

Antonia-Oana Avram

**SIXTEENTH-CENTURY TRAVEL LITERATURE COLLECTORS
AND THE IMAGE OF THE OTTOMANS IN HUMANIST
THOUGHT: FRANCESCO SANSOVINO AND RICHARD
HAKLUYT**

MA Thesis in Comparative History, with a specialization
in Late Antique, Medieval, and Renaissance Studies.

Central European University

Budapest

June 2020

**SIXTEENTH-CENTURY TRAVEL LITERATURE COLLECTORS AND THE
IMAGE OF THE OTTOMANS IN HUMANIST THOUGHT: FRANCESCO
SANSOVINO AND RICHARD HAKLUYT**

by

Antonia-Oana Avram

(Romania)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,
Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the Master of Arts degree in Comparative History, with a specialization in Late Antique,
Medieval, and Renaissance Studies.

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU.

Chair, Examination Committee

Thesis Supervisor

Examiner

Examiner

**SIXTEENTH-CENTURY TRAVEL LITERATURE COLLECTORS AND THE
IMAGE OF THE OTTOMANS IN HUMANIST THOUGHT: FRANCESCO
SANSOVINO AND RICHARD HAKLUYT**

by

Antonia-Oana Avram

(Romania)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,
Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the Master of Arts degree in Comparative History, with a specialization in Late Antique,
Medieval, and Renaissance Studies.

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU.

External Reader

Budapest
June 2020

**SIXTEENTH-CENTURY TRAVEL LITERATURE COLLECTORS AND THE
IMAGE OF THE OTTOMANS IN HUMANIST THOUGHT: FRANCESCO
SANSOVINO AND RICHARD HAKLUYT**

by

Antonia-Oana Avram

(Romania)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,
Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the Master of Arts degree in Comparative History, with a specialization in Late Antique,
Medieval, and Renaissance Studies.

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU.

External Supervisor

Budapest
June 2020

I, the undersigned, **Antonia-Oana Avram**, candidate for the MA degree in Comparative History, with a specialization in Late Antique, Medieval, and Renaissance Studies declare herewith that the present thesis is exclusively my own work, based on my research and only such external information as properly credited in notes and bibliography. I declare that no unidentified and illegitimate use was made of the work of others, and no part of the thesis infringes on any person's or institution's copyright. I also declare that no part of the thesis has been submitted in this form to any other institution of higher education for an academic degree.

Budapest, 05 June 2020

Antonia-Oana Avram
Signature

Abstract

The constant interaction with the Ottoman Empire in the early modern times made Europeans develop an array of possibilities on how to coexist, cooperate, and comprehend this Muslim society. These variants were not expressed only in diplomatic, economic, political, or even religious premises, but also in literary ones. With the advancement of the Ottomans in Europe and the increased interaction with their socio-cultural practices, a vast amount of histories, travelogues, and ethnographic material began to be printed in Europe, either for practical purposes or for the curiosity of the readers. Broadly, the image of the Ottomans emerging from these accounts was one that scared European audiences, but during the sixteenth century it slowly changed, as these descriptions began to display admiration towards the Ottoman Empire. In this thesis I analyse how sixteenth-century humanists' editorial practices and intellectual endeavors were main factors in constructing in their printed works an ambivalent image of the Ottomans. To pursue this line on inquiry, I use as Sansovino's and Hakluyt's works as a case study. I argue that although from both of their works stems an ambivalent image of the Ottoman Empire, each of them has its particularities that are specific to the work of the two humanists. These individual features reflect the influences of various external factors and actors, but as humanists, Sansovino and Hakluyt needed to establish the authority and integrity of their arguments, by putting a lot of emphasis on the veracity of the sources they use and on the credibility of their authors. A close reading of the dedicatory letters, prefaces, correspondence, and paratexts of both Sansovino and Hakluyt reveals that the ambivalent image of the Ottomans that stems from their printed materials is the reflection of their humanist editorial and intellectual endeavors.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude towards a number of people without whose help I would not have been able to complete this thesis: Jan Hennings, my main supervisor, for eagerly continuing to support my topic, for his guidance and confidence in my abilities to put all my ideas together. Marian Coman, who convinced and supported me to apply to CEU and who, during my entire academic career, gave me excellent advice and suggestions. Marcell Sebők for stimulating conversations and useful tips along the two years spent here. My colleagues Serkan Simen, Cevat Sucu, and Iskander Rocha Parker for providing me with insights from their fields of expertise on the matters I was not so well versed on. Last but not least, I am immensely grateful to all of my friends who made my time here at CEU a life-changing experience, and especially to Anja Božič for her unconditional support and encouragement during this last academic year.

Table of contents

Introduction.....	1
Part I. Framing the Ottomans in the writings of Sansovino and Hakluyt.....	8
I.1. Francesco Sansovino’s Image of the Ottomans.....	8
I.2. Richard Hakluyt’s Image of the Ottomans	27
Part II. Humanists’ Agency in Constructing the Image of the Ottomans	47
II.1. Sansovino, Hakluyt, and Editorial Practices	49
II.2. Sansovino’s and Hakluyt’s Intellectual Formation	63
Conclusion	82
Bibliography	84

Introduction

In the early modern period, the Ottoman Empire made Europeans awe at its might. Territorial expansion, military organization, and supreme obedience to the sultan were only several details that filled up the portrait of this empire. With time, the dynamics between European states and the Ottoman Empire diversified, and the conversation between Christian and Muslim societies always translated into a discourse that vacillated between admiration and fear.

This dichotomy of acknowledging or condemning the Ottoman Empire's presence on the cultural, ideological, and political map was strongly linked with the emergence of secularized thinking during the Renaissance. Whether it was in the philosophical perception of man, the individual's role in society (and how this relationship applied to other cultures), or the development of politics and trade interests separate from the interest of the church – the dissociation from long established Christian precepts transformed the Ottoman Empire into a familiar foreigner who nurtured the curiosity of Europeans. The fascination for the history of this Islamic empire, that ruled over a multi-religious and multi-ethnic population, has been lasting until today, as the wide range of analyses of European-Ottoman encounters show.

