

Anna Huemer

Effeminate Rulers, Brave Soldiers? “Foreign” Masculinities in Selected Travelogues of Habsburg Diplomats in the Ottoman Empire

1 Habsburg-Ottoman encounters and the representation of masculinities

In the aftermath of the Ottoman expansion in Southeastern Europe, the Austrian Habsburgs and the Ottomans faced each other in conflict-ridden situations. However, mutual relations were not always carried out on the battleground: as a result of the eight Austrian-Turkish wars between 1526 and 1792, more than 65 peace treaties or ceasefire agreements were negotiated. Reciprocal diplomatic missions helped to establish and maintain peace.¹ These missions produced various types of texts, such as reports, diaries, travelogues, and letters. They significantly shaped contemporary knowledge and perceptions of the Ottoman Empire in the early modern Habsburg Monarchy and thus helped to establish positively – as well as negatively – connoted stereotypes,² which were visible in

Note: The research group funded by the FWF (P30091) at the University of Salzburg and the University of Graz is currently editing Metzger’s travelogue. See *Quellen zur habsburgisch-osmanischen Diplomatie in der Neuzeit. Die Internuntiatoren des Johann Rudolf Schmid zum Schwarzenhorn (1649): Reisebericht, Instruktionen, Korrespondenz, Berichte*, accessed 24 May 2022, <<http://glossa.uni-graz.at/o:dipko.rb>>. I wish to thank Dr. Franz Georg Graf Seefried (Schloss Stiebar) and Mag. Roman Sigg (Stadtarchiv Stein am Rhein) for access to their archives.

1 Arno Strohmeyer, Einleitung, in Arno Strohmeyer and Norbert Spannenberger (eds.), *Frieden und Konfliktmanagement in interkulturellen Räumen: Das Osmanische Reich und die Habsburgermonarchie in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Stuttgart 2013), pp. 11–30, here p. 11. For an overall perspective see Marlene Kurz et al. (eds.), *Das Osmanische Reich und die Habsburgermonarchie. Akten des internationalen Kongresses zum 150-jährigen Bestehen des Institutes für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, Wien 22.–25. September 2004 (Vienna, Munich 2005); Karl-Heinz Ziegler, *Völkerrechtliche Beziehungen zwischen der Habsburgermonarchie und der Hohen Pforte*, in *Zeitschrift für Neuere Rechtsgeschichte* 18 (1996), pp. 177–195, here pp. 180–189.

2 Almut Höfert, *Den Feind beschreiben. “Türkengefahr” und europäisches Wissen über das Osmanische Reich 1450–1600* (Frankfurt am Main et al. 2003), pp. 153–154, 161; Ulrike Ilg, *Bebilderte Reiseberichte aus dem Osmanischen Reich in deutscher Sprache (16. bis 17. Jahrhundert)*,

many different social, cultural, political contexts and are – to some extent – still used today.³

Despite the rise of men's studies in historical research,⁴ there still is a desideratum for research in terms of the “gendered man” in the history of early modern Habsburg-Ottoman (diplomatic) relations.⁵ In an attempt to somewhat close this gap, this chapter will examine the vocabulary linked to masculinities in the diaries/travelogues of the imperial grand ambassador Hans Ludwig von Kuefstein (1582–1656)⁶ and his contemporary Johann Georg Metzger (1623–1698).⁷

in Eckhard Leuschner and Thomas Wunsch (eds.), *Das Bild des Feindes: Konstruktion von Antagonismen und Kulturtransfer im Zeitalter der Türkenkriege: Ostmitteleuropa, Italien und das Osmanische Reich* (Berlin 2013) pp. 55–75, here pp. 56–57; Zita Ágota Pataki, *Orientreisen und Stereotypen in Text und Bild*, in Bekim Agai (ed.), *Orientalische Reisende in Europa, Europäische Reisende im Nahen Osten* (Berlin 2010), pp. 169–202, here pp. 170–172.

3 Höfert, *Feind*, p. 28; Dorothea Nolde, *Aufbruch und Festschreibung: Zum Verhältnis von Geschlechtergrenzen und kulturellen Grenzen auf europäischen Auslandsreisen der Frühen Neuzeit*, in Christine Roll et al. (eds.), *Grenzen und Grenzüberschreitungen: Bilanz und Perspektiven der Frühneuzeitforschung* (Cologne 2010), pp. 547–557, here p. 548. For representations of women in particular see Folker Reichert, *Fremde Frauen: Die Wahrnehmung von Geschlechterrollen in den spätmittelalterlichen Orientreiseberichten*, in Odilo Engels and Peter Schreiner (eds.), *Die Begegnungen des Westens mit dem Osten* (Sigmaringen 1993), pp. 167–184. In her studies on the contemporary stigmatization of Muslim men in Germany, Katherine Pratt Ewing wrote about the representation of Ottoman and Turkish masculinities in European travelogues. She concluded that many early modern stereotypes on Ottoman masculinities are still used today. See Katherine Pratt Ewing, *Stolen Honor: Stigmatizing Muslim Men in Berlin* (Stanford 2008), pp. 34–35.

4 For an overall perspective see Martin Dinges, *Stand und Perspektiven der Neuen Männergeschichte (Frühe Neuzeit)*, in Marguerite Bos (ed.), *Erfahrung: Alles nur Diskurs? Zur Verwendung des Erfahrungsbegriffs in der Geschlechtergeschichte* (Zürich 2004), pp. 71–96; Jürgen Martschukat et al., *Männlichkeit: Geschichtswissenschaft*, in Stefan Horlacher (ed.), *Männlichkeit: Ein interdisziplinäres Handbuch* (Stuttgart 2016), pp. 104–126.

5 In contrast, there do already exist works about gender, especially about women, in the early modern diplomatic context. See on a more general basis Corina Bastian et al. (eds.), *Das Geschlecht in der Geschichte: Geschlechterrollen in den Außenbeziehungen vom Spätmittelalter bis zum 20. Jahrhundert* (Köln et al. 2014); Glenda Sluga and Carolyn James (eds.), *Women, Diplomacy and International Politics since 1500* (London, New York 2016). In some aspects, we can build on contemporary research on diplomatic and international studies, which have also focused on gender roles (but mainly on women), such as Karin Aggestam and Ann Towns, *The Gender Turn in Diplomacy: A New Research Agenda*, in *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 21/1 (2019), pp. 9–28.

6 Hans Ludwig von Kuefstein, *Diarium oder genaue beschraybung deßen, so auf der türkischen legation vonn tag zu tag fürgeheth und gehandelt wirdt etc. Angefangen 21. Novembris 1627, 1628–1629*, Linz, Oberösterreichisches Landesarchiv, Herrschaftsarchiv Weinberg, Handschriften, Band 16, fols. 4r–143v (henceforth Kuefstein, *Diarium*).

Kuefstein was a member of the Lower-Austrian nobility; Metzger was the son of a small-town official. Due to their very different social backgrounds (and positions), their accounts provide two different perspectives on the perception and the representation of Ottoman masculinities. This is a particularly important aspect in historical (and contemporary) gender studies, which is why these two travelogues have been chosen as main sources here. Neither Kuefstein's nor Metzger's travelogue has been analyzed in terms of gender so far. Additionally, Metzger's original manuscript has only recently been discovered in a private archive in Lower Austria, which makes it a pivotal source for gender studies and further research.

