importantly class, constitute, in my view, the most significant frames for Montagu's work.

of Milan), who set off from Venice in 1587, intent on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. After his return, in 1596, he published the pilgrim guide, "*Del viaggio di terra santa*."[10] Alcarotti sets out the terms for classifying people at the outset of his travels, as he and his fellow passengers board the vessel that will transport them down the Adriatic. He divides the human cargo into "we Latins," (that is clerics, and "seculars such as Signors, Gentlemen, and Merchants of various countries"); "those excluded from the bosom of the Church such as Schismatics, Greeks, and other Oriental Christians;" and, finally, "what was worse.... more than a few Jews, Turks, Arab Moors, and other sorts from the worst of nations......"[11] In this division of human space, Alcarotti fits quite naturally and squarely into the traveler-type whose first category of analysis is religious sect. For him, the residents of the last group are little more than beasts who leer at the celebration of the Mass and whose shipboard entertainments are crude or ridiculous. The "Turk," is a group identity (a subset of those outsiders who are beyond the pale) that includes no individuals. Nonetheless, the "Turk," on this voyage, shares something with Alcarotti; he is a displaced person. On the land, however, in "his own" territory, the Turk (the objects of the author's narrative are all male) becomes something else.

Cyprus was already an Ottoman possession by the time Alcarotti landed there on his way to the Holy Land. But its identity, somewhere between "Christian" and "Turk" space, remained ambiguous. When, Alcarotti's ship reached Tripoli in the Levant, however, he imagined himself solidly on "Turk" ground. There his narrative conflates two groups of "Turks." One group stole belongings that Alcarotti had placed in the care of a guardian. The other, a group of unidentified officials (or at least some men who posed as such), plagued the padre by eying him, then stopping him, and pulling his possessions out of his bags.[12] They were, he informed his readers, especially interested in the "best" foods, and the wine he carried, helping themselves with impunity, and paying no heed to his protests. Thus in Alcarotti's guide book, the prospective pilgrim meets the "Turk" in Tripoli, a nameless bunch of men whose sole purpose would seem to be robbery and intimidation. Later in the story of Alcarotti's pilgrimage, we do find reference to a benign individual, a Muslim "gentleman of quality." That gentleman (whose ethnicity is not designated), Alcarotti tells us, assisted the priest's monastic hosts in Jerusalem by calling in the authorities when someone threw the head of a dead

10 Giovanni Alcarotti, *Del viaggio di terra santa* (Novara: Appresso gli Heredi di Fr. Sefalli, 1596). Translations here are mine.

11 Alcarotti, *Del viaggio*, 2.

12 Alcarotti, *Del viaggio*, 18-19.

man into their garden.[13] But this individual, too, remains nameless. He would appear to have a good working relationship with the monks, but for Alcarotti he was a rather remote exception to the rule of "Turkish" bad behavior (as exemplified by the head throwing). For Alcarotti, as for other 'authorities' on pilgrimage, the primary objective was to avoid trouble (which often meant exposure to the wrong people), and to get to the objectives at hand, the sacred pilgrimage sites and the (preferably Latin) associates who facilitated the experience of the sacred.[14]

For other travelers, however, "Turks" might become real people, distinct individuals whose behavior, in addition to their type, determined their identity and their role in the narrative. One such traveler was Wenceslas Wratislaw (b. 1576) who joined a Habsburg embassy to the Ottoman empire in 1591 (as a protégé of the ambassador), just a few short years after Alcarotti's sojourn. Wratislaw certainly characterized the people he met as "Turks" according to their group identities (merchants, janissaries, old women, young women). In that regard he did not diverge greatly from the norms of the travel genre. People, after all, in the traveler's eye, required names only when they became important as resources, friends, allies, enemies, or individuals who (one way or the other) became objects of greater curiosity, or had to be dealt with more directly or at greater length than those who were just passers-by, merchants, servants, or iconic types. What distinguishes Wratislaw for us, however, is that youth seems to have provided him with a spirit open to both curiosity and sociability.[15] He made it his objective to meet people, and his gaze was particularly acute (or at least so it appears in his published work).[16] Wratislaw tells us how he and "the Turk" laughed together (a sure

13 Alcarotti, *Del viaggio*, 181.

14 For commentary on the warnings of other pilgrim guides, see Wes Williams, " 'A mirrour of mis-haps,/ A Mappe of Miserie': Dangers, Strangers, and Friends in Renaissance Pilgrimage," 205-240, in *The 'Book' of Travels: Genre, Ethnology, and Pilgrimage, 1250-1700*, Palmira Brummett, ed. (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

15 Wratislaw, the son of a Bohemian knight, was placed under the watchful eye of Frederic Kregwitz for the embassy sent to the Ottoman court of Murad III (r. 1574-1595) by Rudolph II (r. 1576-1612). In 1593, along with his mentor he was imprisoned for espionage. Released in 1596 after several years in captivity he went on to a successful career as an official and judge.