Traditional historiographical frameworks kept the interaction between European states and Ottoman Empire compartmentalized. Whether approaching political, economic, or religious matters, it was not until towards the end of the twentieth century that scholars began intertwining them to better explain the intricate interactions between the polities.¹ As Palmira

¹ Dorothy M. Vaughan, *Europe and the Turk: A Pattern of Alliances, 1350–1700* (New York: AMS Press, 1976); Pauk Coles, *The Ottoman Impact on Europe* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1968); Paolo Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi* (Florence: G. C. Sansoni, 1975); Charles A. Frazee, *Catholics and Sultans: The Church and the Ottoman Empire, 1453–1923* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Asli Çirakman, *From the "Terror of the World" to the "Sick Man of Europe": European Images of Ottoman Empire and Society from the Sixteenth Century to the Nineteenth* (New York: Peter Lang, 2002); Eric Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople:*

Brummett noted, historians still tend to “run in parallel rather than intersecting tracks” the ways in which the Ottomans were known in the sixteenth century.² There have been published studies dealing with projections of imperial power; histories of the trade exploring economic interests and transnational relations; as well as intellectual and literary histories, which focus on the history of knowledge and identity.³ What she rightly points out is that, in order to understand as best as possible how Europeans knew and understood the Ottomans in the sixteenth century, all these threads must be joined.⁴

Nonetheless, even when these tracks connect in the scholarship, that is when a literary work is contextualized in order to emphasize how economic, political, or religious factors shaped the discourse, the agency of the author is often overlooked. This does not concern well-known and much studied humanists. Rather I am referring to those thinkers whose very agency in collecting and compiling materials on the Ottomans has been neglected because historians mined their texts for sheer content in the search of sources that revealed the early modern European images of the Ottomans. The voluminous editorial accomplishments of the Venetian Francesco Sansovino and the Englishman Richard Hakluyt are a case in point. While this thesis will also deal with the content presented in Sansovino’s and Hakluyt’s compilations, it shifts the focus to the practice of collecting and editing, and to the process of how this content was constructed by humanist erudites.

Nation, Identity, and Coexistence in the Early Modern Mediterranean (Baltimore, John Hopkins University Press, 2006); Daniel Goffman, *The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); John-Paul Ghobrial, *The Whispers of Cities: Information Flows in Istanbul, London, and Paris in the Age of William Trumbull* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014); Nathalie Rothman, *Brokering Empire: Trans-Imperial Subjects Between Venice and Istanbul* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2016); Tobias Graf, *The Sultan's Renegades: Christian-European Converts to Islam and the Making of the Ottoman elite, 1575-1610* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

² Palmira Brummett, “The Lepanto Paradigm Revisited: Knowing the Ottomans in the Sixteenth Century,” in *The Renaissance and the Ottoman World*, Anna Contadini and Claire Norton, eds. (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2013), 92.

³ Brummett, “The Lepanto Paradigm,” 92.

⁴ Brummett, “The Lepanto Paradigm,” 93.

Studies in other fields provide a useful model for this kind of scholarly intervention, for example Mary Thomas Crane's *Framing Authority: Sayings, Self, and Society in Sixteenth Century England*.⁵ Focusing on humanists' notebooks assembled from quotes and emphasizing the intertextuality of fragments rather than an author-centered model, Crane's study on the role of humanists as gatherers and framers, provides several important perspectives. She builds the profile of the humanists gatherers who, despite not producing their own material, "supplement their natural ability with fragments borrowed from existing literature."⁶ By framing, she understands the process of selecting, rearranging, and assimilating ideas from the material they accessed. Through the collection of such passages, the original authority of the source is kept, while the production of new texts is made possible.⁷ Her main argument, on which I partially base my own case, is that through these practices of gathering and framing, humanists created a hybrid method of writing through which they kept the authority of classical texts, but also provided an influential model for authorial practice and for authoritative self-fashioning.⁸ I see Sansovino's and Hakluyt's collecting and editorial activities at the heart of the process of gathering and framing.

Another work that sheds light on the role of humanists is Margaret Meserve's *Empires of Islam in Renaissance Historical Thought*.⁹ Though focusing only on fifteenth and very early sixteenth-century humanists' history books on Islamic societies, Meserve builds her case upon the multiple roles these Renaissance thinkers performed. She argues that these history-writers were not only civil servants, but also thinkers inspired by the idea of *vita activa* which very much influenced the activity of Renaissance humanists.¹⁰ And it was because of the

⁵ Mary Thomas Crane, *Framing Authority: Sayings, Self, and Society in Sixteenth-Century England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).

⁶ Crane, *Framing Authority*, 17.

⁷ Crane, *Framing Authority*, 17.

⁸ Crane, *Framing Authority*, 3.

⁹ Margaret Meserve, *Empires of Islam in Renaissance Historical Thought* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008).

¹⁰ Meserve, *Empires of Islam*, 7.

overlapping of all these personal layers and influences, that linked pursuit of historical truth, political propaganda, personal convictions, and often self-promotion, that the emergence of a new method of inquiry towards Islamic empires was possible.¹¹ Though she notes that prevalent ancient and medieval thinking traditions limited the critical inquiry towards the “other,” Meserve nonetheless affirms something similar to Crane: that by mid-sixteenth century, humanist history writing was a blend between classical models, skeptical approaches to earlier authorities, renewed interest in rhetoric, and a secularized theory of causation.¹² It is within this context that I locate the present thesis.

My argument is that sixteenth-century humanists’ editorial practices and intellectual endeavors were main factors in constructing in their printed works an ambivalent image of the Ottomans. To pursue this line of inquiry, I use as Sansovino’s and Hakluyt’s editions as a case study. I argue that from both Sansovino’s and Hakluyt’s works emerges an ambivalent image of the Ottoman Empire, and although this image follows very similar patterns broadly speaking, each of them has its particularities that are specific to the work of the two humanists. Sansovino purposely constructed a multi-layered image of the Ottoman Empire, one that inspired fear and admiration, in which three levels can be identified: one where he oscillates between a negative and neutral general representation of the Ottomans; one where he delineates a difference between the good and the bad ruler; and one where he talks about human nature and character of the ottoman subjects. While Sansovino’s image was intended as such, it is more difficult to discern such intentions in Hakluyt’s version of the Ottomans. The latter’s ambivalent image of the Ottomans is a clash between the types of sources compiled in the collection. Since the purpose of his collection was to document the travels of the Englishmen, the material touching upon the Ottoman Empire is limited and also chosen in accordance with Hakluyt’s other

¹¹ Meserve, *Empires of Islam*, 3.

¹² Meserve, *Empires of Islam*, 8.

interests. However, the questions of how these ambivalent images emerged still stands and will be subjected to detailed analysis in the thesis.

The present study also examines the depiction of otherness as a means of sixteenth-century humanists' self-fashioning. I argue that the emergence of this ambivalent image was possible only because Sansovino and Hakluyt acted as filters through which the ideas, concerns, and agendas of their times percolated. I provide a two-pronged argument to clarify this process. For this, I bring in two argument. First, the image of the Ottomans is the result of the two humanists' editing activities as gatherers, translators, and authors. Second, the same ambivalent image is the result of a careful selection, paraphrasing, and arrangement of information from other thinkers, whose ideas Sansovino and Hakluyt used to shape, emphasize, or even dissimulate their own in order to self-fashion themselves as humanists.