Gender studies have shown that masculinity is a mutable category that cannot be defined by one universal standard. Masculinities are not biologically determined. Scholars argue that they are made of socially and culturally constructed codes that vary by class, age, religion, ethnicity, and many other factors.⁸ This is particularly true for early modern Central Europe, where stark hierarchies of age, as well as social and marital status, were deeply ingrained.⁹ Especially for diplomats or members of diplomatic missions, it was (and still is) an important aspect of their job to consider the intercultural differences regarding ethnicity, social positions, duties, and gender.¹⁰ Their images of masculinities in particular can be regarded as products of narrative strategies and processes referring to societal scripts and prescriptions on regional and local gender orders, mainly de-

7 Johann Georg Metzger, *Itinerarium oder Rayss Beschreibung von Wien in Österreich nach Constantinopel*. Darin werden beschriben die durchgerayste ländr, stätt, vestungen, schlösser, märck unnd dörffer unnd deren inwohnenden völkher, arth unnd tracht, auch die audientzen, visitationes der pottschafter sambt anderen vühlen denckwürdigen sachen. In drey unterschiedliche thail außgethailt unnd mit etlichen abgerißnen figuren geziert (Wien 1650), Gresten, Schlossarchiv Stiebar (henceforth Metzger, Rayss).

8 Raewyn Connell, *Der gemachte Mann: Konstruktion und Krise von Männlichkeiten* (Wiesbaden 2006), pp. 99–102; Stefan Horlacher, *Überlegungen zur theoretischen Konzeption männlicher Identität aus kulturwissenschaftlicher Perspektive: Ein Forschungsüberblick mit exemplarischer Vertiefung*, in Stefan Horlacher (ed.), *“Wann ist die Frau eine Frau?” – “Wann ist der Mann ein Mann?” Konstruktionen von Geschlechtlichkeit von der Antike bis ins 21. Jahrhundert* (Würzburg 2010), pp. 195–238, here pp. 222–223; Jürgen Martschukat, *Geschichte der Männlichkeiten: Akademisches Viagra oder Baustein einer relationalen und intersektionalen Geschlechtergeschichte*, in *L'Homme* 26/2 (2015), pp. 199–132, here p. 125.

9 Alexandra Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford 2010), p. 2.

10 Dorothea Nolde, *Der diplomatische Körper: Überlegungen zu einer Körpergeschichte der frühneuzeitlichen Diplomatie*, in *Frühneuzeitinfo* 29 (2018), pp. 5–17, here pp. 8, 11; Abigail Ruane, *“Real Men” and Diplomats: Intercultural Diplomatic Negotiation and Masculinities in China and the United States*, in *International Studies Perspectives* 7/4 (2006), pp. 342–359, here pp. 343–344.

pending on time, space, and power structures.¹¹ Thus, “masculinities” in these contexts do not represent certain types of men, but, rather, ways in which men position themselves and others through discursive practices and images.¹² According to Stefan Horlacher, there have been various “key” or “master narratives” on masculinities throughout history¹³ that have served as dominant social and cultural benchmarks.

Regarding the perception or the representation of “foreign” masculinities – especially in travelogues – comparisons or judgements between different models of gender, including of masculinities, were (and still are) often used as reflections on contemporary narratives about the culture of origin and the country visited. Gender has been identified as an important factor in the representation of inequality and hierarchy.¹⁴ Thus, masculinities may also serve as determinant categories used to express (cultural) superiority in relation to the “unknown.”¹⁵ Therefore, this chapter follows up on the question: which hierarchic, competing, or even dysfunctional, images of *Ottoman* masculinities can be detected within the works of Kuefstein and Metzger?

2 Two authors – two perspectives

Kuefstein’s and Metzger’s accounts offer two different views – not only on diplomatic missions *per se*, but also on perceptions and expressions of masculinities: Kuefstein, an Austrian nobleman, was named imperial grand ambassador in 1627. His mission was to represent the emperor, Ferdinand II (1578–1637), and to deliver a ratified peace treaty to Sultan Murad IV (1612–1640). His activities brought him in contact with people from diverse cultural backgrounds, which

¹¹ Raewyn Connell and James Messerschmidt, *Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept*, in *Gender and Society* 19/6 (2005), pp. 829–859, here p. 849; Martschukat, *Männlichkeit*, pp. 105–106; Gabriele Rippl, “Merit, Justice, Gratitude, Duty, Fidelity”: Images of Masculinity in Autobiographies of Early Modern English Gentlewomen and Aristocrats, in Stefan Horlacher (ed.), *Constructions of Masculinity in British Literature from the Middle Ages to the Present* (New York 2011), pp. 69–87, here p. 72. On the construction of social categories see Wolfgang Frindte, *Radikaler Konstruktivismus und Social Constructionism: Sozialpsychologische Folgen und die empirische Rekonstruktion eines Gespenstes*, in Hans Rudi Fischer (ed.), *Die Wirklichkeit des Konstruktivismus: Zur Auseinandersetzung um ein neues Paradigma* (Heidelberg 1995), pp. 103–130, here p. 120.

¹² Connell, Messerschmidt, *Masculinity*, p. 841.

¹³ Horlacher, *Konzeption*, p. 220.

¹⁴ Connell, *Konstruktion*, 99–102; Nolde, *Geschlechtergrenzen*, p. 556.

¹⁵ Dinges, *Perspektiven*, p. 75.

may have shaped his perception of differing social orders as well as of masculinities. Kuefstein's account – a mixture of itinerary, report, and travelogue – mainly describes his tasks as a high-ranking diplomat. The ambassador also wrote about the political and religious aspects of the two opposing powers, described diplomatic ceremonies, and the conditions of his embassy between November 1627 and December 1629. Its 143 handwritten folios formed the basis of the mission's final report, which was handed over to the emperor. It thus served a specific political purpose, which has been discussed by Harald Tersch and recently by Klára Berzeviczy.¹⁶

Johann Georg Metzger's manuscript has 522 pages and was completed in 1650: It depicts the embassy of Johann Rudolf Schmid zum Schwarzenhorn (1590–1667) to Constantinople in 1649 and combines the author's impressions with contemporary historical, scientific, and ethnographic knowledge. It also includes several maps and drawings. The account mainly served Metzger's dynastic identification and was therefore kept in the family archives, where the original manuscript has been rediscovered recently.¹⁷ Inspired by an article about the travelogue in 1928,¹⁸ the Orientalist Franz Babinger had a microfilm made of it but never published his research.¹⁹ It was not until 1973 that Franz Meienberger mentioned the existence of this microfilm in a footnote.²⁰ Since then, Metzger's travelogue has not been researched.

16 Klára Berzeviczy, *Fragen des Zeremoniells während einer Gesandtschaftsreise: Einige Bemerkungen zum Reisebericht des H. L. von Kuefstein*, in Sára Bálázs (ed.), *Quelle und Deutung I: Beiträge zur paläographischen Tagung am 27. November 2013 (Budapest 2014)*, pp. 53–70; Karl Teply, *Die kaiserliche Großbotschaft an Sultan Murad IV. im Jahre 1628: Des Freiherrn Hans Ludwig von Kuefsteins Fahrt zur Hohen Pforte* (Vienna 1976); Harald Tersch, *Hans Ludwig von Kuefstein*, in Harald Tersch (ed.), *Österreichische Selbstzeugnisse des Spätmittelalters* (Vienna et al. 1998), pp. 647–477, here p. 647.

