1

Introduction

Mapping Empire, and "Turks" on the Map

> I will confute those blind geographers
> That make a triple region of the world,
> Excluding regions which I mean to trace,
> And with this pen reduce them to a map,
> Calling the provinces, cities, and towns,
> After my name and thine, Zenocrate.

Christopher Marlowe, *Tamburlaine* 1 IV.iv. 81–9[1]

Thus Christopher Marlowe's theatrical Mongol ruler (Timur) proclaims that it is the sword (his "pen") that ultimately determines the mapping of empires. In his play, *Tamburlaine*, first performed c. 1587, Marlowe (1564–1593) created an artful counterpart to the maps of his day, a sovereign space concocted out of a rather indiscriminate mixing of myth, history, and fiction. He collapsed time and space to place Muhammad and Jove in the same firmament, meld the medieval with the early modern, and jumble the territories of the Afro-Eurasian oikumene into one great imperial backdrop.[2] Marlowe's English audience (elite and common) may or may not have known the historical figures of Timur (r. 1370–1405) and the Ottoman sultan Bayezid I (r. 1389–1402). But in the play these rulers' times, locations, compatriots, and identities were mutable, subject to the vagaries of drama, history, memory, education, artistic convention, and strategic interest. Just so, as early modern Europeans created representations of territory, they employed those same factors to delineate an Ottoman imperial space (and identity) that was as much a function of cultural imagination as it was a product of contemporary technologies of print and measurement. Such representations, particularly those

[1] Christopher Marlowe, *Tamburlaine* (Mineola, NY: Dover Books, 2002), 50; see also Jonathan Burton, "Anglo–Ottoman Relations and the Image of the Turk in Tamburlaine," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 30, 1 (2006): 125–56.
[2] Marlowe, *Tamburlaine*, 102–3.

found on maps, form the subject of this volume. It examines the rhetorical construction of the Ottomans in the texts and images of the Christian kingdoms of early modern Europe and the inscribing of Ottoman territory, sovereignty, and identity onto maps, employing Ottoman self-mapping as a comparative foil. Maps, broadly construed, complicate the notion that representing the Ottomans was an evolutionary process that typed the empire as terrible in the sixteenth century and domesticated in the eighteenth. If we dismiss Marlowe's swirling of character, border, time, and space as merely fanciful or theatrical, we miss the point. For, in the early modern era, mapping was both a pictorial narration of territory and events and a process by which events were subordinated to history, memory, and desire.

With their conquest of the great Christian and Muslim capitals, Constantinople in 1453 and Cairo in 1517, the Ottoman Turks captured the imagination of observers across the Afro-Eurasian world, asserting their identity as one of the most powerful empires of the early modern era. The Ottomans had become a European empire in the fifteenth century, crossing the Danube into Wallachia and extending the territories under their dominion to the borders of Hungary. In the sixteenth century they became a world empire, confronting the Muslim Mamluks and Safavids, in Egypt and Iran respectively, and the Christian kings of Europe, in a broad frontier zone stretching from the western Mediterranean to the Black Sea. Belgrade fell to Ottoman armies in 1521, Rhodes in 1522, and, by 1541, Sultan Süleyman I (r. 1520–66) had occupied Buda and could claim sovereignty over much of Croatia and Hungary. See Map 1. This expanding empire was the object of careful scrutiny and wild speculation in Christian Europe, its military and spiritual prowess addressed in diplomatic reports, histories, sermon literature, compendia of knowledge, plays, essays, murals, broadsheets, and maps, among other forms of communication.

In the Christian kingdoms of Europe the Ottomans were presented as descendants of the "Scythians," the same "Turks" who swept out of Central Asia and confronted the "Saracens" in the crusading era.[3] The "Turks" (a generic designation used to connote the Muslims in Ottoman territory) were then mingled with all the historic Islamic 'marauders' who had tested and trampled the borders of "Christendom."[4] A parade of witnesses passed among the capitals of the Mediterranean world, circulating information

---

[3] Nancy Bisaha, *Creating East and West: Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 174–5, 270 n. 62; Patricia Springborg, *Western Republicanism and the Oriental Prince* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1992); John Michael Archer, *Old Worlds: Egypt, Southwest Asia, India and Russia in Early Modern English Writing* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University, 2001), 65–9, 73–4; and Samuel Chew, *The Crescent and the Rose: Islam and England during the Renaissance* (New York: Octagon Books, 1965), 55–99. See also Kiril Petkov, *Infidels, Turks, and Women: The South Slavs in the German Mind, ca. 1400–1600* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1997), 239–40, on the "German humanists' fondness for their neo-classical knowledge and strict adherence to the norms and requirements of puritanical classicism," in describing the conquests of the Ottomans.