16 Of course the accuracy and originality of such accounts is always qualified. Wratislaw may have had access to other printed narrations of the Ottomans in Istanbul once he returned home; and memory is always subject to imagination and the assessment of audience demands. See Václav Vratislav z Mitrovic, *Príhody* , second to fifth unnumbered pages of biographical note by Milada Nedvědová, which point out that Czech readers by the end of the 16th century had ten published versions of John Mandeville,

indication of commonality and the shared pleasures of the human condition). His story of sociability in Istanbul is a far cry from Alcarotti's scuttling passage through the Holy Land.

The individual who emerges most dramatically in Wratislaw's story is his janissary, Mustafa, a man with whom the young man practiced his Turkish, shared stories, and enjoyed various scrapes and adventures. Wratislaw's narrative suggests how he interrogated Mustafa (and his friends) on daily life, sports, places to visit, acceptable behavior, and women (among other topics). And when a treacherous embassy steward 'turned Turk' and exposed the embassy to condemnation for espionage, it was Mustafa, according to Wratislaw, who tried to protect him as he was being dragged off to jail.[17] Indeed, Wratislaw's account of the violent arrest of the embassy personnel provides an interesting example of the levels of identity assigned to the Ottoman populace in the tale of our young traveler. Wratislaw sets the scene, telling his readers that the ambassador had already been taken from the place where they were all staying. Wondering what would happen next, the rest of the entourage:

"Saw people running from all quarters by the thousands to our house, placing themselves in rows, and creeping on the roofs, and at last so many collected that we could not see to the end of them...[then] we saw the guard which was usually employed at executions making straight for our hotel. Behind this guard rode the sub-pasha, the judges, the head-executioners, heralds, and under-executioners, bearing fetters in their hands. The eyes of all the people were then directed upon us. When they arrived at the house, the sub-pasha and the other Turks dismounted; and janissaries opened our house with a noise and shout... and led and dragged all of us, wherever they could seize us, down the galleries and out of the house..."[18]

Wratislaw, however, was suffering from dysentery and was too weak to walk.

"As I could not stand upon my feet, they brought me a Turk, whom they call a hamola [*hamal*], or porter, who carries all manner of things from the sea about the city for hire, on whose pannier, which was stuffed with rushes, they perched me...Meanwhile a dwarfish Turk, with a reddish beard, called out at the top of his voice to the bystanders: "Is it right that this true believer should carry that dog?" And, running up to me, he gave me a violent blow, so that I shot down from my

as well as Czech editions of Johannes Leunclavius' *History of the Ottomans*, and of Busbecq.

17 Wratislaw, *Adventures*, 108, 112.

18 Wratislaw, *Adventures*, 119.

steed...; also he contemptuously kicked me in the side, and would have beaten me still more, had not our former janissary Mustafa, seen it, and taken compassion upon me. Not enduring this conduct, and looking upon me with sorrow, for he wished me everything that was good – he flourished his staff, and dragging me from [the dwarf], reviled him in Turkish, asking him why he struck a poor sick prisoner, and wanted to show his manhood on me? If he possessed so heroic a heart, let him take it against fresh and strong giaours in Hungary.....And when the other answered him contumaciously, my friend the janissary cudgeled him with his staff over the head, till the blood streamed, upon which the Turk rushed at the janissary with a knife. In a moment about a hundred people ranged themselves on the side of the janissary, and as many more on the side of the other, and they were already beginning to take up stones and throw them at each other...."[19]

At this point the guards, judge and *subaşı* intervened in the confrontation "and ordered them to keep peace under pain of death," thus avoiding a riot. Mustafa helped the young man up and summoned two men to help him. Ultimately, the *çavuş* had him seated on a mule and the "executioners" held his feet to keep him from falling off. As the procession of arrested men was paraded through the streets, Wratislaw tells his reader that some among the crowd reviled them and others "pitied us."[20]

"Turks" here are either parts of the official government detachment (*çavuş, subaşı*, executioner, janissary, etc.), or they are members of the mobs in the street who run "from all quarters," impede the movement of the arrest party, and direct their gaze, their jeers, their sympathy, or their physical abuse toward the prisoners. Among the officials, certain individuals direct some care toward the ill youth, but they are acting as part of the arrest party, fulfilling their duties. Only two individuals are made more three-dimensional, emerging from the crowd: the "dwarfish Turk" whose knife, blood, and aggressive speech stuck in the memory of the narrator, and Mustafa, the janissary, whose compassion for his one-time-charge prompted him to raise Wratislaw up, risk his own neck, and employ his cudgel (and his words) against the youth's attacker. Mustafa here transcends the common trope of the "good" or helpful "Turk."[21] It is notable that even under such duress, Wratislaw (at least in his memoir) goes beyond a unilateral focus on

19 Wratislaw, *Adventures*, 119-121.

20 Wratislaw, *Adventures*, 122.

21 For examples of the good or virtuous Turk or Moor in plays, see Daniel Vitkus, *Turning Turk: English Theatre and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630* (New York: Palgrave, 2003), 139; and Linda McJannet, *The Sultan Speaks: Dialogue in English Plays and Histories about the Ottoman Turks* (New York: Palgrave, 2006), 154.

the all-encompassing "I." And his stories of Turk compassion do not stop there. No individual emerges again in his story in quite the same way that Mustafa does; but Wratislaw is quite open in pointing out the sympathy and aid (even if motivated by self-interest) that he receives from various of his wardens as he bears the burdens of imprisonment.[22] The "Turk," for him, is like other people, capable of humanity, humor, and compassion, (as well as brutality or venality) whether he is a gentleman, a janissary, a jailer, or a member of the crowd.

