

Anders Ingram

“The Barbarousnesse of Turkes and Time”: Discourses of Travel and History in Seventeenth-century Eastern Travelogues

In all this Country of Greece I could finde nothing to answer the famous relations, given by ancient Authors of the excellency of that land, but the name onely; the barbarousnesse of Turkes and Time, having defaced all the Monuments of Antiquity: No shew of honour, no habitation of men in an honest fashion, nor possessours of the Countrey in a Principality, But rather prisoners shut up in prison, or addicted slaves to cruell and tyrannicall Masters.¹

This passage from *The Totall Discourse, Of the rare Adventures, and painefull Peregrinations of long nineteene years Travailes from Scotland, to the most famous Kingdoms in Europe, Asia, and Affrica* by William Lithgow (1582 – in or after 1645) brings together the key themes of this chapter: travel, history, and the overlap of these discourses. Occurring in a travel narrative, and ostensibly framed as an eyewitness report, these lines are informed by both previous travel writing and a profound historical consciousness. This passage is a close paraphrase of the description of Cyprus given in Anthony Sherley’s (1565–1635?) *Relation of his Trauels into Persia* (1613).²

A historical sensibility informs Sherley and Lithgow’s expectations of the lands of classical antiquity, as much as the pithy pairing of “the barbarousnesse of Turkes and Time”. Certainly, lamenting the decay of the lands of classical and biblical antiquity is a common trope in other comparable early modern travel accounts. For example, George Sandys (1578–1644) pines ostentatiously over the condition of these “most renowned countries and kingdoms [...] now through vice and ingratitude, become the most deplored spectacles of extreme miserie: the wild beasts of mankind hauing broken in vpon them”³. However, alongside

1 William Lithgow, *The Totall Discourse, Of the rare Adventures, and painefull Peregrinations of long nineteene years Travailes from Scotland, to the most famous Kingdoms in Europe, Asia, and Affrica* [...], (London 1640), pp. 71–72.

2 Anthony Sherley, *Sir Antony Sherley his Relation of his Trauels into Persia* (London 1613), pp. 6–7: “We found nothing to answer the famous relations given by ancient Histories of the excellency of that island, but the name only (the barbarousness of the Turk, and time having defaced all the Monuments of Antiquity), no shew of splendour, no habitation of men in a fashion, nor possessors of the ground in a Principality; but rather Slaves to Cruel Masters”. Note Lithgow’s additions of ‘Greece’ and ‘tyrannicall’. Many thanks to Dr Kurosh Meshkat and Dr Eva Johanna Holmberg for making me aware of this connection.

3 George Sandys, *A Relation of a Iourney begun An: Dom: 1610* [...] (London 1615), pp. A2r–v.

this trope both Lithgow and Sherley also display a vivid awareness of the previous two centuries of Ottoman expansion, conquests, and rule in formerly Christian lands, as well as, I would suggest, the contemporary English and European discourse on Turkish history, which described and accounted for these events. Indeed, Lithgow imports a central commonplace from this literature – the depiction of the “Turkes” as “cruell and tyrannicall Masters” – along with its structuring function as an explanation for his characterization of the dilapidated and debased condition of Greece and its people.

This chapter will focus upon late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century English Eastern travelogues and explore how they overlapped with, borrowed from, and shaped, the related discourses of Turkish history, and *ars apodemica* (the humanistic theory of travel as a pedagogical or philosophical activity). Although the discussion in this chapter is a case study of English travel to the eastern Mediterranean and of historical works responding to the Ottoman advance into Europe, these discourses (*ars apodemica* and “Turkish history”) are European phenomena. As such, while my discussion will revolve around English authors and contexts, I hope that what I have to say will reward comparison with the overlap of early modern travelogue, history, and contemporary theories of travel and travel writing, in wider European contexts.

The travel accounts I shall be exploring shared material as well as intellectual and cultural contexts. The late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries saw a spate of descriptions of the eastern Mediterranean and northern Africa in the wake of, on the one hand, the onset of formalized Anglo-Ottoman trade and diplomacy in 1580, and on the other, the end of the nineteen-year Anglo-Spanish conflict with the Treaty of London in 1604. Both the relative security of peace and the growth of trade and diplomacy – along with the shipping routes, factors, and resident diplomats it required – stimulated the voyages (and thus published narratives) of a succession of gentleman travelers. These included Fynes Moryson (1565/66–1630), George Sandys (1578–1644), the Scot William Lithgow (1582–in or after 1645), Thomas Coryate (c. 1577–1617), and, slightly later, Henry Blount (1602–1682). Comparable accounts were also written and published by a number of Levant Company chaplains including William Bidolph (fl. 1599–1609), Charles Robson (fl. 1628), and Thomas Smith (1638–1710).

However, it was not only these chaplains who relied upon the routes and infrastructure the trade had developed. This is demonstrated by the number of travelers who visited and enjoyed the hospitality of the resident English ambassador at Constantinople. For example, when visiting Constantinople in 1597 Moryson lodged with Ambassador Edward Barton (1562/63–1598). Thomas Glover (fl. 1606–1611) hosted Sandys for four months in 1610, and then Lithgow for three months in 1611. Similarly, Coryat arrived in Constantinople in late March

1613 with letters of introduction to Sir Paul Pindar (1565–1650), ambassador from 1611 to 1620, with whom he stayed for ten months. The accommodation and orientation successive ambassadors offered these travelers is reflective of their more general frequent recourse to English (and European) factors, merchants, and ships, throughout their journeys, and also serves as a reminder of the general expansion of international English trade in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century.

The books these travelers published met with varied degrees of success and popularity. At one end of the spectrum Sandys' *Relation of a Journey begun in anno domini: 1610* (1615) went through eight editions; while Fynes Moryson's *Itinerary* (1617) appeared some twenty years after his voyage and was not successful enough to warrant the publication of the entirety of the longer geographical and historical information he had collated.⁴ These books were published into a market hungry for English works on the Ottoman world. As I have written elsewhere, the 1590s and first decade of the 1600s were a period of peak intensity in English publishing on the Turks.⁵ Furthermore, this period saw a mass of published literature on English travel and trade (as well as early imperial expansion in Ireland and America), including the large collections of Richard Hakluyt (1552–1616) and Samuel Purchas (1577–1626), published by some of the most successful and eminent men in the book trade respectively.⁶ The travel accounts explored in this chapter draw together all of these threads: peace with Spain; Ottoman expansion and the related English interest in the Ottoman world; England's own nascent commercial and imperial expansion; the material contexts of travel, trade, and diplomacy; and the book market in which these texts were produced.

The first half of this chapter will be methodological. I will first present a critique of “the other”, as the dominant (though much debated) model used to frame current scholarly discussions of early modern English writing on “the East”, including travel accounts.⁷ As an alternative I will conceptualize early

⁴ Sandys' *Relation* has two separate ‘sixth’ editions.

⁵ Anders Ingram, *Writing the Ottomans: Turkish History in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, New York 2015), pp. 7–9. This peak occurred broadly in response to the Ottoman Habsburg “Long War” of 1593–1606.