17 For detailed information on the reception history see Anna Huemer, "Von Wien in Österreich nach Constantinopel": *Das Reisediarium Johann Georg Metzgers aus dem Jahre 1650. Eine Einleitung*, in Arno Strohmeier and Georg Vogeler (eds.), *Quellen zur habsburgisch-osmanischen Diplomatie in der Neuzeit: Die Internuntiaturs des Johann Rudolf Schmid zum Schwarzenhorn (1649). Reisebericht, Instruktionen, Korrespondenz, Berichte* (Salzburg, Graz 2019), accessed 4 April 2022, <<http://glossa.uni-graz.at/o:dipko.rbe>>.

18 Otto Graf Seefried, *Balkanreise im 17. Jahrhundert. Mit einer deutschen Sondergesandtschaft nach Konstantinopel*, in *Neues Wiener Tagblatt/Sonntagsbeilage*, 28 October 1928, pp. 24–26.

19 Franz Babinger to Fritz Rippmann, Munich, 20 August 1948, Stadtarchiv Stein am Rhein, Sammlungen "Schwarzenhorniana," 08.03.00–12. See also Franz Babinger and Fritz Rippmann, *Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München, Ana 684, F. Rippmann*.

20 Peter Meienberger, *Johann Rudolf Schmid zum Schwarzenhorn als kaiserlicher Resident in Konstantinopel in den Jahren 1629–1643: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der diplomatischen Bezie-*

Johann Georg Metzger was a law student at the time of his first journey to Constantinople in 1649. His official task was to keep records of the food rations and the carriages allocated to the entourage.²¹ As a clerk and without an aristocratic background, he gives insights into the mission and its course and records his impressions from the perspective of a (social) position that differed from that of Ambassador Kuefstein. Furthermore, largely lacking personal face-to-face encounters during his journey because of his lower position in the “entourage,” his representations and images of “Ottoman men” seem to be very much “inspired” by previous texts and common narratives.²² According to current research, terms, attributes, or behaviors related to masculinities were not only connected with the tasks and the social status of the authors, they were also strongly linked to the functions and positions of the persons or groups described in their texts:²³ Below, I will analyze two dominant “male” categories in Kuefstein’s and Metzger’s accounts: the “ruling class,” including the sultans and the high dignitaries, and the “military.”

3 Rulers and dignitaries: from courtesy to weakness

In early modern European aristocratic culture, virtues such as decency, mildness, justice, and grandeur were often associated with the ideal of elite or “ruling class” masculinity.²⁴ Such idealized characterizations were reflected in normative literature and conduct books, which have been considered the foundation of European culture and “civility” as well as of its concepts of (gendered) behav-

hungen zwischen Österreich und der Türkei in der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts (Frankfurt am Main 1973), p. 118.

21 Johann Georg von Metzburg, *Verschlossenes Testament und letzter Willen*, Brno, 7 March 1698, Archiv města Brna, Rukopisy 55, pp. 424–454, here p. 426.

22 Anna Huemer, Copy & Paste im Reisebericht der Frühen Neuzeit: Intertextualität im “Türkischen Itinerarium” des Johann Georg Metzger (1650), in *CHRONICA – Annual of the Institute of History of Szeged University* 19 (2020), pp. 84–112, here pp. 90–95. On intertextuality see further Manfred Pfister, *Autopsie und intertextuelle Spurensuche: Der Reisebericht und seine Vor-Schriften*, in Gisela Ecker and Susanne Röhl (eds.), *In Spuren Reisen: Vor-Bilder und Vor-Schriften in der Reiseliteratur* (Münster 2006), pp. 11–30.

23 Elizabeth Leffeldt, *Ideal Men. Masculinity and Decline in 17th Century Spain*, in *Renaissance Quarterly* 61/2 (2008), pp. 463–494, here pp. 467, 474.

24 Nolde, *Körper*, p. 8.

ior and manners.²⁵ Conduct literature has often been the starting point for much of the period's gender analysis. They provide insights into (socially imagined and politically required) ideals of manliness and reflect on contemporary "male" duties and hierarchies.²⁶ Thus, a lack of the virtues, manners, and some of the aforementioned attributes may have indicated a deviation from those required standards, which were implicitly linked to gender. This was especially true for those at the top of the social ladder. While Kuefstein describes Ferdinand II with all these positive attributes – most of all his "mildness and tolerance"²⁷ –, Sultan Murad IV in Kuefstein's account as well as Sultans Mehmed IV (1642–1693) and Ibrahim (1615–1648) in Metzger's travelogue seem to serve as oppositions to those ideals. They are mainly characterized as untrustworthy, fraudulent, and weak.²⁸ These attributes, which can be found in expressions such as "of the fraudulent, barbaric Turkish nation,"²⁹ did not only aim to devalue the Ottoman regime as a whole.³⁰ They also referred to the dysfunctional masculinity of the ruler *per se*, as the symbolic representative of the (deceitful) regime: fraud and untrustworthiness in particular have often been used as grave insults against male honor. By denying men in general, and rulers in particular, the ability to fulfill their duties in an honorable, honest, and fair way, their male status could be lowered easily.³¹ By comparing Murad IV to an "unruly, bad tempered creature",³² Kuefstein very explicitly contributes to his denigration.

The imperial ambassador was not the only one to use such devaluations. Many early modern conduct book writers equated unmanliness with beastliness. Animals – from the perspective of conduct literature – were deemed to have no reason or self-control. Thus, characterizations such as "creature," "dog," "ape,"

25 One of the most influential works was Baldassare Castiglione's (1478–1529) *Book of the Courtier*, first published in 1528. It also gives insights into the importance of social hierarchies in contemporary normative literature. See Baldassare Castiglione, *Der Hofmann: Lebensart in der Renaissance*, translated by Albert Wesselski (Berlin 1996), p. 65; Patrizia Bettella, *The Marked Body as Otherness in Renaissance Italian Culture*, in Linda Kalof and William Bynum (eds.), *A Cultural History of the Human Body in the Renaissance* (6 vols., Oxford et al. 2010), vol. 3, pp. 149–181, here pp. 156, 160. On "civility" and normative literature see Norbert Elias, *Über den Prozess der Zivilisation* (2 vols., Frankfurt am Main 1997), vol. 1, pp. 112, 170.

26 Shepard, *Manhood*, p. 7.

27 "Milde und toleranz"; Kuefstein, *Diarium*, fol. 9v. For further examples see fols. 12r–v.

28 Kuefstein, *Diarium*, fols. 25r, 26r, 55r. Metzger, Rayss, pp. 180, 196.

29 "[...] Der barbarischen türkischen nation betrug." Kuefstein, *Diarium*, fol. 10r.

30 Nolde, *Geschlechtergrenzen*, p. 556.

31 Elizabeth Foyster, *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honor, Sex and Marriage* (Hoboken 1999), p. 211; Shepard, *Manhood*, pp. 162, 166.