To provide one further vision of the late sixteenth century observer, I turn to John Sanderson (b. 1560), a poorly educated Englishman of the tradesman class who also set off as a young man for Istanbul in 1584, but whose experiences and narrative thereof were very different from those of either Wratislaw or Alcarotti. Sanderson was not unaware of the layers of classical and Biblical history applied by contemporaries to Ottoman domains. But they did not concern him terribly. He routinely invoked God in his narrative but was not, apparently, a pious man. Indeed his pilgrimage, as he wrote himself, was a "worldly" one; and he described the hajj caravan in Cairo in much the same way that he described a Christian shrine outside the city.[23] Rather Sanderson was immersed in the telling of his personal and commercial affairs. He was a man who started out as an apprentice, sent to "Turkey" against his will, but who ultimately became master of his own apprentice and a successful businessman.[24] We have an autobiographic fragment from Sanderson as well as an account of his travels, and letters that he sent in the course of his service with the English Levant Company. From these we garner much about the affairs of English diplomats and merchants but little about Ottoman society. Like Wratislaw, Sanderson speaks of alcohol lubricated revels, but unlike the tale

22 Also of interest here is the story (illustrating the intimacy of Muslims, Christians, and Jews) of Hans Ulrich Krafft, of Ulm (1550-1621), who worked for Augsburg trading houses, and was imprisoned in an Ottoman jail in Levantine Tripoli in 1574, later recording his memoir around 1615. See Hans Ulrich Krafft, *Reisen und Gefangenschaft Hans Ulrich Kraffts*, ed., K.D. Haszler, series *Bibliothek des Litterarischen Vereins in Stuttgart*, LXI (Stuttgart: Gedruckt auf Kosten des Litterarischen Vereins, 1861), 1-440. Thanks to Daniel Juette for this reference.

23 John Sanderson, *The Travels of John Sanderson*, second series no. 67 (London: Hakluyt Society, 1931), 20, 42, 45.

24 Sanderson, *Travels*, 2-4, 17-18. Sanderson calls his grammar schooling a "misery." At seventeen, he was placed and then "bound" as an apprentice with Martin Calthorp, "Flaunders merchaunt;" then "without my first knowledge" he was bound to the English Levant Company and put at the disposal of Harborne, English ambassador to the Porte. His father was "a jentillman of the north country," who moved to London and worked as a haberdasher (21).

of the Habsburg page, Sanderson's narrative is a vision of hard living, self-interest, dissolution, fights, prostitution, and other forms of violence. One might say that he pictures the mean streets of the Levant. For Sanderson, "Turk" was one among various ethno-communal identities that he encountered in his travels. In Cyprus, when he describes the men on a ship that sank, he names them simply as English, Greek, Turk, and Jew. He neither ranks them nor comments on their culture. At Damietta, he describes his companions as an Englishman, a janissary, a dragoman, a Jew, and "other attendants."[25] He uses the possessive "my" to refer to the janissary, but he never names him.[26] Indeed, for Sanderson, a man may be jolly, treacherous, civil, or roguish, and those categories are applied regardless of whether the man is "Turk," "Greek," "Moor," or "Englishman." In the Holy Land he prefers the society of a Jew, to that of the "Popish friars;" and he praises the good humor of a "well mannered, manly and civil Turk," with whom he shared the experience of a ship wreck.[27] Beyond such ethnic, and occupational identities, Sanderson pays attention to where the commercial men he encounters are from, be it Genoa, Scio, or Aleppo.

Like Wratislaw, Sanderson was plugged in to the diplomatic community, at least of his own nation, and he was familiar with the names of officials and the various ranks of the sultan's government. Writing the narrative of his time in Istanbul, he devotes much of his energy to describing buildings, monuments, and repeating (often stock) stories about Ottoman governmental affairs. Sanderson learned some Turkish and his account is salted with Turkish phrases and designations. That naming appears in his chart of the "residents" of Istanbul which divides the populace into officials (e.g. vizirs, *kadıs, ağas, solaks, sipahis, kapıcıs*, etc.), janissaries, *topcus, acemioğlans*, other Turks, Christians, Jews, and (as a final and separate category), women and children of all sorts. Though he encounters various of these residents while engaged in his commercial activities, he gives little evidence of having developed friendships (other than drinking partnerships) with Christians or "Turks." Mostly his acquaintances are noted for their utility or lack thereof.

25 Sanderson, *Travels*, 16, 47.

26 Sanderson, *Travels*, 10, does mention a companion in Greece, one "Jeffer Chouse" or Jafer Çavuş, but only to note that he was wounded along with an Englishman in a fight and both were left behind. Later, in his correspondence from Istanbul he mentions a Haji Nasreddin and a Hasan Agha as sources from whom money can be borrowed (192). But otherwise his naming of "Turks" is limited to various vizirs, pashas and high officials (e.g., 223-224).