⁶ Richard Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations* was published by George Bishop (d. 1611) and Ralph Newberry (b. in or before 1536, d. 1603/4) joined by Robert Barker (c. 1568–1646). Samuel Purchas's publishers were William Stansby (bap. 1572, d. 1638) and Henry Featherstone (1565–1635).

⁷ Use of this formulation is too widespread to catalogue here. However, for examples of scholarship using or critiquing “the other” as a framing device for early modern English accounts of the Ottoman world (including travel) see Richmond Barbour, *Before Orientalism: London's Theatre of the East, 1576–1626* (Cambridge 2003); Matthew Dimmock, *Early Modern Travel, Conver-*

modern travel writing as a “discourse”, a model drawing heavily on the work of the intellectual historians J. G. A. Pocock and Quentin Skinner, as well as my own *Writing the Ottomans: Turkish History in Early Modern England* (2015). The purpose of this reframing is to historicize these authors and draw out some of the contemporary concepts, conversations, and literatures that they engaged with and contributed to.⁸ For example, I will show that the body of Eastern travelogues which I have taken as my topic was – at least by the mid-seventeenth century – self-consciously recognized and commented upon by English authors and readers (and is therefore not merely my own construction as a modern critic).⁹

The second half of this chapter will then draw some points of contiguity between the travel narratives of the authors outlined above and the related discourses of histories of the Turks and *ars apodemica*. These borrowings, references, and overlaps (i.e., influences) occur not merely in incidental details such as anecdotes, dates, names, etc. (although these elements are common), but also more fundamentally as underpinning concepts, assumptions, and values. While these travel accounts are ostensibly individual “eyewitness” accounts of travels in the eastern Mediterranean, they are also highly generic, literate, and literary works, engaged with a broad range of contemporary and classical literature about this region and its peoples. Therefore, our interpretation requires de-

sion, and Languages of “Difference”, in *Journeys* 14/2 (2013), pp. 10–26; Norman Housley, *Religious Warfare in Europe, 1400–1536* (Oxford 2002); Gerald MacLean, *Looking East: English writing and the Ottoman Empire before 1800* (New York 2007); Daniel J. Vitkus, *Turning Turk: English Theatre and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570–1630* (New York 2003); M. E. Yapp, *Europe in the Turkish Mirror*, in *Past and Present* 137 (1992), pp. 134–155. For comparable discussions of identity and depictions of the Ottomans in German contexts see for example Almut Höfert, *Den Feind beschreiben. “Türkengefahr” und europäisches Wissen über das Osmanische Reich, 1450–1600* (Frankfurt am Main 2003); and Martin Wrede, *Das Reich und seine Feinde. Politische Feindbilder in der reichspatriotischen Publizistik zwischen Westfälischem Frieden und Siebenjährigem Krieg* (Mainz 2004). For the French Orientalist tradition see Pascale Barthe, *French Encounters with the Ottomans, 1510–1560* (New York 2016); and Frédéric Tinguely, *L’écriture du Levant à la Renaissance: Enquête sur les voyageurs français dans l’Empire de Soliman le Magnifique* (Geneva 2000). Finally, for a broader pan-European perspective see for example Bodo Guthmüller and Wilhelm Kühlmann (eds.), *Europa und die Türken in der Renaissance* (Tübingen 2000); and Marcus Keller and Javier Irigoyen-García (eds.), *The Dialectics of Orientalism in Early Modern Europe* (London 2017).

⁸ To borrow Quentin Skinner’s admirably concise formulation the “general social and intellectual matrix out of which their works arose”. Quentin Skinner, *The foundations of modern political thought* (2 vols., Cambridge 1978), vol. 1, p. x.

⁹ In Pocock’s terms this might be conceptualized as a “moment”. J. G. A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian moment: Florentine political thought and the Atlantic republican tradition*, 2nd ed. (Princeton 2003).

tailed engagement with their intellectual contexts, theories and systems of knowledge, textual organization, literary sources, and rhetoric.

1 Critique

The “other” as a model for describing the underlying psychological mechanisms of depictions of cultural difference has been adapted by postcolonial criticism from its origins in the psychoanalytical theories of Jacques Lacan.¹⁰ The application (and critique/adaption) of the “other” as a model for thinking about European perceptions of the Turks – or even the “East” more generally – can be seen partly as a reaction to critiques of Edward Said’s “Orientalism” thesis (particularly given the ill fit of aspects of Said’s model to periods earlier than the late eighteenth century), and the perceived need for an alternative model. Indeed, in the nuanced versions advanced by Vitkus, Maclean, and others, the “other” has some strengths as a framework.¹¹ It connects and provides a point of comparison from this scholarship to a broader range of subjects and disciplines, such as postcolonial studies, literary criticism, and anthropology. It is general enough to reflect, if perhaps not quite accommodate, the intrinsic complexity of a topic as large as English (or European) writing on the Turks (or “the East”), and it provides a schema in which to consider some of the commonplace tropes and features of this writing. Above all, it is a useful tool for describing and deconstructing the multivalent meanings which were attributed to the figure of the Turk in early modern polemical writing from the Reformation onwards – and to construct arguments about identity (e.g., European identity, English identity, Protestant identity, etc.) in these terms.¹²

However, the “other” also has weaknesses as a model. While it provides a convenient umbrella under which to shelter the massive and complex topic of European accounts of the Turks, we need to consider if applying a single approach to this dizzying volume of material obscures more than it reveals. The

¹⁰ For examples of the centrality of the concept of “the other” in postcolonial writing see Malek Alloula, *The Colonial Harem*, translated by Myrna Godzich and Wlad Godzich (Manchester 1987); Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London, New York 1994), pp. 94–120; Satya P. Mohanty, *Epilogue. Colonial Legacies, Multicultural Futures: Relativism, Objectivity and the Challenge of Otherness*, in *Publication of the Modern Languages Association* 110/1 (1995), pp. 108–118.

¹¹ See for example MacLean, *Looking East*, pp. 1–23; Vitkus, *Turning Turk*, pp. 1–3.

¹² See for example Matthew Dimmock, *New Turkes: Dramatizing Islam and the Ottomans in Early Modern England* (Aldershot 2005), pp. 20–86; Housely, *Religious Warfare*, pp. 131–159.

“Turk” was a ubiquitous figure in early modern writing, occurring in thousands of separate English works alone.¹³ Over roughly the last two decades a growing scholarship has shown the volume and complexity of this material.¹⁴ Can a single heuristic model really usefully identify the central features in all of this without reductivism? Or is it possible that seeking a single unifying approach can serve to limit us to talking about the source material in rather general and superficial terms? While it is hard to disagree with the observation that early modern English reactions to the Ottomans were characterized by both fear and fascination, or that the “Turk” sometimes served as a contrasting cultural reference point (i.e., a “them” to the English “us”), there is a lot more to say in specific terms about this vast and varied corpus. These problems are only amplified if the subject is “European” writing on the “East” rather than “English” writing on the “Turk”. A further problem is that the widespread usage of the “other” in postcolonial studies creates a difficulty in applying this concept to the early modern period without teleology. It is hard to separate this model from a range of deeply anachronistic comparisons to later eighteenth-, nineteenth-, twentieth-, and indeed twenty-first century European imperialist involvement in the Islamic world and modern Middle East, and this represents a serious distortion of the earlier period (i.e., in the manner of Said’s *Orientalism*).