In order to establish what was Sansovino's and Hakluyt's contribution in constructing the image of the Ottomans it is first necessary to grasp what exactly that image looked like. Thus, the thesis is divided into two parts. In the first I analyze what is the image of the Ottomans that emerges from Sansovino's and Hakluyt's works. Here I included two chapters, one on how each of the two humanists portrayed the Ottomans in their publications. Since the nature of works, purpose for compiling the material, and contextual particularities of both Sansovino and Hakluyt were different, the methods I used for tracing this image is different for each of them, too. Because the types of sources allowed me to do so, in Sansovino's case, I focus mostly on his own remarks and opinions on the material he compiled. In this way I can offer a more straightforward interpretation of how the sources he compiled influenced his perception on the Ottomans. Hakluyt, however, he left very few words of his own on the Ottoman Empire, but a lot more clues on how he perceived other foreign cultures, and how the Ottomans were embedded in this wider context. And since sometimes the absence of influence is often as revealing as its presence, I tried to grasp how the image of the Ottomans is shaped in *Principall*

Navigations by fitting it into Hakluyt's larger understanding of the world order. To do so, starting from his stated purpose for compiling the collection, I use his understanding of the English nation and how he constructs it in contradiction to the Spanish. Taking these as two extremes, I analyze the content of the documents from his collection, and based on it, I try to underline how Hakluyt reflected through them his own ideas. The purpose of this part of analysis is to show that despite the different nature and reasons of their publications, Sansovino and Hakluyt were able to accommodate an ambivalent and even contradictory image of the Ottomans in their compendia.

In the second part I analyze what was the editorial and intellectual imprint the two humanists left on their work and how their activities and self-fashioning contributed to the creation of this ambivalent image of the Ottomans. Even if both Sansovino and Hakluyt were the channels through which official state interests were transmitted, they were also agents through which their own humanist education and interests were filtered. These latter factors contributed to the "internal logic" of their works. Thus, I divided this part into two sections where I try to engage the two humanists into dialogue. In the first one, I explore the editorial efforts Sansovino and Hakluyt put into their works, and demonstrate that their perception on issues such as authorship, historical truth, and accurate translation framed to a great extent the information that actually got to the public. In the second one, by tracing the references from Sansovino's and Hakluyt's works, be them to scholars, thinkers, agents of state, I try to see what was the available universe of representations from which they drew their ideas and arguments. In other words, I try to see what ideas influenced them and to what intellectual trends they were attributing their works to. The purpose of these parts of the analysis is to underline that these endeavors were at the same time self-fashioning process through which both Sansovino and Hakluyt wanted to construct themselves as skilled multi-profiled humanists.

Through the present study I hope to partially answer some questions that scholars have previously raised, but have not answered yet, and also, if possible, to open the way for further inquiries, both in the way in which the image of the Ottomans is constructed and in understanding the roles of humanists as collectors, editors, and authors in the second half of the sixteenth century.

Part I. Framing the Ottomans in the writings of Sansovino and Hakluyt

I.1. Francesco Sansovino's Image of the Ottomans

“Who does not wonder at the barbarians who, in the beginning, were unarmed with any discipline?” noted a humanist in the dedicatory letter addressed to a Florentine nobleman, attached as the first page in a 1560 literature compendium about the Ottomans.¹³ A little further down the lines of the letter, however, the writer's tone changed as he remarked that “It cannot be argued, though, that through discipline, obedience, and fortune, the Turkish lineage is not notable and grand.”¹⁴ Such contradictory words about the Ottomans might have been confusing to a contemporary readership. But how did such opposing positions ranging between disparagement and praise come into print?

Ever since Herodotus, European writers have taken an interest in providing descriptions of “the other” in their works. Whether the reasons were economic, political, or religious, the result was a mirrored image: the superiority of one's society reflected in the inferiority of a foreign people.¹⁵ During the Renaissance, humanists reinterpreted the role of man in the universal order, and provided a new understanding of how humans and their role in societies were understood. The emergence of the Ottoman Empire in the Middle Ages and its rapid expansion towards the Mediterranean, raised European awareness of a potential danger and, simultaneously, awakened the curiosity for knowing more about Ottoman culture. However, it was not until the beginning of the sixteenth century that the sources containing descriptions of

¹³ Francesco Sansovino, “Dedicatory Letter,” in *Dell'istoria universale dell'origine, et imperio de Turchi parte prima*, (Venice: 1560)

¹⁴ “Dedicatory Letter,” in *Dell'Historia Universale*, vol. 1, (1560).

¹⁵ François Hartog, *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*, trans. Janet Lloyd (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).

the Ottomans began to array different perceptions.¹⁶ The separation, although in an incipient state, of religious concerns from political and economic state interests, as well as the diversification of the profile of the travelers to the empire, were only some of the factors that led to the construction of a more complex perception of Ottoman culture. Humanist thought also altered the long-established perception of the Ottoman Empire as a faulty and vicious version of European Christianity. By the 1500s, the Ottoman realm was becoming a more familiar, yet still quite foreign entity to European mind. The constant exchanges and interactions with the Ottoman world made travelers and intellectuals reconsider the parameters within which they defined themselves and their cultures in relation to Ottoman otherness. By placing elements of Ottoman culture in already established mental categories, they gave birth to a process of mutual translatability of each others' norms and values, a process that has been described as "commensurability," in other contemporary contexts.¹⁷ Although Ottoman and European practices and principles were never fully synchronized, the humanist thinking implied also the appearance of a more universal understanding of culture and humanity. The capacity to perceive the similarities between the customs, costumes, and organization of peoples who were believed to be inherently different, did not lead to an understanding of only one culture, but rather they were defined in relation to one another. In the second half of the sixteenth century, European intellectuals were becoming aware of how the perception of the other was a projected perception of themselves, as Montaigne noted in his memorable essay *On cannibals* that "every one gives the title of barbarism to everything that is not in use in his own country [...] indeed, we have no other level of truth and reason than the example and idea

¹⁶ Nancy Bisaha, *Creating East and West: Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks*, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006); Margaret Meserve, *Empires of Islam*; Daniel Goffman, *The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe*; Daniel J Viktus, "Early Modern Orientalism: Representations of Islam in Sixteenth-and Seventeenth-Century Europe," in *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other*, David R Blanks and Michael Frassetto, eds. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999), 207-230.