[4] See, for example, G. J. Reinink, "Ps. Methodius: A Concept of History in Response to the Rise of Islam," 149–87, in *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East: Problems in the Literary Source Material*, v. 1, Averil Cameron and Lawrence Conrad, eds. (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1992), 165, 170, 174, who illustrates how this apparently late-seventh-century text collapsed time using both Biblical and classical references (especially to Alexander the Great) to create a vision of apocalyptic restoration.

about the Ottomans, their society, personnel, customs, beliefs, institutions, texts, identities, and material culture. The audiences for that information ranged from statesmen to merchants, and from scholars to illiterate parishioners, from the readers of cheap broadsheets to the consumers of lavish atlases (see Ch. 2). There was enormous demand for images and knowledge of "the Turks," whose successes, coinciding with the Renaissance and Reformation, were believed both to exemplify the effectiveness of a brutal, Islamic 'slave state' and to signal the wrath of an angry Christian God, perhaps even heralding the advent of the Last Days. For some observers, the Ottomans, with their ferocious gunpowder infantry, were poised to overrun Europe; for others, they were temporary squatters on classical and sacred space, the redemption of which awaited only the will and unity of the monarchs of Christendom.[5] Still others saw the rich and successful empire as a land of opportunity, a potential wellspring for products, patronage, and power. These varying perspectives are reflected in the texts and imagery of the time (roughly the mid sixteenth to the later eighteenth century), complicating and lending nuance to the enduring message of the Ottomans as a threat to Christendom.

Methodology, Historiography, and Objectives

The Ottomans, as an element of the historiography of early modern Europe, often appear in two standard forms: the "empire," a continent-spanning but rather amorphous imperial entity that functioned as a military great power; and the "Turks," an embodied plurality that "threatened Christendom," but was ultimately domesticated, exoticized, and dominated by an ascendant Europe as the early modern era came to an end. What the Ottomans did to or with early modern Europe has traditionally been couched in terms of the words "impact" and "difference"; and those terms are a logical outcome of the language of early modern texts. Indeed, Ottoman rhetorics of power and sovereignty, like those of their imperial predecessors and European Christian rivals, highlighted difference and military supremacy. But if we turn to the ways in which the Ottomans and their neighbors in "Christendom" visualized and designated space, then we find a rather more complex picture, one that included permeable borders, overlapping interests, and shared societies.

The historiographic literature on both the Ottoman empire and Christian Europe's reception of the "Turk" has become increasingly rich in recent years through the contributions of Ottomanist historians and scholars of European history, literature, and art.[6] So, too, considerable interest has been

---

See also Walter Kaegi, "Initial Byzantine Reactions to the Arab Conquest," *Church History* 38.2 (June, 1969): 139–49, esp. 144–5.

[5] Anthony Grafton, "The Humanist as Reader," 180–211, in *A History of Reading in the West*, Guglielmo Cavallo and Roger Chartier, eds., Lydia Cochrane, trans. (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1997), 187, writes of the simultaneous Renaissance impulse both to "bring the ancient world up to date," and to "reconstruct it as it was."

[6] For example: Virginia Aksan and Daniel Goffman, eds., *The Early Modern Ottomans: Remappping the Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Gerald MacLean, *The Rise of Oriental Travel:*

generated on the question of Ottomans on the map, a field that for a long time was limited to the pioneering works of Tom Goodrich, Svat Soucek, and a few others.[7] The publication of J. B. Harley and David Woodward's magisterial *History of Cartography* (hereafter *HOC*), along with the staging of cartographic exhibitions such as the 2008 "European Cartographers and the Ottoman World, 1500–1750" at the Oriental Institute in Chicago, have provided textual and visual inspiration on this theme to a wide audience.[8] Nonetheless, much of the work currently available on representations of the "Turk" still tends to proceed in well-defined channels (from a focus in cartographic studies on Piri Reis and major European mapmakers on one hand, to the examination of select travel accounts, diplomatic reports, or 'national' dramas on the other). Thus there remains much to be said regarding the ways in which those residing in the Christian kingdoms of Europe imagined, narrated, and visualized the Ottomans, their sovereignty, and the spaces they possessed.