Most critically, however, for the argument at hand, the “other” does nothing to draw us towards the contemporary debates, concepts, and contexts through which early modern English authors engaged with, thought about, and depicted the expansion of the Ottoman Empire from the mid-fifteenth to the late seventeenth centuries. It does not require us to ask about the contemporary genres and forms of writing through which English authors understood “the Turks” (or the other peoples of the Ottoman world), or how generic rhetorics and conventions shaped these accounts (and they *did*). Rather than seeking a historicized understanding of how these contexts shaped the written interventions of historical actors, “the other” offers an explanation grounded in a psychological mechanism (indeed a psychoanalytical mechanism, in that it relates to unconscious processes), which ignores the terms in which contemporaries themselves understood their actions. This is a particularly key point when working on travelogues because, as I have said, they are emphatically *not* simply eyewitness ac-

¹³ See MacLean, *Looking East*, pp. 6–8.

¹⁴ On the ubiquity of the term “Turk” in early modern writing see Ingram, *Writing the Ottomans*, pp. 7–9. For an alternative view see Helen Baker, Tony McEnery, and Andrew Hardie, *A Corpus-Based Investigation into English Representations of Turks and Ottomans in the Early Modern Period*, in Michael Pace-Sigge and Katie J. Patterson (eds.), *Lexical Priming: Applications and Advances* (Amsterdam, Philadelphia 2017), pp. 41–66.

counts of travel and life in the Ottoman world, but rather highly structured literary works which draw upon very specific intellectual contexts, concepts, and an often broad range of textual sources.

2 Eastern travelogues as “discourse”

As I have indicated already, published works of gentlemanly travelers such as Sandys, Moryson, Coryate, Lithgow, Blount, Biddulph, and others, form a coherent and identifiable subset of English writing on the Ottoman Empire, sharing significant material, cultural, and intellectual contexts. For example, they draw on a shared sense of the classical and biblical heritage of these regions from the biblical descriptions of the life of Jesus, to St. Paul’s (c. 10 BCE–60 CE) travels in western Anatolia, and classical works such as the *Aeneid*. Beyond these basic reference points, they also engaged with an English (and in fact European) discourse of Turkish history, which described the events and significance of the seemingly unstoppable Ottoman expansion through the eastern Mediterranean, North Africa, and Europe over the previous century (and more). Along with narrating the events of these conquests this historical literature formulated and presented prevailing European ideas about the structure and nature of the Ottoman polity, as well as related and overlapping ideas about Islamic history and religious practice (particularly through polemical lives of the prophet – itself a historiography with a very long tradition).

From the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople in 1453 – which had prompted an outpouring of humanist historiography on the origins and character of the Turks – an extensive and sophisticated European literature on “Turkish history” had evolved.¹⁵ By the mid-sixteenth century a flood of new works responded to the disconcerting Ottoman conquest of large parts of Europe with the capture of Belgrade (1521), the Kingdom of Hungary following the battle of Mohács (1526), and Buda (1541). This increasingly included widely read and translated shorter or vernacular works by the likes of historian Paulo Giovio (1483–1552), as well as the works of the former captive Bartholemej Georgijevic (1510–1566).¹⁶ By the

¹⁵ Nancy Bisaha, *Creating East and West: Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks* (Philadelphia 2004); James Hankins, *Renaissance Crusaders: Humanist Literature in the Age of Mehmed II*, in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 49 (1993), pp. 111–207; Margaret Meserve, *Empires of Islam in Renaissance Historical Thought* (Cambridge, Mass., London 2008).

¹⁶ Works of both these authors were translated into English. Paulo Giovio’s *Commentario de la cose de Turchi* (Rome 1532) appeared in print in English as *A Shorte Treatise Vpon the Turkes Chronicles* (London 1546), itself translated from Francesco Negri’s Latin edition *Turcicarum*

later sixteenth century a vast scholarly (and of course popular) literature describing the Ottoman advance, the origins of the “Turks”, and their wider history had developed. This broadly historical discourse (though of course too large to adequately catalogue here) drew material, concepts, and details from a deep well extending through Byzantine historians such as Theophanes (752–817), Joannes Zonaras (twelfth century), and Laonikos Chalkokondyles (c. 1423–c. 1490), to late humanists such as Flavio Biondo (1392–1463), and early to mid-sixteenth century historians such as Marcantonio Sabellico (1436–1506), Andrea Cambini (c. 1460–1527), Francesco Sansovino (1512–1586), and Marino Barlezio (c. 1450–1512). Proliferating composite chronicles of author/editors such as those of Philipp Lonicer (1532–1599) or Johann Leunclavius (c. 1533–1593), compiled these sources (and many more) into longer accounts.¹⁷ We could also include in, or adjacent to, this European discourse widely read diplomats such as Nicolas de Nicolay (1517–1583) and Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq (1522–1592), and even the shorter more topically focused news books and reports of specific events in a number of formats.¹⁸ In late sixteenth and early seventeenth century England a flurry of English works on Turkish history (and numerous translations of continental works on the topic) were published. However, particularly notable is the work of the historian Richard Knolles (1545–1610) who synthesized a great deal of this European literature into *The Generall Histoire of the Turkes* (1603), a rhetorically polished, comprehensive, and coherent form, which was to prove influen-

rerum commentarius (Strasbourg 1537). Henry Parker, Lord Morley (1476–1556), made a presentation to King Henry VIII (1491–1547) of his own manuscript translation “Commentarys of the Turke” as a New Year gift between 1536 and 1541. Georgijevic’s *De Turcarum moribus epitome* (Lyon 1553) appeared in print in English as *The Ofspring of the house of Ottomano and officers pertaining to the Greate Turkes court* (London [1569]). However, from the evidence of contemporary English citations of these authors it is strongly likely they were primarily read in England in their own languages. On Georgijevic see Almut Höfert, Batholomaeo Georgius, in David Thomas and John A. Chesworth (eds.), *Christian-Muslim Relations. A Bibliographical History* (16 vols., 2009–2020), vol. 7 (2015), pp. 321–330.

17 On Leunclavius’ edited versions of texts, seemingly translated and compiled from Ottoman chronicles, see Pál Ács, *Pro Turcis and Contra Turcos: Curiosity, Scholarship and Spiritualism in Turkish Histories* by Johannes Löwenklau (1541–1594), in *Acta Comeniana* 25 (2011), pp. 1–22; Nina Berman, *German Literature on the Middle East: Discourses and Practices, 1000–1989* (Ann Arbor 2011), pp. 87–88.