¹⁷ Sanjay Subrahmanyam, *Courtly encounters: Translating Courtliness and Violence in Early Modern Eurasia*, (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2012), 1-33.

of the opinions and customs of the place wherein we live.”¹⁸ By the end of the same century, the cultural translation that took place between the Ottoman Empire and the European lands led to the emergence of self-fashioning in the image of the other, as well as to the depiction of the other if not in their own image, at least according to it.¹⁹

It was in this context that Francesco Sansovino wrote, in Venice, the above quoted words to the Florentine noblemen. A lawyer by profession, Sansovino (1521-1583) was more drawn to poetry, literary commentaries, history, and political thought. As the son of architect Jacopo Tatti (called Sansovino), he had the advantage of meeting important intellectual figures and developed a vast network of acquaintances. After finishing his studies in Padua, Sansovino moved to Venice where he established a name as an editor and, later, a publisher.²⁰ At the end of his life, he left a legacy of over eighty titles printed under his name, ranging from literary commentaries, translations, and pamphlets to political commentaries, history books, and compilations of travel literature, which reflect the shift in Sansovino’s interests.²¹ Among these publications, there are several titles which encompass between their covers information about the Ottomans such as the compendiums of travel literature and history *Dell’historia universale dell’origine, et imperio de Turchi* (1560, 1568, 1573, 1582), *Gl’annali Turcheschi overo vite de principi della casa Othomana* (1573) or the political commentaries and pamphlets *Lettera o vero discorso sopra le predittioni per la guerra del Turco* (1570)²² and *Informatione di M.*

¹⁸ John M. Cohen, transl., *Michel de Montaigne. Essays* (Middlesex: Penguin, 1958), 108-109.

¹⁹ Gülru Necipoğlu, “Süleyman the Magnificent and the Representation of Power in the Context of Ottoman Hapsburg-Papal Rivalry,” *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 71, No. 3 (1989), 401-427; Bronwen Wilson, “Reflecting on the Turk in late sixteenth-century Venetian portrait books,” *Word & image* 19, no. 1-2 (2003), 38-58.

²⁰ Elena Valeri, “Francesco Sansovino” in *Christian-Muslim Relations. A Bibliographical History, volume 6, Western Europe (1500-1600)*, David Thomas, and John Chesworth, eds. (Boston: Brill, 2014), 567.

²¹ Estimated number based on consulting *Censimento nazionale delle edizioni italiane del XVI secolo* database containing entries from digitized catalogues of Italian libraries and archives: http://edit16.iccu.sbn.it/web_iccu/ima.htm

²² Sansovino republished this letter his treaty *Del Secretario* (Venice: Vincenzo Valgrisi, 1580) and in *Historia Universale* (1582).

Francesco Sansovino a soldati Christiani (1570).²³ These have scarcely been studied until this point, because historians argue that their lack of originality as mere translations and paraphrases of existing history books on the Ottoman Empire make them Sansovino's less notable works.²⁴ While not rejecting this argument, I believe that Sansovino's editorial input influenced the manner in which image of the Ottomans was shaped to a greater extent than historians have previously argued.

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze the image of the Ottomans in Sansovino's works by looking at the paratext, rather than at the compiled material.²⁵ My argument is that in his publications, Sansovino purposefully constructed a multi-layered ambivalent image of the Ottoman Empire. At least three levels can be identified in Sansovino's texts. On a general level, he vacillates between a negative and a neutral representation of the Ottomans. On the second level, he deals about the form of government that is princely rule and its implications, where

²³ Edit16 catalogue refers to this as being published in 1570, but Moz writes in his study that it is in 1582. This may be because *Informatione a soldati Christiani* was integrated in the 1582 edition of *Historia Universale*; See Adriano Moz, "Francesco Sansovino. A polygraph in Cinquecento Venice: His Life and Works," Ph.D. diss. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1985), 90-91 and http://edit16.iccu.sbn.it/scripts/iccu_ext.dll?fn=10&i=73553.

²⁴ All notable studies dealing with Sansovino which were written before the last decade of the twentieth century underline his lack of originality in his publications about the Ottomans. Paul Grendler's main argument is that Sansovino was more interested in the popularization of works about the Ottomans, rather than writing about novel ideas. Eric Cochrane and Adriano Moz also underlined that Sansovino's Ottoman works are compilations, not original pieces. Stéphane Yérasimos also calls Sansovino's *Historia Universale* more of a "hasty compilation, rather than a thoughtful work." In more recent studies, this argument is somewhat confronted. Bronwen Wilson refers only to the illustrations Sansovino copied from Nicolas de Nicolay, while Elena Bonora only partly employs Grendler's argument, as she acknowledges how religious influences shaped his work. Andrei Pippidi ascribes Sansovino a similar role as he notes the humanist's interest in the profitable market of printed material about the Ottomans. However, Pippidi tries to emphasize that, despite the pragmatic purpose of his publishing activity, Sansovino took a personal interest in the matters. As this argument is true, Pippidi's claim that Sansovino travelled to the Ottoman Empire and personally discussed with its inhabitants about their Scythian origins is inaccurate, since Sansovino took on Cambini's and Pope Pius II's refutations of this theory, and no sources indicate that he has ever left the Christian territories in his travels. See Paul Grendler, "Francesco Sansovino and Italian Popular History 1560-1600", *Studies in the Renaissance*, vol. 16 (1969), 139-180; Eric Cochrane, *Historians and Historiography in the Italian Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 333-334; Adriano Moz, "Francesco Sansovino, a Polygraph in Cinquecento Venice; Stéphane Yérasimos, "De la collection de voyages à l'Histoire Universelle," *Turcica* 22 (1988), 19-41; Elena Bonora, *Ricerche su Francesco Sansovino: Imprenditore librario e letterato*, Memorie / Classe di scienze morali, lettere ed arti, vol. 52 (Venice: Istituto Veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti, 1994); Bronwen Wilson, "Reflecting on the Turk"; Andrei Pippidi, *Visions of the Ottoman world in Renaissance Europe* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013), 47-48.

²⁵ In the context of this analysis, paratext is defined as all the documents and textual compositions which are separated from the main body of compiled material and can be clearly attributed to Sansovino; see Gérard Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of interpretation*, Vol. 20 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

he makes a clear distinction between a good and a bad ruler. On the third level, he talks about the human nature and the religiously and culturally constructed character of the Ottoman subjects, particularly those integrated in the sultan's army. Although a similar image may result from an analysis of the way in which Sansovino selected and arranged the compiled material, an examination of the adjacent documents from these compilations may highlight not only the existence of a ambivalent image, but also Sansovino's own understanding of it.²⁶ The present inquiry traces the transformation of Ottoman identity by focusing on the compiler's own ideas, and sidesteps issues related to the audience or the spread of the publications because they would go beyond the scope of the analysis and would leave more questions open than answered.²⁷

To pursue this analysis, I analyze the material that Sansovino himself wrote, as it reflects his own ideas on the Ottoman Empire. In this chapter I mainly refer to the first edition from 1560 and the last edition published during his life in 1582 of *Historia universale dell'origine et imperio de Turchi*. I have chosen these two editions because they contain the better part of the paratext written by Sansovino: the 1560 edition contains three explanatory notes – *Avvertimenti* – on the material compiled in the volume, while the one from 1582 one includes Sansovino's two original pamphlets *Lettera o vero discorso* and *Informationi a soldati Christiani*. Though at first glance these pamphlets are materials propagating Christian crusade, it would be too simplistic to limit their interpretation to what seems to be primary message and unfair to dismiss the layers of meaning Sansovino ascribed to the texts. I also refer to dedicatory letters and prefaces to the readers attached to these editions, as well as to the dedicatory letter from *Gl'annali Turcheschi*. The *Avvertimenti* are very similar to prefaces to the readers as

²⁶ Cochrane argues that many of the sources Sansovino compiled contained contradictory views, and therefore he let his readers decide on the good or bad character; he believes that Sansovino's main purpose in compiling that material was to promote objective inquiry, rather than crusades. See Cochrane, *Historians and Historiography*, 334.