27 Sanderson, *Travels*, 19, 47, 108, 121.

An exception may be found in Sanderson's narration of his journey to the Holy Land, on which he traveled with a company of Jews. Like Alcarotti, Sanderson depicts officials in the Holy Land as expert at extortion, relating how the deputy of the governor (*subaşı*) of Jerusalem, despite Sanderson's letter of protection from the sultan, pressed him for money, and velvet and satin garments. When he refused he was taken to the governor, a "grisly Turk and his rascally attendants" to be thrown into prison. But his Jewish companions "fell down at [the governor's] feet and entreated for me; often kissing his hand and garment, praying him to pardon my bold behaviour and words of displeasure....."[28] So Sanderson escaped through the good offices of the Jews, but not before he was forced to pay 12 sequins in gold. He was saved once again by a Muslim judge, the "Kadi of Tripoli," another traveling companion, who secured his release from prison when he was accused of robbery in Tripoli.[29] His benefactor remains nameless and Sanderson takes pains to note that the judge had "been well treated" by the Englishmen on the voyage from Constantinople, and thus, apparently, owed him a favor. Sanderson was a risk taker, a man who resisted submitting to the 'courtesies' of negotiation and compensation for value gained. He was grateful for the interventions of Muslim and Jew on his behalf, but he did not dwell on his gratitude.

Where Sanderson does become expansive on an Ottoman individual is in his description of Abraham Coen, "my great companion Jew".[30] Coen, Sanderson writes in uncharacteristically effusive fashion, "was so respective, kind and courteous that never in any Christian's company, of what degree soever, I ever did receive better content."[31] Indeed Sanderson suggests that tears came to his eyes when he and Coen had to part:

> "A most devout, zealous, and soft-hearted man he was. I cannot speak too much good of him, in regard of his great humanity and extraordinary charity; his measure being more in those performances than is to be found in many of us Christians."[32]

---

28 Sanderson, *Travels*, 122-123.

29 Sanderson, *Travels*, 90.

30 Sanderson, *Travels*, 102-103, 120-121, 125-126, named seven Jews with whom he traveled, noting where they resided (Scio, Terria [?], Smyrna, Constantinople, and Damascus), "chief" among them Abraham Coen. For Sanderson a "better" Jew is one who does not try to pick religious arguments with him about Jesus, as "the meaner sort" do (118-119).

31 Sanderson, *Travels*, 124.

32 Sanderson, *Travels*, 124-125.

In short, Sanderson, an often bitter man, tells us that the Jew had been good to him.[33] Coen, one might say, represents an Ottoman individual for whom Sanderson came as close as he ever did to expressing heartfelt affection.[34]

When we come to the observer of the eighteenth century we find that the concerns of the sixteenth century traveler with the mores, religious practices, ethnographic divisions, historical antecedents, political threats, and potential profits of the empire remain very much in place. So too do the juxtaposition of associates, officials, and crowds, and the narration of the potential for sociability (seized upon, treated with trepidation, avoided, or ignored entirely). Having taken a look at some of Wenceslas Wratislaw's account, it seems appropriate to examine the published 'letters' of another embassy adjunct, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu (1689-1762), the wife of the English ambassador to the Porte, who traveled to Istanbul in 1716. Montagu, like Wratislaw, was both a member of the notable class (she was the daughter of a duke) and a subsidiary member of an embassy party. Both were very conscious of the imperial rivalries that occasioned their respective sojourns into Ottoman lands. Lady Mary made it her objective to visit, report on, and 'clarify' the English vision of the elite Ottoman harem and, more generally, the Istanbul scene. On her return to England she selected, edited and published some of the letters from her Turkish sojourn. Montagu is famous because we have so few female voices when it comes to travel accounts of the empire. She is often touted as an authentic observer of Ottoman women because of her access to the harem; and her letters are juxtaposed to the 'peep-show' accounts of early modern European males who also commented on the seraglio. But for our purposes, what is intriguing is the way in which Montagu reveals the Ottoman individual to her reading public, and the classification she employs for assessing Ottoman people.

Both Wratislaw and Montagu wrote in the first person, and both took pains to narrate the street scenes of Ottoman Istanbul. Both identified individuals by ethno-communal types (Greek, Turk, Armenian, English).[35] But their presentation of Ottoman peoples was really quite different (perhaps not surprising given age, gender, and experience – Montagu was twenty-seven when she traveled to Istanbul,

33 His narrative affirms Daniel Vitkus, *Turning Turk*, 130, writing of the early modern Ottoman domains, that "'Islam' or 'Turkishness' was a layered conglomeration that enfolded Christians, Jews, Muslims and renegades within a sprawling and expanding cultural mix."

34 This is not to say that Sanderson loved all Jews.

35 Montagu also employs terms of color (blacks, whites), race, and species. See [Mary Wortley Montagu], *The Genuine copy of a Letter Written from Constantinople by an English Lady, who was lately in Turkey*... (London: J. Roberts, 1719), 5-6.