This work attempts one segment of that larger project. It traces out some of the historical and literary sources for representations of the Ottomans, plotting the dissemination of visions of the "Turk" and perusing the complex matrix of borders, interactions, and identities through which European audiences visualized Ottoman territory. It delineates specific categories (war space, historical space, travel space, and sacred space) employed to inscribe the Ottoman empire on maps. It also presents the iconography of the "Turk" as displayed on maps, an iconography that painted the Ottomans, alternately and in combination, as commercial partners, epic warriors, and objects of ethnographic scrutiny, as well as marauding barbarians, heretics, and harbingers of the Antichrist. This study devotes particular attention to the image/text interface (that is, the relationship between images and the texts with which they were associated). That interface is especially important because early modern maps derived their characterizations of Ottoman space from the rhetorics and imagery of texts, and because maps often involve an intricate layering (or collage) of text and image derived from other works.[9] Just as there was no definitive border between Europe and Asia, or Islam and Christendom, in this era, so too there was no definitive boundary between the map itself and the texts that surrounded, inspired, or were inscribed upon it. Further, this book contributes to the burgeoning literature on 'Eastern' travel. As mapmakers enclosed the land and seascapes of the Ottomans within the

   English Visitors to the Ottoman Empire, 1580–1720 (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004); and Natalie Rothman, *Brokering Empire: Trans-imperial Subjects between Venice and Istanbul* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012).

7 Thomas D. Goodrich, *The Ottoman Turks and the New World: A Study of Tarih-i Hind-i Garbi and Sixteenth Century Ottoman Americana* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1990); and Svat Soucek, *Studies in Ottoman Naval History and Maritime Geography* (İstanbul: Isis Press, 2008).

8 J. B. Harley and David Woodward, eds., *The History of Cartography*, [hereafter *HOC*], v. 1–3 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992–2007); Ian Manners, ed., with M. Pinar Emiralioğlu, *European Cartographers and the Ottoman World, 1500–1750: Maps from the Collection of O.J. Sopranos* (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 2010).

9 Leonora Navari, "Gasparo Tentivo's Il Nautica Ricercato. The Manuscripts," 135–55, in *Eastern Mediterranean Cartographies*, George Tolias and Dimitris Loupis, eds. (Athens: Institute for Neohellenic Research, 2004), 138.

map frame, they displayed early modern notions of space measured in terms of cities, fortresses, pilgrimage sites, provisioning stations, and accessible or inaccessible routes. Mapping was thus intimately connected to travel, both actual and imaginary. It had its own logics of possession, movement, and frontiers. The traveler, along with the diplomat and other types of intermediaries, was the eyewitness, the authority invoked by the mapmaker to legitimate his vision of space. Finally, this book, as it examines the diffusion of images of the Ottomans, their sovereignty, their mores, and their armies, adds to the growing historiography on the circulation of knowledge and the translation of culture in the early modern Eurasian world.

It is also important here to state what this book does not do. I am a historian of the intersections between the Ottoman world and surrounding territories; I am neither a cartographer nor an art historian. Thus it is not my intention here to trace the evolution of maps of Ottoman territory or the technical details of map production and artistry. Those tasks have been accomplished or are being accomplished by experts elsewhere, in the *History of Cartography* and in the journal *Imago Mundi*, among other sources. Rather than sorting out the direction of cartographic influences, or precedence in discoveries of mapping technology, what I want to know is how mapmakers in different places embodied and circulated ideas of the Ottomans and Ottoman space, and what their images might tell us about their milieu, their audiences, and things such as state power, historic memory, identity, worldview, borders, the visualization of land and sea, and the exigencies of getting from place to place.[10]