²⁷ See Grendler, *Sansovino and Italian Popular History*; though a relatively old study, it is still a good reference point to understand how Sansovino was integrated in the printers-readers market in sixteenth-century Venice.

they contain explanations regarding the translated material, offer details about rephrasing of the text, and contain indications on how one should read the text. More importantly, such printed interventions sometimes reveal essential details on the author's reason for compiling or translating the texts. The process behind composing these compendiums and pamphlets will be analyzed in detail in the second part of the thesis but it is worth mentioning that even though they contain information extracted from other sources, they are the only extensive materials about the Ottomans written under Sansovino's name and thus can be seen to reflect his ideas.

Sansovino's ambivalent image of the Ottoman Empire was strongly influenced by his political thinking. Although I explain in a more detailed manner in the second part of the thesis the humanist learning process which led to the formation of his politico-ideological thinking, there are several ideas that shed light on why Sansovino's image of the Ottoman Empire might appear contradictory. Sansovino's political thought was centered on the nature of good government, which translated as a well-balanced relationship between men and their government, whether it was between subjects and prince, or citizens and republic.²⁸ The idea of government which he wanted to promote to his readers was built on social order and a just society based on concepts of tranquility, good morals, and prevailing harmony.²⁹ For example, he wrote: "when men must govern a city they should have civil equality, good laws and a good nature."³⁰ Because Sansovino's rhetoric interlaces administrative, ideological, political and religious ideas – thus making these spheres strongly interdependent in the larger context of his writings – it would be difficult to separate them artificially in my analysis. Thus, I will employ the two categories Sansovino himself talks about: the profile of government with its embodiment and the profile of the peoples inhabiting the empire.

²⁸ Donald Epstein, "Francesco Sansovino (1523-1583) and Italian Political Thought" PhD diss. (University of Oregon, 1972), 70; Lucette Valensi, *The Birth of the Despot: Venice and the Sublime Porte* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1993), 40.

²⁹ Donald Epstein, "Sansovino and Italian Political Thought," 71.

³⁰ Francesco Sansovino, *Concetti Politici* (Venice: Giovanni Antonio Bertano, 1578), 71.

For Sansovino, the best form of government was the republic. In his view, its aim was to appeal to a man's intellectual soul, rather than to his sensitive and vegetative powers. For him, this dichotomy marks the distinction and his preference between a republican, and a princely rule, since the latter led men to destruction by placing human destinies and souls in the care of a person who received his power through senses. Sansovino considered this to be a basic human behavior that needed to be overturned.³¹ On the other hand, republics represented the delicate balance between man's ideal and animal nature, and the republican rule was an attempt to achieve harmony between intellect, reason, and physical needs. Sansovino argued that, as far as history teaches, it demonstrates the most noble instincts of human beings as unselfish creatures governed by their brains.³² For him, the ideal historical model for a republic was Rome. He believed that there can be good government only in a state where there is a clear division of authority between civil and military officials, and where people know their rights and duties.³³ For Sansovino, when it came to administrative or military structures there were no better men than the Romans and so he praised any community or state that came close to this model. The political entity that fulfilled these requirements at the time of Sansovino was the Ottoman Empire. A negative comparison of Ottoman subjects as slaves to the sultan with ancient Rome was a commonplace in Venetians' thought and they contrasted the general slavery of the Ottoman people with Venice's mixed form of government.³⁴ But for Sansovino, the analogy between the Ottoman Empire and Rome was different. The Ottomans were the only people whose war strategies, order of the army, as well as its discipline and fortune

³¹ Epstein, "Sansovino and Italian Political Thought," 99.

³² Epstein, "Sansovino and Italian Political Thought," 111-112.

³³ Moz, "Francesco Sansovino, a polygraph," 80.

³⁴ Bronwen Wilson, *The World in Venice: Print, the City, and Early Modern Identity* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), 144.

approximated that of the Romans', and Sansovino sustained this idea from the 1560s to even after the inquisition modified his last edition of *Historia universale*.³⁵

Though the Ottoman Empire was by no means a republic, Sansovino managed to accommodate it in his mental categories. Although in his view, the princely government was more corruptible, Sansovino advised that a prince would be better making laws than taking the riches resulted from the labors of his people, as doing the latter turns him into a tyrant.³⁶ But since the prince himself cannot escape human animal nature, he is prone to harming his own people because his instincts cannot be undermined by his rational mind, which gives the law. Sansovino argues that reason is the best defense for a prince: through the power of reason a prince can surmount human nature, and thus arm himself with a weapon that his enemies cannot use against him: control over his own instincts.³⁷ Eventually, Sansovino's guide to how a prince should act is paradoxical, because he believes that a ruler should play the role of a moderate beast: imposing authority on his subjects, strong in the face of the enemy, yet without being cruel or tyrannical.³⁸ As he himself stated in the dedicatory letter of the first volume of *Historia universale* from 1560, out of all the principalities who made a name for themselves in the world, he has always admired the one under the rule of the sultan, who kept people obedient, and through his actions increased the happy fortune of the entire nation, which is worthy of his glory and name.³⁹ A few years later, however Sansovino's tone towards the sultan's actions changed:

³⁵ "Et se cominciando noi dall'origine sua verremo discorredo con diligenza le cose loro fatte così in casa come suori, diremo et forse con verita, che la disciplina della militia, e la obediencia e la fortuna de Romani dopo la rovina di quella Republica sia trapassata a questa generatione", "Dedicatory letter," *Historia Universale*, vol. 1 (1560); "Percioche quanto alla militia, io non so veder qual gente fra la nostra sia meglio regolata e piu somigliante a gli ordini de Romani della Turchesca," "Dedicatory letter", in *Gl'Annali Turcheschi*, 1573; "Percioche se si consideravene, io non so vedere, qual gente sia nell'arte della Guerra meglio regolata di questa; ne quali ordini piu somiglianti a uelli de gli antichi Romani dei loro." "Dedicatory letter," in *Historia universale dell'origine, et imperio de'Turchi* (1582).

³⁶ *Concetti Politici*, 6.