18 For surveys of national European literatures on the Turks see Clarence Dana Rouillard, *The Turk in French history, thought, and literature: 1520–1660* (Paris 1941); and Carl Göllner, *Turcica: Die europäischen Türkendrucke des XVI. Jahrhunderts* (2 vols., Bucharest 1961); Charlotte Colding Smith, *Images of Islam, 1453–1600: Turks in Germany and Central Europe* (London, New York 2014).

tial on the views of educated Englishmen on the history of the Turks for the following century and beyond.

Thus, beyond common literary sources – be they Ovid (43 BCE – 17/18 CE) or the Bible – the early seventeenth-century travelogues of Sandys, Moryson, Lithgow, et al. drew on an already developed and sophisticated English (and indeed European) literature on the history, character, and significance the Ottoman Empire, its state, territories, and its expansion over the preceding century. In drawing upon details and ideas from this material – while also serving as sources themselves for subsequent English scholarly writing on Ottoman lands – these travelogues engaged with and contributed to a series of established but wider ongoing debates and conversations about the eastern Mediterranean, its peoples, politics, and histories. Furthermore, they did so through specific terminology, images, concepts, and forms.

Indeed, by the mid- to late-seventeenth century several English authors self-consciously describe such Eastern travel writing as a discreet form. For example, Levant Company Chaplain Thomas Smith (1638–1710) commented on the saturation of this genre in 1678:

The curious surveys every where extant of *Bethlehem*, *Nazareth*, and *Jerusalem*, places so famous for the birth, education, and sufferings of our *Blessed Saviour*, (which are owing to the industry and learning and curiosity of devout Pilgrims, who [...] have visited mount *Calvary* and the *holy Sepulchre*) suffer us not to be unacquainted with their situation and state: every one, who has but the least gust for Antiquity, or History, or Travel, or insight into Books, greedily catching at such relations.¹⁹

While this passage reflects the continuing importance of pilgrimage as a model for travelers to the eastern Mediterranean – both in that many of these travelers visited Jerusalem and other biblical sites, and as template for visiting secular sites of cultural importance such as the supposed site of Troy – it also speaks to the saturation that Eastern travel writing had achieved that the category of “Travel” could sit comfortably alongside “Antiquity” and “History” as a topic greedily consumed by those with “gust” for books.

In 1666 the diplomat Paul Rycaut (1628–1700) had sought to set his work of political economy *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire* apart from precisely such Eastern travel accounts:

I Present thee here with a true Systeme or Model of the Turkish Government and Religion; not in the same manner as certain ingenious Travelers have done, who have set down their

¹⁹ Thomas Smith, *Remarks Upon the Manners, Religion and Government of the Turks* (London 1678), p. 205.

Observations as they have obviously occurred in their Journeys; which being collected for the most part from Relations, and Discourses of such who casually intervene in company of Passengers, are consequently subject to many errors and mistakes [...].²⁰

The diplomat Rycaut sets himself apart from the superficial “Observations” of travelers – but in doing so he also defines a coherent body of travel writing on the East. This body of works, or “discourse”, shared more than topic. To borrow J. G. A. Pocock’s terminology of “discourse” it shared a “language” made up of elements such as: “facts” (in the sense of discrete details accepted to be true and widely repeated); “ideas” (in the sense of normative or structuring assumptions); and the rhetorical figures through which these were often expressed.²¹ These building blocks were widely drawn on by travel writers who mixed them freely with other elements, details from unrelated literary sources, or personal observations and anecdotes, in ways that reflected their specific social and intellectual contexts and historical *milieu*.

For example, Sandys’ *Relation* pauses its travel narrative proper to give a substantial account of Constantinople, followed by a general description of the Ottoman Empire under heads such as “history”, “policy”, “forces”, “Mahomet”, “the Mahometan religion”, “Clergie”, “the Turkes, their manners etc.” A great deal of this is identifiably drawn from the second edition of Richard Knolles’s *Generall Historie of the Turkes* (1610). Just like Knolles, Sandys starts with a pre-Ottoman history of the Turks whose narrative, names, dates, and incidents, (“facts” in Pocock’s sense) are abridged from his source. Drawing on such textual sources in preparing a travel account was common practice. Moryson tells us that before writing his *Itinerary* he spent three years abstracting “The Histories of these 12 Dominio[n]s thorow which I passed, with purpose to ioyn[e] them to the Discourses of the seuerall commomwealths for illustration and ornament”. However, finding that they ran to great length, he omitted them from his travel narrative.²²

20 Paul Rycaut, *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire* [...] (London 1668), A4r.

21 J. G. A. Pocock, *The Reconstruction of a Discourse: Toward the Historiography of Political Thought* (1981), in J. G. A. Pocock, *Political Thought and History. Essays on Theory and Method* (Cambridge 2009), pp. 67–86, here p. 67.

22 Fynes Moryson, *An Itinerary written by Fynes Moryson, Gent. First in the Latine Tongue, and then translated by him into English. Containing his ten yeeres travell through the twelve dominions of Germany, Bohmerland, Sweitzerland, Netherland, Denmarke, Poland, Italy, Turkey, France, England, Scotland, and Ireland* (London 1617), to the reader [ii]. These unpublished chapters survive in MS form (Corpus Christi College, Oxford, MS xciv) and were published in part as Charles Hugh (ed.), *Shakespeare’s Europe; unpublished chapters of Fynes Moryson’s Itinerary* (London 1903).

However, historical writing on the Ottomans did not just provide authors like Sandys or Moryson with anecdotal details (“facts”) but also with conceptual frameworks and ideas (“normative assumptions”). A common such normative assumption was that the contemporary Ottoman advance into Europe (and the dynastic history of the Ottoman family) was part of a wider historical continuum stretching back to the crusades, into the *Seljuk* period, and ultimately even further to the Scythians described by Herodotus (c. 485–424 B.C.) – hence “Turkish history” – as a European construction – rather than, say, Ottoman dynastic history. This “Scythian” trope had its origins in late fifteenth-century humanist orations responding to the Ottoman capture of Constantinople but became a staple of “Turkish history” as it evolved in the sixteenth century, and from there appears commonly in travel accounts. For example, these lines of doggerel summarize the contents of the section on Turkey in Lithgow’s *Total Discourse* (1640):

The Turkish custome and their manners rude,
And of their discent from the Scythian blood:
Their harsh Religion, and their sense of Hell,
And Paradice: their laws I shall you tell:
Then last of Mahomet, their God on earth
His end, his life, his parentage, and birth.²³

The historical commonplace of Scythian ancestry appears alongside a roll call of standard elements of the kind of summary accounts of “the Turks” that travel accounts such as Lithgow’s generally contained: i.e., manners and customs, history, religion and theology, and a life of the prophet (note that, manners aside, these are all subjects primarily drawn from textual sources). The Scythian descent of the Turks was so thoroughly digested into Western European historical traditions that English travel authors might draw on it from a number of sources. Clergyman William Biddulph’s *Travels of certaine Englishmen* (1609) frames his “discourse and description of Syria” – or at least of the inhabitants thereof – through reference to the Table of Nations contained in Genesis 10. This framing has an explicitly eschatological overtone. Biddulph presents the Scythians and Turks as the descendants of Noah’s son Japheth through his son Magog – best known from the apocalyptic prophecies of Revelation, which feature Gog and Magog as the archetypal enemies of God.²⁴ Biddulph’s follows this section

²³ Lithgow, *Total Discourse*, p. 131.