Wratislaw fifteen). Lady Mary, highly conscious of literary style, presented herself as the central character on the Ottoman stage. Thus its individuals, culture, and events (including harem visits) were relevant chiefly in how they affected and related to her. She was obsessed with class, the primary factor she employed to separate one "Turk" from another, and with beauty, entertainment, and material culture (the more luxurious the better). Variants of the word "amusement" appear in her narrative with remarkable regularity, applied to people as well as to places and diversions. Unlike Wratislaw, she was never arrested. But we can take a look at her descriptions of public scenes to see how she categorized Ottoman people and their actions. What follows are two excerpts from her account of the sultan processing to Friday mosque. First Montagu narrates her impressions of seeing the sultan; her fellow witness was "the French ambassadress" (Madeleine-Françoise de Gontaut-Biron). Then she relates a second story of her own procession, with the same French companion, through the streets of Istanbul.

"The Grand Signor....was proceeded by a numerous guard of janissaries with vast white feathers on their heads, as also by the sipahis and bostcis (these are foot and horse guards) and the royal gardeners... After them the Aga of the janissaries in a robe of purple velvet lined with silver tissue, his horse led by two slaves richly dressed. Next the Kilar [Kızlar] Aga (your ladyship knows this is the chief guardian of the seraglio ladies) in a deep yellow cloth (which suited very well to his black face) lined with sables, and last his sublimity himself, in [a] green [garment] lined with the fur of a black muscovite fox, which is supposed worth a thousand pounds sterling, mounted on a fine horse with furniture embroidered with jewels....The sultan appeared to us a handsome man of about forty, with a very graceful air but with something severe in his countenance, his eyes very full and black. He happened to stop under the window where we stood, and, I suppose being told who we were, looked upon us very attentively, that we had full leisure to consider him and the French Ambassadress agreed with me as to his good mien."

"I see that lady very often .... I went with her the other day all around the town in an open gilt chariot, with our joint train of attendants, preceded by our guards, who might have summoned the people to see what they had never seen nor ever would ever again; two young Christian ambassadresses never yet having been in this country at the same time, nor I believe ever will again. Your ladyship [Montagu's correspondent] may easily imagine that we drew a vast crowd of spectators, but all silent as death. If any of them had taken the liberties of our [English] mob upon [seeing] any strange sight, our janissaries had made no scruple of falling on them with their scimitars, without danger for so doing, being above the law. Yet these people [the janissaries] have some good qualities; they are very zealous and

faithful where they serve, and look upon it as their business to fight for you on all occasions...."[36]

Perhaps it is unfair to align Montagu's procession scenes with Wratislaw's tale of the arrest of the Habsburg embassy. But what is interesting here are their (relative) familiarity with Ottoman officialdom, the juxtaposition of elites and crowd, and the varying presentation of self in 'confrontation' with the "Turk." Wratislaw and Montagu would agree on the loyalty of the personal janissary, but not, I think, on what type of relationship that loyalty bespoke. Wratislaw seems to have had genuine admiration and affection for Mustafa, whom he calls "friend," whereas for Montagu, a janissary was simply one type of servant among many others. Wratislaw focuses on narrating what he sees while Montagu highlights the ways in which Ottomans see her.

Montagu, elsewhere, does name some of the various notables and their wives with whom she comes into contact. And she does articulate a friendly conversational encounter with one "Turk" man, the governor of Belgrade, Ahmed Pasha. This governor, whom Montagu characterizes as accomplished in languages and able to write in Latin script, was her host at one stop on the journey to Istanbul.

"My only diversion here is the conversations of our host Achmed Bey ... [who] has had the good sense to prefer an easy, quiet, secure life to all the dangerous honours of the Porte... I have frequent disputes with him concerning the difference of our customs, particularly the confinement of women. He assures me there is nothing at all to it... He has wit, and is more polite than many Christian men of quality. I am very much entertained with him. He had the curiosity to make one of our servants set him an alphabet of our letters, and can already write a good Roman hand.... These amusements do not hinder my wishing heartily to be out of this place...."[37]

---

36 Montagu, *The Turkish Embassy Letters*, 67-68, goes on to relate the story of one of her janissaries, in a village near Philippopolis, imprisoning and threatening the local kadi with death because he had been unable to deliver the pigeons which Montagu had mentioned she desired for dinner.

37 Montagu, *The Turkish Embassy Letters*, 53-54. Montagu does not directly reference a translator here but clearly one was required for these interchanges. Her description of her host echoes that of earlier travelers like Dr. John Covel, *Voyages en Turquie 1675-1677*, Jean-Piere Grélois, trans., series *Réalités Byzantines* 6 (Paris: Éditions P. Lethielleux, 1998), 7-8. On a trip to Iznik, Covel described his host on the bay of Izmit: "We lodged with one Bayouchtoogle Sardar here; we were recommended hither to him by our friends at Ismet, he being a great friend of the metropolite's of Nicomedia. He was the most courteous man alive, very rich." Impressed with the high standard of

Montagu thus admired the pasha as a 'worthy' companion, but only up to a very clear point. Ahmed Pasha is one of the few Ottoman individuals we actually 'see' in Montagu's narrative, despite the celebration of her harem encounters. And even then, the juxtaposition of entertainment and boredom is a primary frame through which Lady Mary presents her encounter. No doubt she was meeting the expectations of class and of genre (amusing commentary and 'authoritative' descriptions); but for we later-day readers, she also provides some intriguing glimpses of the interests of the bey himself.