³⁷ *Concetti Politici*, 124.

³⁸ Epstein, "Sansovino and Italian Political Thought," 78.

³⁹ "Dedicatory letter," in *Historia Universale*, vol. 1 (1560).

What other image in our eyes combines arrogance, pomp, great pride than that of the Turk? He is inflated with an excessive persuasion to be a god on earth, not speaking, not practicing and not talking with various intelligent noblemen as our Princes do, he remains in a grand, dangerous and obscure ignorance: which awaken in him, by not understanding those worthy things which are known by way of reading. [He does not understand that] it is necessary that you often refer to the opinion of others. Did these things go against the natural order: being loathsome to the well-trained minds, and bringing little benefits to his subjects? This king who loves to be more feared than loved, converted the true officials in the direction of tyranny [...] What virtue are you grateful for? Which illustrious work of his deserves a reward? To which strength of glory does he aspire? And what ideas of his make him worthy of eternal remembrance? Obviously, none, because having given up the place of the reason for that of sensuality, that which takes pleasure in carnal [activities], that which is the most wicked vice, that which is the most heinous crime, how could you expect any greater cruelty from him?⁴⁰

This passage reflects the Mediterranean politico-military context at the time when Sansovino wrote the pamphlet: the religious implications of the Battle of Lepanto. Although it is, as the title states, a publication meant to motivate Christian men to engage in a war against the Ottomans, Sansovino's *Informatione a soldati Christiani* contains several details that complicate the image of the Ottomans for the readers. The portrait of the arrogant, lustful, stubborn and incapable ruler seems to be a leitmotif in this pamphlet. But a closer look into the text reveals that Sansovino directs this critique solely towards Selim II.⁴¹

In Sansovino's eyes, Selim II's actions will bring him "the eternal disgrace of his tenebrous name."⁴² His judgement in all matters was clouded, full of errors, and, furthermore, his leadership in the art of war lacked any military strategy, as he only took advantage of the

⁴⁰ "All'incontro quale alterezza, qual fasto, qual maggior superbia si puo rappre sentare a' nostri occhi di quella del Turco? Egli gonfio da una eccessiua persuasione d'essere un Dio in terra, non fauellando non praticando e non discorrendo con diuersi nobili ingegni come fanno i Principi nostri, se ne resta in una grande, pericolosa e oscura ignoranza: la quale partorisce in lui, che non intendendo le cose degne se non per uia di lettura, e necessario che si riporti spesso all'altrui parere. Questa cosi fatta saluatichezza contra l'ordine naturale, e odiosa a gli animi ben composti, che aporta altro se non poca satisfattione a suoi sudditi? Questo Re ch'ama d'essere temuto piu ch'amato, conuertita la uera Podesta regia della Tirannica, qual begnita dimostra e forte alcuna di persone? Qual uirtu gli e grata? A quale opera illustre rende egli premio? A qual forte di Gloria aspira? E che pensiero fa mai degno d'eterna memoria? Certo, nessuno, percioche hauendo la ragione ceduto il luogo alla sensualita, a qual diletto carnale, a qual uitio piu scelerato, a qual delitto piu atroce, e a qual crudelta maggiore non attende egli?" *Informatione a Soldati Christiani*, A5v.

⁴¹ Cf. Chapter 3 in Bonora, *Ricerche su Francesco Sansovino* and Bronwen Wilson, *The World in Venice*, 143.

⁴² "perpetua vergogna del suo oscurissimo nome," *Informatione*, A2v.

mistakes made by Christians, and waged war on a whim without listening to his councilors.⁴³ In Sansovino's view, Selim II was the bad prince, the one who was ruled by his bad habits and gave in to his animal instincts, clouding his judgement.⁴⁴ He develops this argument further by stating that Selim II's advisors became incapable counseling him because they were too involved in competing against each other for a place among the Sultan's companions (*musahib*).⁴⁵ Thus, for Sansovino, the Ottoman prince was a model which inspired the actions of his followers: as long as the prince's nature was corrupted, his subjects would be the same. What seems to have been the worst of Selim II's actions was not how his foolhardiness affected the Ottoman subjects, but how it destroyed the order established by his predecessors. By breaking the capitulations made by the previous sultans with the Christian states, Selim imposed a tyrannical law, acted "contrary to the divine and natural reason," and defied the authority of the Venetian Senate.⁴⁶

To this extent, Sansovino constructs Selim II's image mirrored in the image of the previous sultans. By disobeying his ancestors' peace treaties with the Europeans, he disgraced his predecessors, showing no loyalty to their good deeds.⁴⁷ Until Selim II, the Ottoman dynasty had lived in "splendour and amplour [which] has been done by meetings of intelligent men [...] until he came to the throne and destroyed those things through means which are to be found only in a person with the darkest mind."⁴⁸ In comparison with Selim II, previous Ottoman rulers are to be remembered as moderate, religious men and keepers of the faith

⁴³ *Informatione*, A3r.

⁴⁴ Sansovino, *Lettera o vero discorso sopra le predittioni per la guerra del Turco* (Venice, 1570), A5v.

⁴⁵ *Lettera o vero discorso*, A5v.

⁴⁶ *Lettera o vero discorso*, A3r; "Percioche essendosi costui posto a sedere nel Throno del padre, e conseruando le nuoue e l'antiche capitulationi con diuersi popoli e Signori, uenuto a quelle che esso ha con questo Setenissimo e Religioso Senato, osseruare da suoi maggiori con tanta fede, le guiro e sottoscrisse in apparenza con faccia tanto piu allegra, quanto ch'esso era piu fermo nel suo proposito di non uolerle osseruare," *Lettera o vero discorso*, A2r.

⁴⁷ *Informatione*, A2v.

⁴⁸ *Lettera o vero discorso*, A4v.

[loyalty].⁴⁹ Sansovino explicitly praises Suleyman when criticizing Selim's actions against the "distinguished works of his father."⁵⁰ Thus, in Sansovino's view, and heavily emphasized in *Gl'annali Turcheschi*, Ottoman rulers were generally notable characters, whose dignity made them worthy of their success in expanding the empire. However, in the same works, Selim II became the embodiment of everything that contradicted the idea of a good, rational ruler. For Sansovino, the most admirable prince was the one who was able to keep his subjects organized and obedient, in any living conditions and regardless their wicked nature.