²⁴ William Biddulph, *Travels of certaine Englishmen into Africa, Asia, Troy, Bythinia, Thracia, and the Blacke Sea. And into Syria, Cilicia, Pisidia, Mesopotamia, Damascus, Canaan, Galile, Samaria, Iudea, Palestina, Ierusalem, Iericho, and to the Red Sea: and to sundry other places. [...]* (London 1609), p. 46.

with a brief polemical account of Islam focusing on a pejorative life of the Prophet, which he prefaces with the apocalyptic biblical prophecy of Daniel (“Diuers Prophets haue foretold of the wickednesse and tyrannie of the Turkes: but I will only recite the Prophecie of Daniell”).²⁵ Thus Biddulph’s characterization of the Turks as descended from Magog fits his tone well. The addition of the Turks to the descendants of Japheth is not Biddulph’s innovation, being present in the English Bible at least as far back as *The Bible and Holy Scriptures* (1561).²⁶

In contrast Sandys – drawing upon historiographical rather than biblical sources – uses the Scythian commonplace to transition from his description of Constantinople to his short overview of Turkish history (though the figure of the Scythian ultimately still serves a framing function): “The *Turkes*, now Lords of this Imperiall Citie, (together with the goodliest portion of the earth) arrived at this height of dominion from so obscure an original, as the same is rather coniectured at, then positiuely deliuered by any. But certaine it is, they were a people of *Scythia* [...]”²⁷

In contrast to Lithgow’s crude but vivid rhymes, or Biddulph’s biblical eschatology, Sandys’ hedged usage (“rather coniectured at, then positiuely deliuered”) reflects a long established and historical literature which had debated the origins of the Turks since the mid-fifteenth century (as digested through his primary historical source, Knolles, who also equivocates). Other travelers draw on this normative assumption in more passing ways. Thomas Smith simply notes: “They [the Turks] are ashamed of their Scythian original; it does not comport with their present grandeur, to look back and remember what poor vagabond lives their Ancestors lead.”²⁸ Fascinatingly, Moryson does not relate the Turks to the Scythians at all, claiming instead: “some of the Irish are of the race of Scythians, comming into Spaine, and from thence into Ireland,” a statement which conforms strongly to Moryson’s presentation of the “wild irish” as the epitome of barbarism throughout the *Itinerary*.²⁹ Applying this lineage to the Irish may indeed be intended to convey to his readers that they are even *more* barbaric than the more commonly “Scythian” Turks.

A further ubiquitous normative assumption in accounts of the Ottoman Empire, which also has its roots in the European genre of Turkish history, was that

²⁵ Biddulph, *Travels*, p. 47.

²⁶ See Meserve, *Empires of Islam*, p. 255. For *The Bible and Holy Scriptures* conteyned in the Olde and Newe Testament (Geneva 1561) see STC 2095. The association of Magog with the Scythians goes back to at least Josephus in the first century.

²⁷ Sandys, *Relation*, p. 42.

²⁸ Smith, *Remarks*, pp. 24–25.

²⁹ Moryson, *Itinerary*, p. 163.

the Ottoman polity was a “tyranny”. This was not simply a term of abuse, though it was of course pejorative. Rather, as a neo-classical political category, “tyranny” implied a matrix of underlying structural relationships that profoundly shaped and ordered descriptions and observations of the Ottoman Empire and its peoples throughout the period. Tyranny in this sense could be defined as a polity which is sustained by force instead of law, severity instead of justice, and slavery instead of freedom, or, in Aristotelian terms, as a polity modelled on the relationship of a master and slave, instead of the head of a household to his children. Fynes Moryson’s *Itinerary* (1617) is a good example of how this idea might play out in a travel account. We will begin with his general description of the nature of the Ottoman polity:

All that liue vnder this Tyrant, are vsed like sponges to be squeased when they are full. All the Turkes, yea the basest sort, spoile and make a pray of the Frankes [...] and in like sort they spoile Christian Subjects. The soldiers and officers seeking all occasions of oppression, spoile Common Turkes, and all Christians. The Gouvernors and greatest Commaunders make a pray of the very souldiers, and of the Common Turkes, and of all Christians, and the superiors among them vse like extortion vppon the Inferiors, and when these great men are growne rich, the Emperour strangles them to haue their treasure.³⁰

Moryson extends the principle of tyranny from the top down like a pyramid, right through Ottoman society, with Christian subjects and Western visitors firmly at the bottom. This concept is then actively used by Moryson to frame and interpret his own experiences travelling in the Ottoman Empire. For example, this is his account of his arrival in Constantinople:

Hauing cast anchor [...] in the Port of *Constantinople* [...] many companies of Turkes rushing into our Barke, who like so many starued flies fell to sucke the sweete Wines, each rascall among them beating with cudgels and ropes the best of our Mariners [...] till within a short space the Candian Merchant hauing advised the Venetian Ambassadour of their arriuall he sent a Ianizare³¹ to protect the Barke, and the goods; as soone as he came, it seemed to me no lesse strange, that this one man should beate all those Turkes, and driue them out of the Barke like so many dogs, the common Turkes daring no more to resist a souldier, or especially a Ianizare, then Christians dare resist them [...] such is the tyranny of the Turkes against all Christians aswel their subjects as others.³²

Here is the pyramid model of tyranny writ large into Moryson’s narrative: the Turks preying on the Christian mariners only to be beaten by the “Ianizare”, ex-

³⁰ Moryson, *Itinerary*, p. 12.

³¹ Janissary.

³² Moryson, *Itinerary*, pp. 259–260.

plicitly framed as an example of the logic of “tyranny”. A key point here is that although this episode is presented as an eyewitness account, in practice his experience is impossible to separate from the normative category of “tyranny” which frames and presents these events. To understand this passage – and Moryson’s account in general – we must explore its intellectual contexts and the concepts that he engages with.