Lady Mary, as narrator, made a point of her role as female observer with access to things female. But noting her gender does not suffice to characterize her writing. Montagu was, after all, an active and even aggressive participant in a predominantly male, European republic of letters. Gender certainly mattered in her account, but it was only one factor among others. It was subordinate, I would argue, to class, education, interests, and task at hand (both embassy spouse and author).[38] So rather than employ our lone female narrator to represent the eighteenth century on her own, I will conclude with the Cambridge scholar and clergyman Richard Chandler (d. 1810), a narrator who was perhaps a bit more restrained than Lady Mary.

Chandler journeyed into the Ottoman realm in 1764, charged with charting its antiquities for the English Society of Dilettanti. His observations, published in *Travels in Greece and Asia Minor* (1775-1776), provide a later eighteenth century model for the ways in which individuals in Ottoman space might be acknowledged. People do not appear in the forefront of Chandler's narrative as they do in those of Wratislaw or Montagu. And when they do appear, they usually seem to be temporary occupiers of classical space, much as the residents of Palestine, for many Western Christian travelers (even up to the present day) seem to be temporary residents of Biblical space. Chandler's vision of Ottoman realities, like Alcarotti's or Sanderson's, is thus very much reflective of the task (collecting the past, pilgrimage, and commerce respectively) at hand, though he does diverge from his mission periodically to comment on culture.

Chandler divides the people he does mention into ethno-communal categories; but he also highlights what people do. Thus he witnesses dervishes, officials, boatmen, or consuls, sometimes mentioning their ethnicity and sometimes not.

accommodations, food, and service at the serdar's house, Covel concluded by saying that he "seems a most obliging man."

38 Although gender certainly tended to determine education in this era. Were it not for her educational advantages we would certainly not have had Montagu's voice on the Ottomans.

He describes a local man serving as an English agent as "a fat well-looking Jew" whose house was plagued with bugs.[39] On a boat excursion near the mouth of the Hellespont, he notes that "we had six Turks, who rowed; a janissary, and a Jew servant.[40] He does not deem these companions worthy of further comment. Chandler also employs civilizational categories, calling the boatmen on the Anatolian side of the Dardanelles "savage figures," and, like Montagu, employing the notion of different "species" of human being.[41] For Chandler, the friendly "Turk" was one who was accommodating, and facilitated his task, much like Montagu's janissaries, though he does not pay the same attention to the 'legitimacy' of janissary authority as Montagu does, or to the thrilling nature of their violence.

In Chandler's account, as in those of our other narrators, women were a separate category of being. Like earlier travelers, this eighteenth century clergyman felt compelled to comment on their clothing, hair styles, and behavior, and to equate them with "classical" antecedents, whether the ladies in question were "Greek" or "Turk."[42] Perhaps because of the classical prism through which he viewed Ottoman lands, however, Chandler's "Greek," beauties are always superior to their counterparts of other nationalities. Montagu was much more enthralled with "Turkish" beauties (although needless to say the women of the Ottoman harems were of very mixed ethnicity). When he classifies women, he specifies ethno-communal identity, age, status (virgin or matron) and class (which he may associate with beauty and delicacy).[43] He also comments on mores, positing the normalcy of women's subservience to men.[44] But Chandler does not name the individual Ottoman women whom he encounters (usually in the households of Christian men). No exceptional individual, comparable to Wratislaw's janissary or Sanderson's Jew, emerges from the pages of Chandler's work, even though his account suggests masculine social gatherings with "Turkish" associates like "Osman Aga."[45] Though he may name these (usually elite) men in the context of detailing his affairs, he does not dwell on affinities.

Our five travelers' tales thus differ substantially in their focus and voice. They all tell us something about ethnographic types, and group identities; but they

39 Chandler, *Travels*, 1: 14.

40 Chandler, 1: 17.

41 Chandler, 1: 14. This indeed may be a choice of language more common in the eighteenth century.

42 Chandler, 2: 152,

43 Chandler, 2: 155.

44 Chandler, 2: 157.

45 Chandler, 2: 157.

provide only glimpses of Ottoman individuals. What they do reveal is a sense of the possibilities for day-to-day sociability (between Ottoman subjects and foreign travelers) unimpeded by a presumably rigid communal divide. Visits, hardships, business dealings, shared experience, and curiosity lead to hints of conversation, laughter, confidences, and debates whose texts in their entirety simply do not make it into the published account. A few words and sentences caught in the narrative framework of the imperial and the classical, and in the constraints of gender relations, are made to speak for the whole.