The early modern era was indeed a time when the technologies of charting, engraving, and depicting the world's spaces were evolving and improving. But technological capability and scientific knowledge were only two factors in the complex intellectual, political, economic, historical, and pictorial process that was mapping.[11] Early modern maps, like the texts from which they derive, do not follow a strict evolutionary pattern in depicting the Ottomans and their empire; they are, rather, the products of tropes of narration and conventions of representation, the technical constraints of printmaking, and the knowledge, education, imagination, and demands of a consuming public that is notoriously difficult to pin down, except anecdotally. Most of all, I want to know what Ottoman space looked like to that public. In seeking that objective, I focus on the map itself and its narrative contexts to demonstrate the ongoing tensions over truth-claims and illustrate some of the ways in which Ottoman space was experienced and constructed. The tales of individual narrators do not, of course, substitute for a close examination of each one of the numerous interpretative communities affected by these maps: how they accepted, misunderstood, acted on, or ignored the messages of the map. But it may be hoped that the traveler witnesses employed here will speak in some

---

[10] That is, I was more interested in the essential contexts for maps described so eloquently by J. B. Harley, *The New Nature of Maps: Essays in the History of Cartography* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 2001), 35–8.

[11] Peter Whitfield, *The Charting of the Oceans: Ten Centuries of Maritime Maps* (London: British Library, 1996), 46, 56–7, for example, notes the adherence to old templates, "legend and imagination," despite the acquisition of new knowledge.

small way for their own reading communities, whereas I leave the project of assessing audience reception in specific communities to other scholars.

Neither do I propose to trace out the extent of geographic knowledge in the Ottoman world or to present in any comprehensive way the literary and historical contexts out of which mapped images of the Ottomans emerged. A database of cartographic literary allusions grouped by time and region would be a wonderful thing; but it is beyond my capabilities. What I hope to accomplish, rather, is a comparative commentary on the modes and types of representation of Ottoman space deriving from some of the Christian kingdoms of Europe. I place before the reader an array of mappings of the Ottomans (particularly those spaces on the European 'side' of the empire) in hopes that they will provoke discussion and refine and expand our sense of the ways in which the Ottomans were imagined and imagined themselves. This material is purposefully selected to range widely, unconstrained by strict chronology or 'national' designation. It crosses genres to present a mix of imagery of the "Turk," similar, perhaps, to that an educated reader might be exposed to. I hope thereby to illustrate the ways in which the map layered historical time and manipulated space, suggest those forms of representation that were enduring and those that were exceptional, and, further, propose that the mappings of the sixteenth and eighteenth century worlds were not as dramatically different as they might sometimes seem.[12]

This volume is divided into three parts comprising seven chapters plus an afterword. Part One (Chapters 1 and 2) sets the stage by addressing methodology, approach to space and time, categories of analysis, genres of mapping the "Turk," and the processes by which the Ottomans were made familiar to audiences in the Christian kingdoms of Europe. This first chapter serves as an introduction. It suggests a set of categories by which Ottoman space was understood and introduces some of the possibilities for comparisons to Ottoman self-mapping. It emphasizes the ways in which time and space were collapsed on early modern maps in order to convey political and cultural messages of entitlement and identity. Chapter 2, on "Reading and Placing the 'Turk,'" introduces some of the genres employed for mapping the Ottomans and speaks (through a set of illustrative examples) about the ways the Ottomans were represented and translated into text and image. It also addresses questions of the circulation of knowledge. Part Two (Chapters 3, 4, and 5) presents the mapping of Ottoman space in terms of borders, fortresses, and the iconography of triumph and submission. Chapter 3 is divided into three sections, which address conceptions of the ends of empire; the transimperial borders among the Ottoman, Hapsburg, and Venetian empires; and, finally, the roles played by Constantinople and the Holy Land as annexes of Europe and focal points for prophecy in mapping the division of "Christian" and "Turk" space. Chapter 4 examines the fortress (inland and coastal) as

---

[12] David Woodward, "Cartography and the Renaissance: Continuity and Change," 3–24, in *HOC*, v. 3, pt. 1, *Cartography in the European Renaissance*, David Woodward, ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 12, 23, provides a typology of the ways in which the nature of European maps changed (or did not change) in the Renaissance era, noting that the timing of changes varied from place to place in Europe. He lays out the arguments against any simple "progressive" model of mapmaking (6–7).