Although Moryson is particularly explicit in relating the tyrannical structure of the Ottoman polity to its current state and his experiences there, both the concept of tyranny, and rhetorical figures expressing this idea are common in the writing of contemporary travelers. For example, the allegorical frontispiece of Sandys’ *Relation* is flanked on the left side by the figure of the reigning Turkish Sultan “Achmat, Sive Tyrannvs” (“Ahmed I, or the Tyrant”, 1590 – 1617) holding a globe to signify dominion over the world and a yoke to symbolize slavery. He is standing on the broken scales of justice and a trampled book to represent the neglect of law and learning. These themes of a state supported by military power and slavery (often coupled in accounts of the Janissary corp and *dev-şirme*), the severity of law, the neglect of good governance, and the subsequent dilapidated state of the country are commonly commented on by travelers, even if they do not explicitly state that the Ottoman polity is a “tyranny”. For example, although Lithgow does not give as structured an account of Ottoman tyranny as Moryson he reports that “[t]he puissance of the great Turke is admirable, yet the most part of his Kingdomes in Asia, are not well inhabited, neither populous”, and repeats other tropes relating to a European discourse about the Ottoman state with the concept of “tyranny” at its heart.³³

3 Related discourses: history and *ars apodemica*

History was not the only discourse which influenced the travel accounts written by early modern Englishmen. *Ars apodemica* (“the art of travel”) was a European genre of advice literature with roots in humanist attempts to codify and improve travel practice on pedagogical and often classical precedents. From longer attempts to systematize and model the knowledge acquired through travel such as Theodor Zwinger’s (1533–1588) *Methodus apodemica* (1577), to shorter humanist orations or essays, these ideas spread across Europe and became part

³³ William Lithgow, *A most delectable and true discourse of an Admired and Painefull Peregrination from Scotland to the Most Famous Kingdomes in Europe, Asia and Affricke [...]* (London 1616), pp. 60–61. Lithgow’s brief potted description of “Turkish history” and the Ottoman state follows his account of Islam.

of aristocratic travel and educational practices, becoming naturalized in England by the late sixteenth century.³⁴ For example, the *First Letter of Advice to the Earl of Rutland* (Roger Manners, 1576–1612) by the Earl of Essex, Robert Devereux's (1565–1601), shows the apodemic praise of travel in moral and education terms flourishing at the highest levels of English aristocratic society.³⁵ By the seventeenth century apodemic essays “of travel” had become a mainstay of English pedagogical works such as the *Compleat Gentleman* (1622) by Henry Peacham (1576–c. 1643). This also prefigured the development of later “Grand Tour” practices: for example, the *Voyage of Italy* (1670) by Richard Lassels (c. 1603–1668) begins with an apodemic preface “Concerning Travelling.”³⁶

Apodemic literature is particularly interesting (in the context of this chapter) as an example of the generic closeness of historical and travel writing. As we shall see, a major recommendation of much apodemic writing was that travelers ought to read the history (and cosmology) of lands they travelled to. More fundamentally, history, travel, and cosmology or geography, all shared similar conceptual categories for describing a country's state: its people and their origins and history; its natural and human geography; its produce, trade and manufacture; its laws, polity, and military; its religion, customs and manners, etc. It was these categories themselves, as much as the specific details of a particular country, which were important to the traveler. History provided a conceptual frame-

34 The classic accounts of *ars apodemica* are Justin Stagl, *Apodemiken: Eine räsionierte Bibliographie der reisetheoretischen Literatur des 16., 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts* (Paderborn et al. 1983), and Justin Stagl, *A History of Curiosity: The Theory of Travel 1550–1800* (London, New York 1995). More recently the *Art of Travel, 1500–1850*, a project at the National University of Ireland, Galway, has sought to reconstruct the transnational genre of travel advice literature, exploring its intellectual and cultural contexts, and illustrating its lasting importance. See Daniel Carey, Gabor Gelléri, and Anders Ingram, *The Art of Travel (1500–1850) database*, in *Viatica* 7 (2020), and the project's online database, accessed 16 May 2022, <<https://artoftravel.nuigalway.ie/>>.

35 MS, BL, Harl., 6265, fols. 115r–17r. Other contemporary English examples would be Hubert Languet's (1518–1581) letter to Phillip Sidney (1554–1586) “On Traveles” (18 December 1573) or Sidney's own similar apodemic letter of 18 October to his brother Robert (1563–1626). See Hubert Languet, *Epistolae Politicae et Historicae, Scriptae quondam Ad Illustrem, & Generosum Dominum Philippum Sydnaeum* (Frankfurt am Main 1633), and Arthur Collins, *Letters and Memorials of State: In the Reigns of Queen Mary, Queen Elizabeth, King James, King Charles the First, Part of the Reign of King Charles the Second, and Oliver's Usurpation* (London 1746). Links to both letters can also be found at the online database of the project the *Art of Travel, 1500–1850*, accessed 16 May 2022, <<https://artoftravel.nuigalway.ie/>>.

36 The term “Grand Tour” was of course not in usage in this period.

work that could be used to structure and frame observations and descriptions of foreign lands.³⁷

Contemporary English travelogues contain both numerous examples of the use of such categories to structure their descriptions, and explicit references to apodemic theories as a justification of this practice. Thomas Coryate, for example, includes a translation of an *apodemic* oration in the prefatory material of his *Coryate's Crudities* (1611). The original of this essay is by Hermann Kirchner (1562–1620), a Professor of Poetry and Rhetoric at Marburg, and had appeared in Latin in 1599 (Coryate's text also includes a second Kirchner oration from 1607, only a few years before the *Crudities* was published).³⁸ Drawing on classical precedents Kirchner describes how the process of travel adds practical knowledge to the theoretical learning of the humanist education, and prepares the gentleman for public service:

For no man can be fitter and with greater praise advanced to the sterne of a Common weale [...] then he that hauing before travelled much and long with Vlysses, hath seene the diuers manners and rites, and the beautifull Cities of many people: knowen the ordinances and decrees of many Common-weales: noted their customes: searched their lawes: sought for the originals and increase of Kingdoms: scanned the causes of the translations and ouerthrowes thereof [...] [hath seen] what againe in all their distinct Offices, in their Tribes, in their Arts, in their Seruices, and manuarie trades: hath also noted what is worthy [...]

37 Joan-Pau Rubiés has explored the connected intellectual histories of humanism, travel writing, and cosmography in detail in a series of publications including: Joan-Pau Rubiés, *Travel Writing and Humanistic Culture: A Blunted Impact?*, in *Journal of Early Modern History* 10/1 (2006), pp. 131–168; Joan-Pau Rubiés, *From the 'History of Travayle' to the History of Travel Collections: The Rise of an Early Modern Genre*, in Daniel Carey and Claire Jowitt (eds.), *Richard Hakluyt and Collected Travel Writing in Early Modern Europe* (London 2012), pp. 25–41; Joan-Pau Rubiés, *Comparing Cultures in the Early Modern World: Hierarchies, Genealogies and the Idea of European Modernity*, in Renaud Gagné, Simon Goldhill, and Geoffry E. R. Lloyd (eds.), *Regimes of Comparison: Frameworks of Comparison in History, Religion and Anthropology* (Leiden, Boston 2019), pp. 116–176.