Parameters of Change, Or Not, Periodization

Was the eighteenth century traveler substantially different from his sixteenth or seventeenth century counterpart in his (or her) representation of the empire, its groups and individuals? Certainly the scope and pace of travel to the empire from the lands of the Christian kings had increased by 1700. More travelers, from more places, with expanded objectives and a higher degree of familiarity (at least textual familiarity) were sojourning to the realms of "the Great Turk" and "classical antiquity." Still, I would propose that the classification of types into which the "Turk" was placed, and its range of options, had not changed dramatically from the beginning to the end of our period, roughly 1570 to 1770. The "Turk" was still the "Turk," either an emblem of empire, or a generic name for the Muslims of the Ottoman world. Individual and group were still evaluated in travel narratives primarily on the bases of their utility, the degree to which they facilitated or impeded the traveler's objectives and provided the level of entertainment (or information) that he wished for his audience. Certainly those objectives varied, along with experience, from traveler to traveler, as one can clearly see when comparing the blinders operative in Alcarotti's pilgrim guide to the microscope and kaleidoscope of Wratislaw's narrative.

We certainly see that the personality of the narrator, from the beginning of the period until the end, was a critical factor in determining both opportunities for interaction and how that interaction was retold. So were class (which dramatically affected exposure to textual knowledge and historical memory, as illustrated in Sanderson's account), and age, as illustrated by the youthful exuberance still present in Wratislaw's account even after his years in prison. As for gender, we still have Lady Montagu. She was a very particular, very literate type of observer, as conscious of her role as a pioneer narrator as Florence Nightingale (rather less aptly) would be a century later.[46] But her categories of classification (goods, beauty,

46 Florence Nightingale, *Letters from Egypt: A Journey on the Nile 1849-1850* (New York: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1987), was just as assertive of the role of self in travel narrative as Montagu and just as conscious of whether the "natives" were paying sufficient

antiquities, and amusements) were shared by her male counterparts in the early modern era. And her insistence on the first person self may be as significant a marker of her narrative and its era as was her gender.

What had changed from the sixteenth century to the eighteenth, was the opening of the floodgates of textual knowledge and print representation of the Turk. This was not, I would argue, because materials traveled or were translated more quickly. The pace of translation and circulation was already incredibly fast in the sixteenth century (days for works to be pirated, and months for translations to proceed from Italian to French to English). But the system of publication had expanded by 1700, as had the reach of translation. The upper middle classes after that date joined their leisured 'betters' and their mercantile 'inferiors' in having access to direct experience of the "Turk" along with the educational inclination to write about that experience. And the Ottomans, who had long been part of the Mediterranean Republic of Letters, joined in a more expansive republic, one that included the Atlantic world. Thus Mary Wortley Montagu betrays a consciousness of who and how and how widely she would be read that was not available to Wratislaw, despite similarities in their status and their shared experience.[47] In the eighteenth century more travelers had the opportunity to see Ottoman spaces for themselves and to find them on their maps. More (and cheaper) compendia of knowledge sorted out for the armchair traveler just how to understand and relate to that space, though they invoked the interwoven tropes of the 'classical' and' imperial' just as vociferously as had their sixteenth century predecessors. Some travelers still returned home with exactly what they had expected to find. Others, as in the sixteenth century, found opportunities to expand their visions of the Ottoman world. Some laughed with the Turk, as Wratislaw did, others kept their distance. But after 1700 the janissary, in European travel narratives, still tended to remain un-named, the pilgrim (often enough) still shut out Ottoman society in order better to see the places where Jesus walked, and the "Turk" continued to appear as a group, evaluated by his ruly or unruly behavior, with periodic exceptions made for 'remarkable' individuals.

---

attention to her or not. That quality is one found in the famous medieval traveler Ibn Battuta as well. Place and people in all three narrators were evaluated on the basis of that demand for proper attention.

47 That consciousness certainly is made manifest by other female writers as well, for example the playwright Mary Pix whose 1696 play, *Ibrahim*, on the Ottoman sultan, highlights (perhaps ironically) the "weakness" of women (author and characters) both in the epilogue and in the text of the play, but also notes that the harem has "women enough to undo the Universal World." See Mary Pix, *Ibrahim, the Thirteenth Emperour of the Turks: A Tragedy As it is Acted by His Majesties Servants* (London: For John Harding, 1696), final verse of epilogue; act 1, scene 1, 12-23.

You Say 'Classical,' I Say 'Imperial,' Let's Call the Whole Thing Off: Empire, Individual, and Encounter in Travel Narratives of the Ottoman Empire

Abstract ■ The literature of "encounter" has enriched our sense of who the Ottomans were and how they were described by their various others. And although the notion of encounter comprises interaction at the levels of group, commune, state, and empire, it is most expressive when it presumes the individual – a person for whom these larger entities are made manifest in the figures of individual personalities. This paper thus takes as its subject the "telling" of individuals in Ottoman space by individuals coming from the spaces of the European Christian kings. I hope, thereby, to comment on how the Ottoman individual was "told" in the context of imperial competition and conversation, and to draw that individual off the page through compiling a set of descriptors by which he or she was made "real" for the teller's audience. I address the idea of encounter and the (possible) transformation of that idea as it relates to 'European' encounters with the Ottoman citizen individual, using as examples three late sixteenth and two eighteenth century travelers. Finally, I want to comment briefly on periodization, the ways in which the eighteenth century may or may not be detached from the preceding era when it comes to the genre(s) of encounter.