When it comes to the image of the people, Sansovino oscillates between applauding the military organization and obedience of the Ottomans and condemning their behavior and nature. The obedience of the Ottomans is one of the elements he emphasizes the most. The dedications of the 1560 and 1582 editions and the letter to the readers from the 1573 edition of *Historia Universale*, reveal Sansovino's recurrent fascination with the Roman-like discipline and obedience of the Ottoman militia, owing it all to the sultan's greatness and good fortune.⁵¹ The dedication of the *Annali* underlines that the history of the Ottoman advancement is worth studying because the order of their armies and civil government prove they are men of valor and not rough rulers.⁵² Sansovino's tone is, however, completely different in the earlier publications of 1570. He argues that the organization and obedience of the Ottomans is crushed when the sultan on the throne is weak and unable to control his subjects and keep them from

⁴⁹ "Pecioche sentendo esso ricordarlo per continente huomo, per religiosi, e per osseruatore e mantenitor della fede, pare a lui che gli si rinfacci la sua dissolute maniera di uiuere, l'infedelta e perfidia uerso i Principi del mondo e la sua molta disobediencia e poca osseruanza delle sue leggi," *Informatione*, A5v. In the next chapter which will investigate the process of constructing Sansovino's texts, I analyze that the term "fede," especially in *Informatione a soldati Christiani*, denotes both religious faith and political loyalty interchangeably.

⁵⁰ *Informatione*, A5v.

⁵¹ "Dedicatory letter," in *Historia Universale*, vol. 1 (1560); "Dedicatory letter," in *Historia Universale* (1582); "Letter to the readers," in *Historia Universale* (1573).

⁵² "che la grandezza e la potenza della natione Turchesca, sia degna di molta consideratione, percioche vededosi qual sia l'institutione della loro antica militia, et qual l'ordine de governi civili, si dee far giuditio si come si vede per pruoua, che siano huomini di valore, e non punto rozzi," "Dedicatory letter," in *Gl'Annali Turcheschi* (1573).

running away out of fear.⁵³ Thus, Sansovino paints the sultan as the model image of moral behavior for his subjects.

A look at Sansovino's other publications that touch upon the idea of man could shed light on how he understood the nature and behavior of the Ottomans. Although I explain in a more detailed manner in the second part of the thesis the humanist learning process which led to the formation of his philosophical thinking, there are several ideas which strongly shape his general understanding of man. As other polygraphs, Sansovino adopted and adapted the ancient and humanist historiographical approach, arguing that the study of history implies more than military and political events. He believed that history should be centered around man in two ways. By studying the deeds of previous men, one could understand and learn from their experiences, and one would be able to predict future reactions and shape the course of actions by his own will. For Sansovino, a man could be integrated in the society and its structures only if he masters that which he can control: his mind and his body. And because he considered that man ought to have guidance in this process of self-understanding, many of his works paint the portrait of the ideal man, not only morally, but also physically.

Sansovino published a series of compilations that dealt with anatomical issues such as *L'edificio del Corpo Humano, Della materia medicinale libri IV*, as well as a translation of Aristotle's *Anima*.⁵⁴ The dedications attached to these works tell that for Sansovino, human intellect is a man's highest asset, as it is the only part of man that cannot merely appear evolved, but it actually has to be. Taking on Aristotle's idea, he believed in the mind's superiority over that of the body, but the latter was still important because it serves as the dwelling of the

⁵³ "Ci dee anco grandamente muouere la corruttione de Turchi, i quali rallentata in parte la loro fierezza naturale per le già gustate delicatezze, e massimamente sotto un Principe morbido e dissolute in ogni sorte di piaceri, guarandosi essi da pericoli, a quali alter uol correuano con una lor certa pazza persuasione, per esser mancata in loro la obediencia e la religione sprezzata dal suo Signore, uanno molto piu lenti e mal uolentieri alla morte, onde in conseguenza sono anco molto piu debili del solito per paura," *Lettera o vero discorso*, A5r.

⁵⁴ Francesco Sansovino, *L'edificio del corpo umano*, (Venice, 1550); Sansovino, *L'anima d'Aristotele*, (Venice, 1560); Sansovino, *Della materia medicinale. Libri quattro*, (Venice: Gio. Andrea Valvassori detto Guadagnino, 1562).

intellect. Because of this Sansovino believed that great effort should be put in maintaining a healthy human body and, most importantly, that man is able to heal himself. The same idea, that man is able to self-regulate his actions and thoughts can also be identified in his political works, where he is highly concerned with how man can escape his animal nature, behave, and use his best traits in such a way that he can acquire the status of perfect citizen in the perfect republic. Sansovino believed that the animal nature of man can be repressed. This idea is reflected in his translation of Fenestella's *D'i sacerdotii, e d'i magistrati romani* which had a different division than the original.⁵⁵ In Sansovino's edition, the first books dealt with how man could develop his moral and spiritual aspects, since they are the traits that differentiate him from brutes, while the second part, presented laws as the method through which man can restrain his instinctual nature and facilitate the realization of moral reason. Needless to say, even though all these works were only translations and compilations on which Sansovino wrote, they influenced how he shaped the idea of man in his other publications.

For Sansovino, the idea that man was able to control his body and mind was extrapolated also to the Ottomans. First, he tries to convince Christian soldiers that the Ottomans are "men from the same flesh and bone as you [Christian soldiers], in any case not more noble or valuable, but infamous and lacking any order of the militia."⁵⁶ Although written under religious compulsion, this passage also underlines a key idea in Sansovino's thought, that goes beyond the common labels ascribed to the Ottomans. By the time he was writing, the Ottomans were metamorphosing from misunderstood barbarians into people of the same nature as those for whom Sansovino was writing. By oscillating in his texts between the stereotypical representation of the uncivilized infidel and the humanized depiction of the people under the sultan's rule, Sansovino becomes the channel through which the image of the Ottomans began

⁵⁵ Lucius Fenestella, *D'i sacerdotii e d'i magistrati romani*, trans. Francesco Sansovino (Venice: Gabriel Giolito de Ferrari, 1547).

⁵⁶ "Questi dico sono i Soldati co' quali uoi hauete a combattere, huomini d'ossa e di carne come uoi, e non punto piu nobili o ualorosi, ma infami e priui d'ogni ordine di militia," *Informatione*, A10r.

to be reshaped. If his portrayal of the sultans resulted into a clear ambivalent image that separated Selim II from previous rulers, Sansovino's descriptions of the Ottoman people is full of discontinuities and incoherence. A closer look into his works highlights the difficulty of discerning a constant position in his thoughts about ethnic, religious, and political divisions of the Ottomans.