the quintessential marker of space and sovereignty, employing examples concentrated in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The fortress was the centerpiece of possessed space and of the competition for hegemony in the transimperial zone linking the Ottoman, Venetian, and Hapsburg empires. Chapter 5 continues the examination of conflict imagery in historical texts and map imagery. Possession was counted not only in fortresses but also in images of the conquered foe, his head, his body, his arms, and his symbols. The fallen Turk, deployed on the map, delivered a powerful message of ownership. Part Three (Chapters 6 and 7) elaborates on the literatures and imagery of travel along with the various authorities invoked in an attempt to demonstrate the 'accuracy' and 'truth' of mapped space. Chapter 6 presents the stages by which travelers and maps charted the movement into and out of Ottoman space. This chapter highlights the journeys from Vienna and Venice to Istanbul by land and sea and illustrates the modes and measures by which Ottoman space was counted. Chapter 7 addresses the threefold foundation of authority (knowledge, text, and eyewitness testimony), used by travelers and transposed onto the map to certify the validity of descriptions of Ottoman domains. The knowledge and texts of 'classical' and Biblical pasts were front and center in the imagery of the early modern era. They constituted its history and memory. In this chapter, narratives by Italian and English travelers will be featured and then juxtaposed to the well-known travel narrative of the Ottoman raconteur Evliya Çelebi.[13] Additionally, in this chapter, I will use travelers' descriptions of women and their dress as a special element of claims to authority. By way of conclusion, the "Afterword" (Chapter 8) will take up some of the implications of mapping space and identity that have traced through both the volume and the historiography of Ottoman–European relations and that find resonance in both world-historical paradigms and contemporary world struggles.

Designations of Space

This work is about mapping Ottoman space. I employ the term *space* as an alternative to *territory*, because I want to suggest the Ottoman realm (conceptualized by early modern peoples) as a place imbued with attendant identities, cultures, and historical contexts, all of which could be enclosed within the map frame.[14] Ottoman space, in the European (and Ottoman) imagination, was not simply a block of territory circumscribed on a map. It was a place entangled in a set of histories and competing claims dating back to creation. It was full of peoples, faiths, languages, occupations, and cultural mores that transcended political reality, or endured as carefully preserved

---

[13] Italian and English travelers were certainly not alone, nor was actual travel a necessity, as Tom Conley, *The Self-Made Map: Cartographic Writing in Early Modern France* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 135, has aptly noted.

[14] This is not to argue that "territory," a term that I employ as well, is not conceptually complex. Stuart Elden, *The Birth of Territory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013), 7, speaks of "territory" as "a word, a concept, and a practice"; also as "a distinctive mode of social/spatial organization, one that is historically and geographically limited and dependent . . . (10)." In his discussion of early modern conceptualizations, highlighting the work of Gottfried Leibnitz (1646–1714), he focuses on "legal–political power" and the articulations of sovereignty (315–20).

artifacts of cherished past lives. Further, Ottoman space was not limited to those lands where the sultan's armies could readily be deployed. It included lands claimed by the sultan. It comprised those adjacent places where the threat of Ottoman arms held (or seemed to hold) sway. Nor was it limited to *terra firma*, including as it did the seascapes of the Mediterranean, Aegean, Adriatic, Black, and Red Seas onto which Ottoman power was projected. The notion of Ottoman space then presumes the sultan's domains as a complex form of possession and identity, dependent not entirely on what was actually there but also on what was imagined, remembered, depicted, hoped for, and then visualized in textual and pictorial sources such as maps and travel accounts.[15]