32 "Ungebärdt und affectierte[s] wesen." Kuefstein, *Diarium*, fol. 55r.

or “beast” can be interpreted as some of the most severe forms of insult against the male status.³³ As the capacity to reason was one of the key features of the ideal early modern (aristocratic) masculinity, manhood was at risk if any deficiency was insinuated.³⁴ Metzger uses animal-metaphors in his descriptions too: not for the characterization of the sultans, but for the portrayal of the Ottoman envoy Hasan Agha (around 1650), who had been sent to Vienna in 1649 as the equivalent of the imperial envoy, Johann Rudolf Schmid zum Schwarzenhorn. In addition to this, the young author specifically associates him with danger and greed.³⁵

In Metzger’s account, the ideals of elite masculinity – reason and self-control – are further extended to “proper” or, in this case, “improper” sexual behavior and to male-female relationships. Many early modern writers used similar associations to describe the foreign social order as a whole³⁶ – analogies which are still dominant today in some narratives.³⁷ In his travelogue, Metzger accuses the former sultan, Ibrahim, of lack of bodily control by describing his immoral interactions with women and focusing mainly on nudity and excessive lust.³⁸ At the same time, he refers to a common contemporary narrative when he writes:³⁹ “Then the sultan got undressed just like his sultana and the other women and they danced with each other. Whenever he wanted, the sultan took

33 Foyster, *Honor*, p. 211; Shepard, *Manhood*, pp. 72, 174–175.

34 Shepard, *Manhood*, p. 30.

35 Metzger, Rayss, p. 350.

36 Nolde, *Geschlechtergrenzen*, p. 547.

37 For contemporary theoretical references see Ursula Stummeyer, *Mann-Frau Beziehungen als Feld des Umgangs mit Fremdem*, in Burkhard Müller et al. (eds.), *Interkulturell Denken und Handeln: Theoretische Grundlagen und gesellschaftliche Praxis* (Frankfurt am Main 2006), pp. 155–162.

38 Metzger, Rayss, pp. 180–182.

39 Compare with Salomon Schweigger, *Ein neue Reyßbeschreibung auß Teutschland nach Constantinopel und Jerusalem. Darinn die Gelegenheit derselben Länder, Städt, Flecken, Gebew etc. der innwohnenten Völcker Art, Sitten, Gebreuch, Trachten, Religion vnd Gotteßdienst etc. Insonderheit die jetzige ware gestalt deß H. Grabs, der Stadt Jerusalem und anderer heiligen Oerter [...]. Deßgleichen deß Türckischen Reichs Gubernation, Policey, Hofhaltung, Nutzbarkeit des Reysens, und vielerley andern lustigen Sachen [...].* In III unterschiedlichen Büchern [...] (Nuremberg 1608), p. 125. On contemporary images of the harem see Reina Lewis, *The Harem: Gendering Orientalism*, in Geoffrey P. Nash (ed.), *Orientalism and Literature* (London 2019), pp. 166–184, especially pp. 174–175; Ruth Bernard Yeazell, *Harems of the Mind: Passages of Western Art and Literature* (Yale 2000), pp. 97–112. On the function of “intertextuality” in travelogues of aristocrats see Andrea Voß, *Reisen Erzählen: Erzählrhetorik, Intertextualität und Gebrauchsfunktionen des adligen Bildungsreiseberichts in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Heidelberg 2016), pp. 72–79.

one of his concubines and committed immoral sexual acts with them in front of the others.”⁴⁰ Sexual excess was a Western stereotype used to underline barbarity and inferiority as key features of Ottomans and other foreign cultures. Read against the backdrop of gender, it can also be associated with inferior masculinity, contradicting the canon of European aristocratic virtues, which included self-control and chastity.⁴¹ Unlike in the Middle Ages, when men could be celebrated for loving many women, uncontrolled and unreasonable love and sexuality were later considered as weakness or foolishness.⁴² Again, the forfeiture of mental and bodily self-control was said to affect the duties as a ruler: a man who could not control himself was considered unfit to govern others.⁴³ Metzger underpins this idea when he portrays the sultan’s regime as “unreasonable and brutal” (alluding to Roman emperor Nero [37–68]), and “effeminate”⁴⁴. His image of the “effeminate” ruler is similar to Kuefstein’s comparison of Murad IV to a “creature.”

With this, both authors refer to hierarchies corresponding to contemporary views: Since the late Middle Ages, femininity and bestiality (as well as childhood) had often appeared as opposites of masculinity.⁴⁵ Contemporaries labeled certain behaviors as “male” and others as “female” to mark gender differences and to justify superiority and inferiority.⁴⁶ This idea was not only based on the humoral bodily model, which characterized men as hotter, dryer, and physically stronger than women,⁴⁷ but was also legitimated by the (idealized) concepts of the dominant early modern gender hierarchies: women and effeminate men were considered weak, holding subordinate positions, and – most of all – lacking the ability of self-governance. As these aspects were regarded as fundamental to the experience of being male, their lack consequently led to a deficient

40 “Alßdan hat er sich, wie auch seine sultanin oder weiberen [...] außgezogen unnd darnach mit seinen weiberen ganz nackhendt [...] herumb gedantz [...]. Darauf, wan es ihm in wehrendem tanzen beliebte, hat er eine seiner nackhenden weiber genomen unnd seinen muethwillen mit ihr, in zusehung der anderen, getriben unnd volbracht.” Metzger, Rayss, p. 182.

41 Heike Talkenberger, Konstruktion von Männerrollen in württembergischen Leichenpredigten des 16. bis 18. Jahrhunderts, in Martin Dinges (ed.), Hausväter, Priester, Kastraten: Zur Konstruktion von Männlichkeit in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit (Göttingen 1998), pp. 29–74, here pp. 55–56; Bettella, Body, p. 175.

42 Leffeldt, Men, p. 479.

43 Shepard, Manhood, p. 85.

44 “Neronisch” and “weibisch.” Metzger, Rayss, p. 183.

45 Ruth Karras, From Boys to Men: Formations of Masculinity in Late Medieval Europe (Philadelphia 2003), p. 153.

46 Shepard, Manhood, 29.

47 Rippl, Merit, p. 71.

masculinity.⁴⁸ In *Il Corteggiano* by Baldassare Castiglione (1478–1529) effeminacy was even depicted as perverted, because it changed the plan given by God himself.⁴⁹ Furthermore, the word “effeminate” occurs repeatedly in histories and early modern travelogues, where mainly Ottoman rulers become “effeminate” because of excessive luxury, sloth, or flattery.⁵⁰ This severe devaluation of manhood and thus of status was also used in other sources of the Habsburg-Ottoman diplomatic context: for example in a letter from the imperial resident at the Sublime Porte between 1649 and 1666, Simon Reniger von Renningen (d. 1668),⁵¹ to the Viennese court. In his description, an Ottoman dignitary considers another high-ranking commander as being unmanly and fearful. Reniger notes: “[...] he acts like a woman and flees from one corner to another.”⁵² This example very clearly shows the analogy of femininity and weakness the author aimed at.