38 See *Peregrinandum esse adolescentibus ac omnibus qui eruditionis & rerum gerendarum tum domi tum foris laudem consecantur*, in Hermann Kirchner, *De Gravissimis Aliquot Cum Juridicis Tum Politicis Quaestionibus in utramque partem discussis, Orationes* ([Frankfurt] 1599). The second Kirchner oration – which Coryate integrates into his text as *An Oration in praise of the trauell of Germany in particular* – is drawn from Hermann Kirchner, Henry de Stangi, *De Germaniae Perlustratione Omnibus Aliis Peregrinationibus anteferenda: Oratio Directore* [...] Hermann Kirchnero [...] In Conventu Academiae Marburg: habita ab Henrico De Stange Silesio ([Marburg] 1607). On the original context of these orations see Stagl, *Apodemiken*.

in the mustering of their Armies [...] in the ordering of their forces [...] surely this is the man whom Plato [428/27–348/47 BCE] doth call a Philosopher.³⁹

The model of travel presented by Kirchner (and apodemic authors generally) is not just about going places; at a fundamental level it is also reading about them. Kirchner's praise of the traveler who has "sought for the originals and increase of Kingdoms: scanned the causes of the translations and ouerthrowes thereof" makes clear that what he has in mind is not merely physical travel but also a scholarly and indeed specifically historical *travail* (effort or exertion). These literary efforts are identifiable in many early English travel accounts of the Ottoman Empire. For example, Lithgow's *Total Discourse* (1640) begins with a lengthy account of Constantinople, followed by a life of Mahomet, and then accounts of Islam, Turkish customs, origins of the Turks, their empire, trades and revenues, polity, military, etc. all presented in categories very similar to those which structure Sandys' account discussed above. Lithgow seems to have drawn much of these sections from textual sources which he combines with his own first-hand observations (e.g., of Constantinople).

Coryate is however, not the only one of our travelers to include an explicitly apodemic section. Moryson's *Itinerary* includes two apodemic chapters. The first is an essay on the stock subject of the moral benefits and dangers of travel ("That the visiting of forraigne Countries is good and profitable") drawing on numerous classical quotations and vernacular proverbs.⁴⁰ The second – "Of Precepts for Trauellers" – is a lengthy apodemic discourse (addressed to an idealized male gentleman traveler) where moral advice on the practice of religion, and practical advice on, for example, hiring a Janissary through the mediation of Christian consuls or ambassadors, sit alongside a programmatic method for how to prepare for and profit from travels.

Moryson places an emphasis on the *forms* of knowledge the traveler is to acquire through observation and note taking. After stipulating a long list of categories to be observed or visited, from the produce of crops and goods, to natural

³⁹ Thomas Coryate, *Coryats Crudities* hastily gobled vp in five moneths trauels in France, Sauoy, Italy, Rhetia co[m]monly called the Grisons country, Heluetia aliàs Switzerland, some parts of high Germany, and the Netherlands; newly digested in the hungry aire of Odcombe in the county of Somerset, & now dispersed to the nourishment of the trauelling members of this kingdome (London 1611), pp. B8r–v.

⁴⁰ The moral essay on the virtues and vices of travel was a common topic of sixteenth-century humanist orations. See Daniel Carey, *Advice on the Art of Travel*, in Nandini Das and Tim Youngs, *The Cambridge History of Travel Writing* (2019), pp. 392–407.

and human geography, manners, institutions (universities, libraries, etc.), and people notable for learning, or civic or martial virtue, he concludes:

The Traueller shall further obserue the policy of each State, and therein the Courts of each King or Prince, with the Courtiers entertainements, fees, or offices, the statutes of the Princes, their reuenues, the forme of the Commonwealth, whether the Prince be a Tyrant, or beloued of the people, what Forces he hath by Sea or Land, the military discipline, the manners of the people, their vices, vertues, industry in manuall Arts, the constitution of their bodies, the History of the Kingdome, and since the soule of each man is the man, and the soule of the Commonwealth is Religion, he shall obserue the disposition of the people, whether it be religious, superstitious, or prophane, and the opinions of Religion differing from his, and the most rare Ceremonies thereof.⁴¹

As with Kirchner, this model of travel is as much a literary and intellectual affair as a physical peregrination, and includes a comprehension of the history, polity, laws, constitution, military, religion, etc., of foreign lands. Indeed, Moryson is explicit about the need for the traveler to acquire this knowledge through careful directed reading: “That hee [i.e. the traveller] may the better premeditate those things which formerly I aduised to bee [sic] obserued by him, and the like, he shall doe well before he set forth, to get some skill (at least superficial) in the Art of Cosmography [...] I containe vnder this Art, Corography, and the knowledge of those Kingdomes which he is to passe [...]”⁴²

Moryson’s insistence on the need for the traveler to gain “some skill” in “cosmography”, “Corography” (i.e., Chorography, or the description of the natural features and history of a region or part of a map or chart), and “knowledge of Kingdomes” of course encompasses precisely the categories outlined in the discussion above. We can observe Moryson following these precepts himself in book three of the *Itinerary* which provides a section of chorographical descriptions of the lands he has travelled through. The section on “Turkey”, for example, gives a long account of the provinces of the Ottoman Empire which also describe their ancient history, geography, commodities and trades, diet and means of life. In this sense just as his historical reading shaped his conception of the Ottoman state as a tyranny, apodemic theory also served to structure and frame his account of the Ottoman world.

Moryson’s method for travel does not only include this literary preparation and the physical journey itself, but also looks forward to the traveler using the

⁴¹ Moryson, *Itinerary*, book three, p. 10.

⁴² *Ibid.*

knowledge he has acquired through a process analogous to commonplacing (if you will, a commonplacing of the world):⁴³

And because the memory is weake [...] let him constantly obserue this, that whatsoever he sees or heares, he apply it to his vse, and by discourse (though forced) make it his owne [...]. In the meane time, though he trust not to his papers, yet for the weakenes of memory, let him carefully note all rare obseruations [...]. Let him write these notes each day, at morne and at euen in his Inne, within writing Tables carried about him, and after at leasure into a paper booke, that many yeeres after he may looke ouer them at his pleasure.⁴⁴

Through internalizing the details of his observations and using these examples in his own spoken discourse until he becomes able to recall them comfortably, the traveler will acquire a body of practical knowledge which completes his assumed humanist education (and possibly equips him for public service). This process is assisted by a disciplined process of note-taking as much as the reading of histories and cosmologies before and after travel. In a sense, Moryson's method also anticipates the travelers' own literary productions; this was precisely the process he followed himself.

4 Travelogues as sources

If Eastern travelogues drew upon history and apodemic writing for details, anecdotes, and concepts to frame and construct their narratives, travel authors were also widely drawn on by later authors writing on the Turks, the Ottoman lands, and related topics (such as the contemporary state of the Holy Land). For example, Sandys – to take one prominent example – was cited and appropriated by a wide variety of authors. These included historical works such as Thomas Fuller's (1608–1661) *The Historie of the Holy War* (1639), which quotes Sandys on the Jews of Thessalonica, Jerusalem, and contemporary names of biblical sites. However, it was geographical authors such as Peter Heylyn (1599–1622) and Purchas who cited Sandys with the greatest frequency, treating the *Relation* as a ready store of contemporary information on lands Sandys had travelled to. This is particularly clear in Purchas' massive cosmology *Purchas his Pilgrimage*, which ap-

⁴³ On commonplacing see Peter Beal, "Notions in Garrison": The Seventeenth-Century Commonplace Book (s. n. 1987); Ann Moss, *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought* (Oxford 1996); Fred Schurink, *Manuscript Commonplace Books, Literature, and Reading in Early Modern England*, in *Huntington Library Quarterly* 73/3 (2010), pp. 453–469.