The idea of Ottoman space is complicated by terminologies of place and identity that defy the drawing of borders. The borders of Europe, in the early modern imagination, as we shall see in Chapter 3, ranged over a broad territory, despite what the continental divisions of ancient geographies or the national boundaries of contemporary atlases might suggest. Christendom and Europe on one hand, and Islam and Asia on the other, were not coincident. And finding precise terminology for designating Ottoman space in Europe is a vexed process and one with a long history. That dilemma is reflected in early modern European cartographic usage, which came to employ the designations "Turkey in Asia" and "Turkey in Europe" to suggest its own uncomfortable relationship to the cross-continental territorial holdings of the Ottoman sultans. I have used here (rather broadly) the terminology "Balkans" and "Greco-Balkan peninsula" to describe those European territories into which the Ottomans expanded and in which they operated in the fifteenth to eighteenth centuries.[16] That usage is a geographic convenience employed to avoid the repeated recitation of individual regions. But it fails to reflect the complex relationships among sovereign (or not so sovereign) lords, or among inland, coastal, and island territories. I cannot resolve these ambiguities of designation in any comprehensive way. "Europe" remains a term that designates continental space, with Constantinople as its evident eastern outpost, "before Asia."[17] And in this study I will employ that term because it is customary and familiar to denote the location from which 'outside' observers in the Christian kingdoms characterized the sultan and his territories. But the Ottoman empire was as European as it was Asian; its heartland and signature province, Rumelia, lay in Europe.

Another problem of designation resides in the fact that the territories of Europe were no more entirely Christian than the territories of Anatolia or Syria or Egypt were entirely Muslim, or Turk, as European sources of the

---

[15] For a discussion of some elements of the "spatial turn" in history, see Charles Withers, "Place and the 'Spatial Turn' in Geography and in History," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 70.4 (October, 2009): 637–58, esp. 648–9, on history as "mapping," and 656–8. Withers nonetheless points out the complexity and "metaphysical imprecision" of the usage of the terms "space" and "place" (637).

[16] Maria Todorova, *Imagining the Balkans* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 21–37.

[17] See Norman Davies, *Europe: A History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 27–8, 44. Although pointing out that East and West in Europe were categories most durably based on the line between Catholic and Orthodox Christianity, he also notes that "In more modern times there is the Ottoman line, which marked off the Balkan lands which lived for centuries under Muslim rule (27)."

era might describe them. Ottoman sources customarily employed a we/they distinction: the "well protected domains" of the sultan as opposed to the "lands of the Christian kings." This juxtaposition separated the empire from the polities of European enemies and allies alike without suggesting that the whole continent of Europe was somehow necessarily "Christian." That division of space, relying on sovereignty rather than communal identity, is a useful one because it includes all those people (and readers) resident under either Ottoman rule or that of the Christian kingdoms. It takes up the enduring minorities (such as the Jews of Europe or Anatolia), that seem to be precluded in designations such as "Christendom" and "Islam," highlighting instead the communally legitimized power structures to which majority and minority populations alike were subject.

Time/Periodization

Various scholars have tried to periodize the representational relationship of the kingdoms of Christian Europe to the Ottoman empire. Some, such as Lucette Valensi, see European authors as moving by the turn of the seventeenth century from the vision of the Terrible Turk to a rather admiring notion of the Ottoman empire as a well-organized and efficient form of government.[18] A related notion, articulated by Joan Pau Rubiés, is that the depiction of the East in the seventeenth century became more systematic, more scientific, and more "secular."[19] Other commentators, such as Mustafa Soykut, argue that the Ottomans were domesticated in the European imagination, particularly after the death of Sultan Süleyman I in 1566, the Christian victory at the Battle of Lepanto in 1571, and the advent of the English in the Ottoman Mediterranean around 1580.[20] Conventions of representation, however, do not necessarily, or readily, transform in response to political changes, battles, or commercial developments. The ways in which the Ottomans were mapped in any period might thus have as much to do with aesthetic tastes, ideological positions, available print models, consumer demand, conventions of labeling, or modes of looking as with any given political episode or any given advances in technologies of writing, commerce, travel, or mapping. More broadly, the whole notion of the early modern as an era that anticipates the ideas, state formations, and hegemons of the nineteenth century suppresses a set of very powerful continuities that tie the sixteenth, seventeenth, and even eighteenth centuries to the long medieval era that preceded them. The ways in which the Ottomans were mapped was inevitably conditioned by the pull of the past. The English advent in the Mediterranean, for example, was important to the English, and to their

---

[18] Lucette Valensi, *The Birth of the Despot: Venice and the Sublime Porte*, Arthur Denner, trans. (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993); and Jean Pierre Amalric, "Une géopolitique de bénédictin: la Turquie d'Europe dans la Géographie historique de Dom Vaissète (1755)," 359–74, in *Byzance et ses périphéries: Hommage à Alain Ducellier* (Toulouse: Université Toulouse, 2004), 366, 372–3.