In addition to this, clothing was mobilized to enact the masculine or its “opposite” – the feminine.⁵³ Costumes of the higher Ottoman dignitaries in particular often became the subject of a process of feminization, thus contributing to the (intercultural) formation of hierarchic gender stereotypes.⁵⁴ Johann Georg Metzger, too, refers to this aspect when he writes: “Men are clothed splendidly and delightfully, but just like women [...]”⁵⁵ Metzger’s limitation – the “but just” – obviously aims to contrast the splendor of the costumes he describes to their suggestions of inferior masculinity in the same sentence. However, while the young clerk uses these common narratives, the imperial ambas-

⁴⁸ Lehfeldt, *Men*, p. 467; Foyster, *Honor*, p. 210.

⁴⁹ Castiglione, Hofmann, p. 32.

⁵⁰ Jacqueline Pearson, ‘One Lot in Sodom’: Masculinity and the Gendered Body in Early Modern Narratives of Converted Turks, in *Literature and Theology* 21/1 (2007), pp. 29–48, here p. 31.

⁵¹ Zsuzsanna Cziráki, Zur Person und Erwählung des kaiserlichen Residenten in Konstantinopel, Simon Reniger von Renningen (1649–1666), in Zsuzsanna Cziráki (ed.), *Wiener Archivforschungen: Festschrift für den ungarischen Archivdelegierten in Wien*, István Fazekas (Vienna 2014), pp. 157–164.

⁵² “Er halte sich alß wie ein weib und fliehe auß ein winckhel zum andern.” Simon Reniger to Ferdinand III, 12 September 1653, Vienna, Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Haus- Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Staatenabteilung, Türkei I, 126/2, fol. 37r.

⁵³ Sidney Donnell, *Feminizing the Enemy: Imperial Spain, Transvestite Drama, and the Crisis of Masculinity* (London 2003), p. 164; Michèle Hayeur-Smith et al., *Men in Black: Performing masculinity in 17th- and 18th- century Iceland*, in *Journal of Social Archeology* 19/2 (2019), pp. 229–254, here p. 230.

⁵⁴ Bettella, *Body*, p. 176; Castiglione, Hofmann, p. 69.

⁵⁵ “Nicht weniger gehn auch die manß persohnen ganz prächtig unnd köstlich, schier allerdings wie die weiber geklaidt.” Metzger, Rayss, p. 298.

sador, Kuefstein, does not allude to Ottoman costumes and their associations with femininity at all.

Metzger also expresses inferior masculinity through the alleged dominant behavior of Mehmed IV's grandmother Kösem Mahpeyker (1590–1651). Her “reign” – pejoratively referred to as “The Sultanate of Women” – has long been linked to the decline of the Ottoman Empire in Habsburg-Ottoman historiography.⁵⁶ Also according to Metzger, Kösem is “a fraudulent person, who dominates the whole empire.”⁵⁷ In Kuefstein's text there are similar expressions. He describes his negotiations with the *kaymakam* (a high official of an Ottoman district) in reference to the vast influence of his wife and her mother, who make important decisions and manage delicate issues: “with her and the mother anything can be done and arranged,”⁵⁸ which highlights female power and influence.

The image of the “Feminine Government” of mothers and wives has been a common narrative in the discourse of the “effeminacy” of Ottoman rulers.⁵⁹ Because idealized masculinity has often been generated through the dominance of the man over women or his control of the “*familia*,”⁶⁰ the sultan and other Ottoman dignitaries implicitly lose parts of their authority in the narrations of Kuefstein and Metzger. This image can primarily be regarded as an insult against the ideal of elite masculinity, because low male authority was connected with lower status, which in turn was mainly associated with the subordinate classes. In addition, being under the control of one's mother (apart from Mehmed IV, who was still a child in 1649) or wife was an analogy to young age, which was also considered a threat to real masculinity.⁶¹ Because the sultan is seen as a representation of the Ottoman Empire and as the peak of its social hierarchies in Metzger's account, the author transfers the image of female rule to other social levels as well. In this context, Metzger cites a passage from *Reyßbeschreibung* by Salomon Schweigger's (1551–1622), a well-known seventeenth-century travelogue that had a formative influence on many subsequent (published and

56 On the “Sultanate of Women” see Josef Matuz, *Das Osmanische Reich: Grundlinien seiner Geschichte* (Darmstadt 2010), pp. 165–166.

57 “Eine arglistige fürstin, [die] jetzt das ganze werckh dirigiere.” Metzger, Rayss, p. 119.

58 “Durch sie und die muetter alles goltenn und richten khönnen.” Kuefstein, *Diarium*, fol. 47r.

59 Pearson, *Turks*, p. 32. On the “actual” power (regardless of the European narrative) of Ottoman women see Leslie Peirce, *The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire* (New York et al. 1993).

60 Ronald G. Ash, *Europäischer Adel in der Frühen Neuzeit: Eine Einführung* (Köln et al. 2008), p. 8; Foyster, *Honor*, p. 39.

61 On the weaknesses of young age see Castiglione, *Hofmann*, p. 67; Foyster, *Honor*, p. 30.

unpublished) works. He very explicitly refers to the “excesses” of female domination and writes: “[They] are afraid of their wives and thus are fools in their own houses. Every day and night, they have relations with them, and they submit to them as if they were their slaves [...]”.⁶²

Another threat to real manhood was non-white skin. Skin color was a defining element that separated civility from barbarity, purity from impurity and – again – even masculinity from femininity – which is explicitly referred to in Metzger’s description of the sultan, who is portrayed as “brownish.”⁶³ In Metzger’s text, the explicit mention of skin color may not only be understood as an actual description of the facts, but also as an implicit devaluation of (male) status.

As stated above, the ruler also represents the higher dignitaries and his government, who, facing Kuefstein as grand ambassador in *official* negotiations, are often described as arrogant and conceited. Kuefstein further uses descriptions connoted with rudeness and meanness.⁶⁴ According to him, they have a “dishonest and mean character”⁶⁵ and Metzger, too, relegates the Ottoman dignitaries to a “a poorly chosen aristocracy.”⁶⁶ He additionally notes: “The Turkish ministers are more insidious than ever, even though they pretend to be polite – at least as far as their barbarian nature allows.”⁶⁷ In contrast to idealized (noble) behavior, which was linked to honesty and fairness, these characterizations and associations with fraud, deceitfulness, and dishonesty can be construed as inferior manners on the axis of gender.⁶⁸

However, these images are not adopted for all high functionaries in Metzger’s and Kuefstein’s texts. Kuefstein in particular describes face-to-face interactions and many “unofficial” encounters with Ottoman dignitaries as polite, respectful, noble, and just.⁶⁹ The ambassador uses descriptions such as “a

62 “Hergegen fürchten sye sich vor ihren weibern unnd seind rechte haußnarren, pflegen tag und nacht mit den weibern ihren muethwillen volzubringen unnd erbege sich ihnen, das sye gleichsam ihre sclaven sein müeßen.” Metzger, Rayss, p. 294; Schweigger, Reyßbeschreibung, p. 201; Huemer, Intertextualität, pp. 84–112.

63 “Braundecht.” Metzger, Rayss, p. 92; Bettella, Body, pp. 163, 165.

64 Kuefstein, Diarium, fols. 53v, 108v, 138v.

65 “Falsche, bösen arth.” Kuefstein, Diarium, fol. 121v.

66 “Ubel ordinierte aristocratia.” Metzger, Rayss, p. 120.