Keywords: Ottoman Empire, travel, ethnography, early modern, individual

Bibliography

Aksan, Virginia: "The Question of Writing Premodern Biographies of the Middle East," *Autobiography and the Construction of Identity and Community in the Middle East*, Mary Ann Fay (ed.), Houndmills: Palgrave 2001, p. 191-200.

Alcarotti, Giovanni: *Del viaggio di terra santa*, Novara: Appresso gli Heredi di F.F. Sefalli 1596.

Andrea, Bernadette: *Women and Islam in Early Modern English Literature*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2007.

Andrews, Walter, and Mehmet Kalpaklı: *The Age of Beloveds*, Durham: Duke University Press 2005.

Boyar, Ebru, and Kate Fleet: *A Social History of Ottoman Istanbul*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2010.

Chandler, Richard: *Travels in Asia Minor and Greece*, Nicholas Revett (ed.), new edition, 2 vols., Oxford: Clarendon Press 1825.

Covel, Dr. John: *Voyages en Turquie 1675-1677*, Jean-Piere Grélois, trans., series *Réalités Byzantines* 6, Paris: Éditions P. Lethielleux 1998.

Desai, Anita: "Introduction,"Malcolm Jack, (ed.), *The Turkish Embassy Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, London: Virago 2000, vi-xxxvii.

Dursteler, Eric: *Venetians in Constantinople: Nation, Identity, and Coexistence in the Early Modern Mediterranean,* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press 2006.

Halsband, Robert: *The Life of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 1960.

Krafft, Hans Ulrich: *Reisen Und Gefangen Schaft Hans Ulrich Kraffts*, K.D. Haszler (ed.), series *Bibliothek des LitterarischenVereinsin Stuttgart*, LXI, Stuttgart: Gedruckt auf Kosten des LitterarischenVereins 1861, p. 1-440.

MacLean, Gerald: *The Rise of Oriental Travel*, Houndmills: Palgrave 2004.

Matar, Nabil: *Turks, Moors and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery*, New York: Columbia University Press 1999.

McJannet, Linda: *The Sultan Speaks: Dialogue in English Plays and Histories about the Ottoman Turks*, New York: Palgrave 2006.

Montagu, Mary Wortley: *The Complete Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, Robert Halsband (ed.), v. 1, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1965.

[Montagu, Mary Wortley]: *The Genuine copy of a Letter Written from Constantinople by an English Lady, who was lately in Turkey...*, London: J. Roberts 1719, p. 5-6.

Naughton, James: "Czech and Slovak Literature Resources: Renaissance and Humanism," http://users.ox.ac.uk/~tayl0010/lit_renais.htm.

Nightingale, Florence: *Letters from Egypt: A Journey on the Nile 1849-1850*, New York: Weidenfeld and Nicholson 1987.

Pix, Mary: *Ibrahim, The Thirteenth Emperour of the Turks: A Tragedy As it is Acted by His Majesties Servants*, London: John Harding 1696.

Poetry Foundation: "Lady Mary Wortley Montagu," http://www.poetryfoundation.org/bio/lady-mary-wortley-montagu

Sanderson, John: *The Travels of John Sanderson*, second series, no. 67, London: Hakluyt Society 1931.

Terzioğlu, Derin: "Autobiography in Fragments: Reading Ottoman Personal Miscellanies in the Early Modern Era," *Autobiographical Themes in Turkish Literature: Theoretical and Comparative Perspectives*, *Istanbuler Texte und Studien* 6, Okay Akyildiz, et. al., (eds.), Würzberg, Ergon 2007, p. 1-20.

Vitkus, Daniel: *Turning Turk: English Theatre and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630,* New York: Palgrave 2003.

Vratislav z Mitrovic, Václav: *Des Freyherrn von Wratislaw merkwürdige Gesandtschaftsreise von Wien nach Konstantinopel: so gut als aus dem Englischen übersetzt*, Leipzig: Schönfeldschen Buchhandlung 1786.

Vratislav z Mitrovic, Václav: *Príhody* , Milada Nedvědová, (ed.), Praha: n.p.,1976.

Williams, Wes: " 'A mirrour of mis-haps,/ A Mappe of Miserie': Dangers, Strangers, and Friends in Renaissance Pilgrimage," *The 'Book' of Travels: Genre, Ethnology, and Pilgrimage, 1250-1700*, Palmira Brummett, (ed.), Leiden: Brill 2009, p. 205-240.

Wratislaw, Wenceslas: *Adventures of Baron Wenceslas Wratislaw: What He Saw in Constantinople, in his Captivity, Committed to Writing in 1599*, Albert Henry Wratislaw, trans., London: Bell and Daldy 1862.

Zarinebaf, Fariba: *Crime and Punishment in Istanbul, 1700-1800*, Berkeley: University of California Press 2010.