[19] Joan-Pau Rubiés, *Travel and Ethnology in the Renaissance: South India through European Eyes, 1250–1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 388–91. But science had to contend with the known and remembered layers of history. And the "secular" retained at least a very healthy measure of the sacred.

[20] Mustafa Soykut, *Image of the "Turk" in Italy* (Berlin: Islamkundliche Untersuchungen, 2001).

competitors. But its significance has been greatly magnified by the much later ascent of that nation to the position of world seapower, and by the extensive scholarship on both the English mercantile investment in Asia and the English literary imagination of the 'East.'[21]

That said, the death of Süleyman, the Battle of Lepanto,[22] the founding of the English "Turkey" Company,[23] and cartographic innovations did all play important roles in the familiarization of Europe with the Turk. Indeed, *familiarity* (how it happened and what form it took) is perhaps *the* key concept in establishing a periodization for European representation of the Ottomans.[24] Although the Ottomans were certainly "domesticated" for European readers (or viewers) by the seventeenth century, that domestication was already well under way by 1548. And it was accomplished not simply through a rather ephemeral naval victory but through a blizzard of news and imagery that had already reached stunning proportions by 1571. In many ways the Ottomans were familiar to some European audiences long before Lepanto. That familiarity derived in part from a complex network of commercial and cultural relationships that spanned the Afro-Eurasian oikumene and predated the Ottomans.[25] It drew on the medieval constructions of the Muslim conquerors who were the Ottomans' antecedents. And it added new variants to the representational corpus as events, audience, and situation demanded and as narrative and visual modes allowed.

These demurrals are not meant to argue that there can be no logical periodization for early modern European mapping of the Ottomans. Indeed, that mapping was characterized increasingly by a movement from regional to state designation; a complementary movement to the marking of borders of various sorts; the employment of ethnographic vignettes; a willingness to

[21] Constance Relihan, *Cosmographical Glasses: Geographic Discourse, Gender, and Elizabethan Fiction* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 2004), 45, links Lepanto to the notion of a turning point but also suggests the continuity in England of the consciousness of Ottoman threat. See also Nabil Matar, *Islam in Britain, 1558–1685* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

[22] On Lepanto, see Niccolo Capponi, *Victory of the West: The Great Christian–Muslim Clash at the Battle of Lepanto* (Cambridge, MA: da Capo, 2008); and Andrew Hess, "The Battle of Lepanto and Its Place in Mediterranean History," *Past and Present*, 57 (November, 1972): 53–73. See also Palmira Brummett, "The Lepanto Paradigm Revisited: Knowing the Ottomans in the Sixteenth Century," 63–93, in *The Renaissance and the Ottoman World*, Anna Contadini and Claire Norton, eds. (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2013); John Guilmartin, *Gunpowder and Galleys: Changing Technology and Mediterranean Warfare at Sea in the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 221–52; and Halil İnalcık, "Lepanto in the Ottoman Documents," 185–92, in *Il Mediterraneo nella seconda metà del '500 alla luce di Lepanto,* Gino Benzoni, ed. (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1974).

[23] On the English "discovery" of the Mediterranean, see, for example, Archer, *Old Worlds*, 3; and MacLean, *The Rise of Oriental Travel*. This is an era that Daniel Vitkus, *Turning Turk: English Theater and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570–1630* (New York: Palgrave, 2003), 21, has called "a period of intensive intelligence-gathering" by the English on the Mediterranean and the Ottomans.

[24] Bronwen Wilson, *The World of Venice: Print, the City, and Early Modern Identity* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), 147, has argued, rightly, that the Ottomans were "too familiar to be made exotic." See also Deborah Howard, "Cultural Transfer between Venice and the Ottomans in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries," 138–77, in *Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe,* v. 4, *Forging European Identities, 1400–1700*, Heinz Schilling and István György Tóth, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); and Gerald MacLean and William Dalrymple, eds. *Re-orienting the Renaissance: Cultural Exchange with the East* (London: Palgrave, 2005).

[25] See Palmira Brummett, *Ottoman Seapower and Levantine Diplomacy in the Age of Discovery* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1994).