67 “Die vornembste türckhische ministri, ob schon sye sich, so vil ihr barbarische angebohrenheit zulast, höfflich und freindtlich erzeigt, waren falscher alß nie.” Metzger, Rayss, p. 120.

68 Castiglione, Hofmann, pp. 29–30; Talkenberger, Männerrollen, p. 55.

69 Kuefstein, Diarium, fols. 17r–v, 38v, 40v.; Metzger, Rayss, p. 86.

nobleman, who means well” or “a modest and noble man,”⁷⁰ which correspond to male norms highlighted in influential early modern conduct literature. Murteza Pasha (d. 1636), the vizier of Buda (Ofen), for example is mainly characterized as reasonable and, according to Kuefstein, carries out his tasks with respect, reason, and (most of the time) with politeness. From a contemporary gender perspective, this description makes him an “ideal man,” at least in his specific social spheres.⁷¹ Further proof of this is Kuefstein’s portrayal of the Grand Vizier Gazi Hüsrev Pascha (d. 1632). On the one hand, the ambassador considers his regime brutal, but on the other, he trusts him to act “out of love for justice,”⁷² which was a highly valued virtue.

In conclusion, there are two main narratives about the ruling/elite masculinity in Kuefstein’s account. Negative attributes such as arrogance, lack of control, and effeminacy are frequently used to describe official encounters, but reason, courtesy, and politeness are used when describing unofficial situations.⁷³ From this perspective, masculinity is used as a flexible category to credit or discredit the tasks people had to carry out and not to judge those who are sticking to the rules. Kuefstein underpins this theory when he writes about the Ottoman ambassador Recep Pascha (d. 1632) in relation to his own behavior: “[...] just as this [the Ottoman] ambassador does the right thing obeying his own master’s commands, I cannot be judged for obeying my own master’s commands.”⁷⁴ Metzger, on the contrary, resorts to common stereotypes. He thus tends to devalue the Ottoman regime as a whole, as personified by its ruler and its high dignitaries, by implicitly and sometimes even explicitly devaluing their behavior in its reference to (group-specific) masculinity.

70 “Fürneme[r] edlmann,” who is “*ehrlich und wohlmainend*” or “*beschaydene[r], faine[r] mann.*” Kuefstein, *Diarium*, fols. 38v, 40v. For idealized normative manners see Giovanni Della Casa, *Der Galate: Das Büchlein von erbarn, höflichen und holdseligen Sitten*, edited by Klaus Ley (Tübingen 1984).

71 Foyster, Honor, p. 56; Kuefstein, *Diarium*, fols. 22r, 28v.

72 “Aus lieb zu der gerechtigkheitt.” Kuefstein, *Diarium*, fol. 63r.

73 Kuefstein, *Diarium*, fols. 30v, 31r.

74 “Gleich wie iener botschafter recht thue, daß zu vollziehen, so ihme befohlen, also sey ich nit zuverdenken, daß ienige zu thuen, so mir aufgetragen.” Kuefstein, *Diarium*, fol. 31r.

4 From “knights” to warriors: power and its limitations

The demonstration of military prowess, especially in times of war but also in times of peace, was of great importance and often proof of “real” manliness among male groups. Therefore, the idea of early modern (aristocratic) masculinity implied being an experienced warrior. This image was one of the most direct connotations associated with masculinity in many contemporary sources.⁷⁵ As armies and war are prominent topics in both Metzger’s and Kuefstein’s accounts, various images of the “warrior” can be found. Kuefstein describes the Ottoman “military” as “dignified,”⁷⁶ a term which he associates with beauty, glory, and grace. Impressed by their appearance, his choice of words may implicitly refer to the early modern meaning of external beauty, which was not only a category of aesthetics. It was also connected with (moral) judgements, authority, and prowess.⁷⁷

In both texts, there are references to the anachronistic ethos of the honorable, strong, and brave knights. Kuefstein portrays individuals of this category as both ideal courtiers and ideal warriors, “brave [and] polite”⁷⁸; Metzger, too, characterizes them as courageous,⁷⁹ referring to their prowess and fearlessness in battle. Kuefstein even uses the term “knighthood”⁸⁰ to describe his impressions of the “acrobatic” equestrian games presented to him. They were held near Buda to showcase the Ottoman strength, physical skills, and military power to the imperial ambassador. Through the demonstration of physical skills, “martial masculinity” could be performed in a very direct way. Especially activities such as riding, fencing, or hunting⁸¹ as well as visible attributes of male physiognomy such as a big and athletic body or a large neck were

⁷⁵ Lehfelddt, *Men*, p. 489; Rippl, *Merit*, p. 72.

⁷⁶ “Ansehnlich.” Kuefstein, *Diarium*, fol. 24r.

⁷⁷ Mary Rogers, *Beauty and Concepts of the Ideal*, in Linda Kalof and William Bynum (eds.), *A Cultural History of the Human Body in the Renaissance* (6 vols., Oxford et al. 2010), vol. 3, pp. 125–148, here pp. 126, 128.

⁷⁸ “Dapfer [and] höflich.” Kuefstein, *Diarium*, fol. 42v.

⁷⁹ Metzger, *Rayss*, p. 82.

⁸⁰ Kuefstein, *Diarium*, fol. 31v.

⁸¹ According to Ernst Hanisch, hunting was still a key aspect of “real” masculinity in the twentieth century. See Ernst Hanisch, *Männlichkeiten: Eine andere Geschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Vienna et al. 2005), p. 393.

often connected with the model of “ultimate” maleness.⁸² They corresponded to the moral characteristics of generosity, bravery, and justice, which were part of the classic cardinal virtues.⁸³ In addition, the winning and dominating other men (either on the battlefield or – for example in Kuefstein’s descriptions – in games) were of great importance in the perception and construction of masculinities. They did not only increase honor and prestige, but also male status in relation to others.⁸⁴ Furthermore, these connections correspond to current sociological research on masculinities, which highlights the competitive aspect in the process of becoming a “man” – mainly in its opposition to femininity or homosexuality.⁸⁵

According to Hans Ludwig von Kuefstein, the Ottoman equestrian performance seemed to work. In his account, Kuefstein acknowledges the equestrians’ efforts and pays tribute to their “impressive acts of bravery which were nice to watch.”⁸⁶ Kuefstein also portrays the riders’ weapons and focuses on their “splendid cavalry.”⁸⁷ In European aristocratic culture, these items were viewed as symbols of power and strength. Metaphorically, they also distinguished the elites from the subordinates, the winners from the losers, and men from women.⁸⁸ Kuefstein reflects on these ideals in his text. For him, the equestrians do indeed meet the masculine and noble ideal of the knights – but not without certain limitations. His descriptions most likely contain these limitations to avoid an “over”-glorification of the foreign soldiers, a message which would have been inappropriate for a report sent to the Viennese court. Adjectives such as “child-

82 Castiglione, Hofmann, p. 33; Christof Muigg, ‘Eine majestätische Erscheinung’: Körperideale des Feldherren und des Diplomaten, in *Frühneuzeit-Info* 29 (2018), pp. 30–38, here p. 33. For more information about body-related concepts and norms see Noga Arikha, *Passions and Tempers: A History of the Humours* (New York et al. 2008), pp. 113–183.