⁴⁴ Moryson, *Itinerary*, book three, p. 10.

peared in updated editions in 1613, 1614, 1617, and 1626. The edition of 1617 refers extensively to the *Relation*, published two years earlier, indicating that Purchas read Sandys to update his work between editions. He references Sandys on diverse topics, but particularly on Turkish dress and manners, where the *Pilgrimage* lifts an entire section of the *Relation* word for word.⁴⁵ In Pocock's and Skinner's terms, Sandys contributed a whole range of new anecdotes, details, places, names, and "facts" to the "language" in which contemporary English discourse about the Ottoman Empire was conducted.

Sandys was also read himself as an authority on the Turks – and is therefore analogous to someone like Knolles. For example, the diary of Lady Anne Clifford (1590 – 1676) records: "Upon the 9th I went up to see the things in the Closet & began to have Mr Sandy's [sic] Book read to me about the Government of the Turks, my Lord sitting the most part of the Day reading in his Closet."⁴⁶ Perhaps most interesting is here the identification of the topic of the *Relation* as "the Government of the Turks" rather than as a travel account, or a description of any of the other lands Sandys travelled to – a slippage which points to the connections between travel writing and other forms of English discourse about the Turks.⁴⁷

Conclusions

This chapter has sought to historicize and contextualize a small corpus of early to mid-seventeenth century English (and Scottish) travelogues, by exploring their points of contact with related contemporary discourses of Turkish history and apodemica. I have framed this discussion through a critical vocabulary of discourse – drawing from the work of intellectual historian J. G. A. Pocock – to explore "facts" or anecdotal details, "normative assumptions" or broadly put ideas, and the rhetorical figures, tropes, and images through which these were expressed. In doing so I have tried to connect the travel accounts by Sandys, Lithgow, Moryson, et al. to wider contemporary conversations and debates

⁴⁵ Samuel Purchas, *Purchas his pilgrimage, or Relations of the vvorlde and the religions obserued in al ages and places discouered, from the Creation vnto this present [...]* (London 1617), pp. 339 – 340.

⁴⁶ Anne Clifford, *The Diaries of Lady Anne Clifford*, edited by David J. H. Clifford (Stroud 2003), p. 47.

⁴⁷ Barbara Lewalski's 1991 article, seemingly relying solely upon Clifford's diary, even identifies a book called "the government of the Turks" by Sandys, which does not exist. Barbara K. Lewalski, *Re-writing Patriarchy and Patronage: Margaret Clifford, Anne Clifford, and Aemilia Lanyer*, in *The Yearbook of English Studies* 21 (1991), pp. 87–106, p. 93.

about the eastern Mediterranean, the Turks, and Islam, which they engaged with and contributed to within their specific social milieu and contexts. I will end now with one final example that to me seems to summarize many of the elements we have explored so far. This source is “An appendix of some directions for travelling into Turkey and the Levant parts” added to the second edition of the apodemic *Instructions and Directions for Forren Travell* (1650) by the educational writer and historian James Howell’s (c. 1594–1666).⁴⁸

Howell’s justification for travel to “Turkey” combines contemporary fears of a tyrannical Ottoman universal monarchy with the classic apodemic injunction to study the government, policy, military, and current state of a foreign country: “He [the Turk] is the Sole Earthly potentat, and fatallst foe of the Crosse of Christ, and so som advantages may bee taken by prying into the errors of his government) [sic] and weaknesse of his dominions, I say if he hath a mind to make some researches what kind of Soule doth inform, actuat [?], govern, and conserve that vast Empire [...]”⁴⁹

Howell notes that there are three ways in which a gentleman may travel to the Ottoman Empire. First and foremost, he can “take his advantage of the season, that our company of Turkey Marchants set out their Shippes for *Constantinople*”, secondly, he can embark at Marseille for ‘Ligorn’ (Livorno) and thence Smyrna (Izmir). Thirdly: “he may go to *Venice*, where he may agree with a Janissary to conduct him in company of a Caravan all the way through the Continent of *Greece* [...] where in the way he may ruthfully observe how that Country, which used to be the nource [sic] of all speculative knowledge, as also of policy and prowess, is now orewhelm’d with barbarisme and ignorance, with slavery and abjection of Spirit.”⁵⁰ Here Howell combines the pragmatic advice given by experienced travelers such as Moryson or Smith (who both recommend travelers to hire Janissary guides), with the common trope of a lament for the contemporary condition of Greece fallen from its ancient classical glory and debased by the ill governance of Turkish tyranny to “barbarisme and ignorance”.

48 On this text see D. R. Woolf, Howell, James (1594?–1666), in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*; and Eva Johanna Holmberg, *Travelling to the Levant Through the Eyes of Others: The James Howell Method*, accessed 16 May 2022, <<https://memorient.com/articles/travelling-to-the-levant-through-the-eyes-of-others-the-james-howell-method>>.

49 James Howell, *Instructions and directions for forren travell. Shewing by what cours, and in what compas of time, one may take an exact survey of the kingdomes, and states of Christendome, and arrive to the practicall knowledge of the languages, to good purpose* (London 1650), pp. 129–130.

50 Howell, *Instructions*, pp. 130–131.

The goal of all three of these routes – as it was for Sandys, Lithgow, Moryson, Blount, and Coryate – is to reach Constantinople where he “may observe more then any where else, the *Religion*, the *Justice*, the *Militia*, and *moralities* of the Musulmen”.⁵¹ Indeed, most of the travel authors that we have explored in this chapter included précis on just these topics in the general accounts of the Ottoman Empire which they include in their narratives. Just as much of these travelers’ summaries of the Ottoman state and policy were in fact drawn from reading – Howell included a brief account of Islam, the “Alcoran”, Justice, “Militia”, and “Cayro” (Cairo). This section is perhaps supposed to start the prospective traveler’s preparatory research, but also seems to acknowledge that most of Howell’s readers will in fact not travel to Turkey. There is a further irony here: the key topics for observation (laws, militia, clergy, history, etc.) which are used to justify the educational value of travel in the first place often are often those which draw heaviest upon the reading the traveler conducts at home.

By the 1650s when Howell’s appendix was published, both genteel accounts of voyages to Constantinople and apodemic debates about the moral and educational value of travel were well-traveled roads. His combination of practical reflections upon the material realities of travel (drawn as much from contemporary travel writing as his own experiences), with a well-worn integration of the content, ideas, and tropes of a discourse on the Ottoman world, its peoples, and their history, and all aimed at an idealized, imagined male, gentleman, traveler, feel paradigmatic of a settled mid-century genre of Eastern travelogue and travel advice writing whose reference points, and clichés, were already well established.

51 Howell, *Instructions*, p. 132.