83 Werner Paravicini, *Die ritterlich-höfische Kultur des Mittelalters*, 2nd ed. (Munich 2010), p. 26.

84 Karras, *Men*, p. 38. The terms “honor” and “virtue” had also been linked to the elite corps of Janissaries in the influential work of Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq, *The Turkish Letters*. From 1555 until 1562 (with one interruption), Busbecq was an imperial ambassador accredited to the Sublime Porte. As he wrote about the Janissaries, he also highlighted the Ottoman social order, which, according to him, put those in favor who had the best (mental, physical, and moral) skills. Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq, *Vier Briefe aus der Türkei. Mit 20 Wiedergaben zeitgenössischer Holzschnitte und Kupfer*, edited by Wolfram von den Steinen (Erlangen 1926), pp. 64, 66.

85 Michael Meuser, *Männlichkeit: Soziologie*, in Stefan Horlacher (ed.), *Männlichkeit: Ein interdisziplinäres Handbuch* (Stuttgart 2016), pp. 218–236, here p. 225.

86 “Dapferen genadigkheyttenn, so wohl zu sehen gewesenn.” Kuefstein, *Diarium*, fol. 134v.

87 “Wohlgebutzten reutterey.” Kuefstein, *Diarium*, fol. 128v. For further examples see fols. 31v, 32r, 50r.

88 Walter Demel, *Der europäische Adel: Vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich 2011), p. 10; Karras, *Men*, pp. 60–61.

ish” are the most visible expressions of these limitations, because age was regarded as an important determinant of early modern masculine hierarchies.⁸⁹ Especially male youth was associated with vices such as a lack of self-mastery, anger, and idleness – they were threats to ideal masculinity.⁹⁰

Metzger, however, very explicitly portrays the Janissaries, the Ottoman elite infantry unit, as courageous and “brave in using their fists.”⁹¹ He thus describes their “group-specific” masculine (physical) virtues and even links them to aspects of the ancient heroic tradition: according to Metzger, the noble and high-ranked Janissaries in Belgrade for example were dressed in the skins of exotic animals. He further compares them to Hercules, the ancient hero, who is portrayed wrapped in the fur of a lion by classical authors.⁹² Such references to classic heroic traditions were commonly used tools in expressing ideals of “martial” masculinity.⁹³ Already in ancient Greek mythology, Hercules had been celebrated for his strength and his virility. Later, from the fifteenth century on, this mythological figure was frequently used to represent powerful monarchs and dynasties.⁹⁴ Metzger’s adaptation of this allegory is an example of its modern discursive value, because he himself copied the passage from Schweigger’s *Reyßbeschreibung*.⁹⁵ These analogies may have possibly served as projections of a desired and, again, highly idealized, masculinity. Furthermore, to the Habsburgs, the Ottoman Empire was a direct threat and its military force was feared. Thus, idealized images of the “powerful Ottoman warrior” linked to the classic hero – Hercules – may have indicated that the “Ottoman threat” had to be taken seriously, which was implicitly extended onto a gendered level as well.⁹⁶

However, in Metzger’s account, there are limitations to the ideal of the (masculine) foreign warrior as well: When describing a contemporary Ottoman war campaign and its troops stationed in Constantinople (Istanbul) in 1649,

⁸⁹ “Childish behavior.” Kuefstein, *Diarium*, fol. 32r.

⁹⁰ Shepard, *Manhood*, pp. 21–26.

⁹¹ “Dapfer von der faust.” Metzger, Rayss, p. 82.

⁹² Metzger, Rayss, p. 43. For a classic description of Hercules see Herodotus, *Histories*, translated by Alfred D. Godley (Cambridge 1920), book 4, chapter 8.

⁹³ Rippl, *Merit*, p. 73; Rogers, *Ideal*, p. 129.

⁹⁴ Katharina N. Piechocki, *Sincerity, Sterility, Scandal: Eroticizing Diplomacy in Early Seventeenth-Century Opera Librettos at the French Embassy in Rome*, in Tracey Sowerby and Jan Hennings (eds.), *Practices of Diplomacy in the Early Modern World c. 1410–1800* (London, New York 2017), pp. 114–129, here pp. 121–122.

⁹⁵ Schweigger, *Reyßbeschreibung*, p. 20.

⁹⁶ Bettella, *Body*, p. 175.

Metzger highlights their undisciplined and uncontrolled violence.⁹⁷ In another context, he even characterizes the future Janissaries as savages, as “young pests”⁹⁸ and “uncontrolled mob”⁹⁹. Again, Metzger is referring to youth and to a lack of control as deviations from the “standards.” According to Alexandra Shepard, who analyzed the meaning of violence on the axis of gender in early modern England, (idealized) masculinity was particularly associated with controlled violence and the absence of irrational cruelty.¹⁰⁰ Male groups used controlled violence as a tool for the regulation of their hierarchies and for the demonstration of their authority. However, driven to excess, violence turned into a symbol of a weak mind and a lack of the most masculine virtues: reason and control.¹⁰¹

Many contemporary sources extended the image of uncontrolled violence and cruelty to the sultans:¹⁰² According to Metzger, “Neronian cruelty was an inherent trait in all of the Ottoman rulers.”¹⁰³ He thus reproduced a well-known concept of the “enemy,” which – viewed from a perspective of gender – gives another insight into the multi-faceted construction of stereotypes.¹⁰⁴

Another attribution that referred to a lack of control and discipline was excessive drinking. Even though specific male groups (especially on a lower social level) considered it a common method of masculine bonding and of proving one’s en-

97 Metzger, Rayss, pp. 110 – 111.

98 “Junge[s] unkraut.” Metzger, Rayss, p. 336.

99 “Unrüehig gesindlein.” Metzger, Rayss, p. 336.

100 Shepard, *Manhood*, p. 150.

101 Dinges, *Perspektiven*, p. 83; Foyster, *Honor*, p. 211; Margaret Healy, *Fashioning Civil Bodies and “Others”: Cultural Representations*, in Linda Kalof and William Bynum (eds.), *A Cultural History of the Human Body in the Renaissance* (6 vols., Oxford et al. 2010), vol. 3, pp. 205 – 226, here p. 211. On modern sociological aspects see Michael Meuser, *Körperdiskurse und Körperpraxen der Geschlechterdifferenz*, in Brigitte Aulenbacher et al. (eds.), *Soziologische Geschlechterforschung* (Wiesbaden 2010), pp. 125 – 140.

102 Wolfgang Geier, *Südosteuropa Wahrnehmungen: Reiseberichte, Studien und biographische Skizzen vom 16. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden 2006), p. 50; Felix Konrad, *Von der ‘Türkengefahr’ zu Exotismus und Orientalismus: Der Islam als Antithese Europas (1453 – 1914)?* in Institut für Europäische Geschichte (ed.), *Europäische Geschichte Online* (Mainz 2010), accessed 4 April 2022, <<http://ieg-ego.eu/de/threads/modelle-und-stereotypen/tuerkengefahr-exotismus-orientalismus>>.

103 “Neronische grausamkeit [war] den ottomannischen regenten in gemein gleichsam angeboren.” Metzger, Rayss, p. 183.

104 Martin Wrede, *Feindbild*, in Friedrich Jaeger (ed.), *Enzyklopädie der Neuzeit* (15 vols., Stuttgart 2006), vol. 3, pp. 878 – 890, here p. 887. On theoretical aspects see Lars-Eric Petersen and Bernd Six (eds.), *Stereotype, Vorurteile und soziale Diskriminierung: Theorien, Befunde und Interventionen* (Weinheim 2008).

durance and toughness, using terms such as “*sauffen*” (drinking excessively) suggests the negative aspect of alcohol consumption.¹⁰⁵ In this regard, Metzger characterizes the future Janissaries as follows: “They go to taverns every now and then where they drink excessively and do not pay their bills,”¹⁰⁶ throwing away what they could not consume themselves. In this short description, he combines different concepts of dishonorable and dysfunctional male behavior, including not paying one’s debts, which is associated to debased social status. This synthesis results in an image of wastefulness, dishonesty and, most of all, of untrustworthiness.¹⁰⁷ Kuefstein’s account is different in these regards: The author draws attention to the ideals of honesty and trustworthiness by highlighting them as his very own virtues. He notes that Ferdinand II chose him as his representative at the Sublime Porte because of “the emperor’s trust in him”¹⁰⁸ and due to his “well known good qualities.”¹⁰⁹ Unlike Metzger, Kuefstein’s remarks on alcohol consumption are limited to non-Ottoman dignitaries. In a similar manner to other early modern diplomatic sources, he describes their drinking habit as polite and hospitable.¹¹⁰ Kuefstein emphasizes the “noble” manners of some Ottoman dignitaries, who do not drink alcohol, but ritually serve “coffee and sherbet”¹¹¹ instead. Viewed from the two perspectives of Metzger and Kuefstein respectively, this example again reveals the contextual dependency of the construction and the representation of (idealized) masculinity – or its deviations.

In conclusion, even though the image of the “chivalrous,” brave, and strong masculinity of the Ottoman warrior may be true in some regards, both authors still highlight attributions which stand in contrast to contemporary European “standards” linked to idealized military virtues. Viewed from the perspective of gen-

105 Metzger, Rayss, p. 336; Frank Michael, *Trunkene Männer und nüchterne Frauen: Zur Gefährdung von Geschlechterrollen durch Alkohol in der Frühen Neuzeit*, in Martin Dinges (ed.), *Hausväter, Priester, Kastraten: Zur Konstruktion von Männerrollen in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit* (Göttingen 1998), pp. 187–212, here pp. 194–196; Talkenberger, *Männerrollen*, p. 43.

106 “Sye lauffen hin unnd wider in den wirthsheußeren, sauffen auch hin unnd wider sich ganz voll, geben kein zäch.” Metzger, Rayss, pp. 336–337.

107 Martin Dinges, *Ehre und Geschlecht in der Frühen Neuzeit*, in Sibylle Backmann (ed.), *Ehrkonzepte in der Frühen Neuzeit: Identitäten und Abgrenzungen* (Berlin 1998 [reprint 2018]), pp. 123–147, here p. 140; Karras, *Men*, p. 60.

108 “Vertrauen gegen meiner person.” Kuefstein, *Diarium*, fols. 5v, 7r.

109 “Erkhandten, gueten qualiteten.” Kuefstein, *Diarium*, fol. 10v.

110 Nolde, *Körper*, p. 13; Kuefstein, *Diarium*, fols. 57r, 114r.

111 “Schwarze[s] waßer, [and] scherbet.” Kuefstein, *Diarium*, p. 63v.

der, these deviations may have served to highlight the superiority of the familiar, which was important in the process of generating and consolidating identities.¹¹²

Conclusions

In a broader sense, a focus on the “gendered man” reveals the interplay between masculinity as a social category based on social scripts and prescripts and the valuation of different political/cultural systems.¹¹³ The well-observed dual nature in the perception and in the representation of the Ottoman is therefore extended onto the matrix of gender: there is the duality of danger and opportunity, of threat and temptation, and of male and female.¹¹⁴ More specifically, the analysis of Kuefstein’s and Metzger’s accounts shows that the images of the “gendered man” can be considered as highly contradictory – even within one single text. They depend on various factors, such as on the type of source, as well as on the aim and on the (social) position of the authors. While Hans Ludwig von Kuefstein focuses on his experiences as a grand ambassador and on the (highly ritualized) manners he was faced with in this position, Johann Georg Metzger’s descriptions are based more on common stereotypes. Likewise, the images of masculinities in Kuefstein’s account remain mainly hidden or implicit. Metzger, however, very explicitly adopts and expresses the (mainly negative) notions of Ottoman masculinities. Furthermore, the construction of foreign masculinities within the texts depends on the social and cultural hierarchies of those who are described as well as on the tasks and functions that were expected from them. As Jürgen Martschukat has accurately argued, “It is not enough to only focus on gender, because we then miss how complex gender [is ...]”¹¹⁵ He further states that “Although masculinity can be the vanishing point of an analysis, it is a mutable category, which cannot be decoded without understanding its various relations and intersectionalities.”¹¹⁶ Accordingly, in Metzger’s and Kuefstein’s accounts the “masculinity of the rulers” is – for the

112 Hans Nicklas, *Klammern kollektiver Identität: Zur Funktion von Vorurteilen*, in Burkhard Müller et al. (eds.), *Interkulturell Denken und Handeln: Theoretische Grundlagen und gesellschaftliche Praxis* (Frankfurt am Main 2006), pp. 109–117, here p. 111; Bettella, *Body*, p. 175.

113 Healy, *Representation*, p. 216.

114 Bettella, *Body*, 175.

115 “Ausschließlich Geschlecht als Kategorie in Betracht zu ziehen, greift zu kurz. Wir verpassen dann, wie vielschichtig die Verknüpfungen [sind].” Martschukat, *Viagra*, p. 126.

116 “Männlichkeit kann [...] ein Fluchtpunkt einer Analyse sein, sie ist zugleich aber immer changierend und ohne die vielfältigen anderen Relationen und Intersektionen nicht zu verstehen.” Martschukat, *Viagra*, p. 126.

most part – represented differently from that of the soldiers: On the one hand, there are images referring to effeminacy, lower status, and female domination. On the other, the masculinity of the warriors is linked to violence, brutality, and to the vices of young age. However, in both texts, there are many references to the absence of reason and control, which are the most dominant narratives in the construction of dysfunctional masculinity for both groups. Metzger and Kuefstein may have used these representations to sharpen their own ideas of manhood – mainly by implicitly confirming (or even glorifying) their own concepts against the backdrop of the “other.”¹¹⁷ In this respect, the sources analyzed here are a historical treasure because in these narratives the “familiar” emerges more distinctively from the “unfamiliar.”

117 Johannes Mattes, *Für Gott, Kaiser und Vaterland: Männlichkeitskonstruktionen in Joseph Roths Radetzkymarsch*, in Stefan Krammer (ed.), *MannsBilder: Literarische Konstruktionen von Männlichkeiten* (Vienna 2007), pp. 64–80, here p. 75; Louise Mirrer, *Representing Other Men: Muslims, Jews and Masculine Ideals in Medieval Castilian Epic and Ballad*, in Clare Lees (ed.), *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages* (Minneapolis 1994), pp. 169–186, here p. 170.