Sansovino dedicates several pages to describe the misery of the tributary people who, dragged unwillingly under the rule of the Sultan, now have to live among a people "so vile and rude, enemy of all humanity, and deprived of all the things that usually make for a civilized life, or the diligent cure of the study of the belle-sciences."⁵⁷ Sansovino lets his readers know that the people who were forcefully converted to Islam, live under oppression and have many obligations, such as child levy (*devshirme*) and poll tax (*cizye*). Nonetheless, he hopes that because of their nature, these oppressed people would be able to return to their Christian lands.⁵⁸ It can be seen here that he believed that these peoples were able to change their own condition due to their nature. In Sansovino's opinion, these unfortunate Christian peoples could never integrate properly into the Ottoman system, as they were not conforming with them in costumes and humors.⁵⁹ To a certain extent, Bronwen Wilson's observation, that Sansovino's "Turks" denoted a religious rather than an ethnic identity, seems correct.⁶⁰ The above mentioned ideas show a clear Christian-Muslim dichotomy, but it would seem that Sansovino

⁵⁷ "Vi giouera anco la buona dispositione de gli animi di molti popoli tributari e ad herenti per forzaa alla casa Othomana: i quali sopportano mal uolentieri la tirannica Signoria di gente cosi infame e uillana, nemica della humanita, e priua di tutti I beni che suol dare altrui la forma della uita ciuile, o la assidua cura dello studio delle bellissime scientie," *Informatione*, A3r.

⁵⁸ "Alla mala contentezza de sopradetti, s'aggiugne in uniuersale quella de sudditi, e di coloro che si trouano sotto la legge di Macometto o per forza o per altro accidente, i quali uiuendo in misera seruitu, e essendo acerbamente oppressi con graui angarie ne figliuoli e nella roba, e prendendo tutte le cose loro dalla uolonta d'un capo solo il quale non riconosce ne uirtu, ne gentilezza di sangue, anzi sprezza ogni uno, e non si cura se non de suoi dependenti che riceuono con diuersi mezzi i fauori di quella Corte: sperano pur una uolta, per istinto della natura, che si muti nuoua faccia a quell'empio gouerno, e di ritornar quando che sia, alle patrie christiane, dale quali essi trassero le loro antiche prosapie," *Informatione*, A3r.

⁵⁹ "i quali tutti non si confacendo co Turchi per la diuersita de costumi, e di gli humori, saranno (come nemici secreti) pronti per uoi a una sicura e certa occasione," *Informatione*, A3r.

⁶⁰ Wilson, "Reflecting on the Turks," 38.

associates each of the two religions also with ethnic groups and their innate characteristics. It is interesting that Sansovino believed that people had fixed inborn traits, but at the same time, they also carried with them culturally constructed factors. If religion was indeed the criteria based on which the term “Turk” gained meaning, as Wilson argues, then religion would be the factor that would shape both the natural and the cultural traits of an ethnic group. Sansovino reinforces this idea when he says that although the Ottomans are men [humans], they do not follow Christian precepts. Thus, they do not agree with “the laws nor with the customs after which you [Christian soliders] live in accordance with the order of nature.”⁶¹ However, Sansovino’s texts unveil that he had a much more complex understanding of the term ‘turk’, as in *Informatione* he writes:

The Turks are not so invincible or frightening if they have comparison [terms] and our [soldiers] don’t let themselves be deceived by them. Because the better part of the Jannisaries, that is ten out of twelve thousand infantrymen, is composed of Slovenes, Hungarians, Bohemians, Moldavians, Tartars and other valuable and bold nations; the rest of the army is high only in number, not in value, as it’s composed of Scythians, Arabs and other half naked nations, which are nothing but cruel and ignorant barbarians without any discipline of the militia. Besides the aforementioned there are the Greeks worn by idleness, the Asians corrupted by lust, the Egyptians castrated even in their minds and the Arabs without spirit and blood. But you Soldiers, which side [of your nature] do you have that is not praiseworthy? Which nation among you is not noble either in body or mind? We see that the Hungarian, whose body is made tough, knows how to use very well the iron [weapons]; that the German, who has a generous mind, is fearsome in fights; that the French, who is ambitious in the dignity, is magnanimous; that the Spanish who is of firm person, is sharply wary and, finally, the Italian, who is right and strong, is prudent. But how many of you Soldiers deserve to be praised because when you go to war you lay off all your vices and put on the military virtues as it is the custom of the Turks? [But although the Turks] know no dispute, game, or curse-word among them, they are happy just with bread and water and give in to lust and all the other vain things that prevent the victory.⁶²

⁶¹ “accioche uedendo uoi che essi sono huomini, quanto che essendo contrari alla nostra Santissima religione, non si concordano nelle leggi e ne gli usi con noi che uiuiamo secondo le regole conformi all’ordine della natura,” *Informatione*, A6r.

⁶² “Non sono adunque i Turchi inuincibili, ne spauentosi quando hanno riscontro, & ch’i nostri non si lascino punti ingannare: percioche dal neruo de Iannizeri infuori che sono da 10 in 12 mila fanti, composti di Schiauoni di Vn[g]ri, di Boemi, di Moldaui, di tartari, & d’altre genti di ualore & d’ardire, l’altro, suo essercito non ual molto se non per numero, come quello che e fatto di Scithi, d’Arabi, e d’altre nationi, mezzo ignudi & ne quali non e se non crudelta Barbara & ignoranza senza disciplina alcuna della militia. Oltre a’predetti ui sono i Greci consumati nell’otio, gli Asiani corrotti nella lussuria, gli Egittij castrati anco nell’animo, e gli Arabi senza

In the better part of this passage Sansovino underlines the innate predilection towards moral perfection of European peoples and mirrors it in the decaying nature of the other ethnic groups integrated into the Ottoman army. He lets his readers know that the people coming from European countries constitute the major part of the Janissary corps. What Sansovino does not say here, but mentions elsewhere in the text, is that these people taken from Christian lands were forced to convert to Islam.⁶³ If in this case religion was the agent shaping the human nature and cultural traits of European people then, by becoming Muslims, the Hungarians, Bohemians, Moravians and all the others should have been deprived of their good nature once they uttered the Profession of Faith. However, Sansovino indicates that even as a part of the Ottoman army, these ex-Christians are superior in value and order to other ethnic groups in the army. The argument that linked religion and the nature of a people is also questioned by his critique of the Greeks who, although Christians, were attributed negative characteristics. Furthermore, as Sansovino urges Christian soldiers to take the example of the “Turks” who in war dissimulate all their vices into military virtues, he argues that they are not inherently bad people, but that the culturally constructed practices enhance their natural instincts. Overall, through this passage Sansovino emphasizes that, because of their natural traits, men are capable of controlling how they let the religious-cultural environment shape their character.

In *Informatione* he pays a great deal of attention to how the religious-cultural factors shape the Ottomans’ acquired traits, that is their character. Sansovino’s opinion on the Ottoman

spirit e sangue. Ma uoi o Soldati qual parte hauete che non sia laudabile? Qual natione e fra uoi che non sia nobile o di corpo o d’animo? Certo che se si guarda bene. Uedermo che l’Vngaro indurato di corpo e sicuro nelle ferrite ch’il Tedesco ch’e generoso di animo, e terribile nelle zuffe, ch’il Francese ch’e ambizioso ne gli honori, e di molto cuore, che lo Spagnuolo ch’e di salda persona, e sottilmente accorto, & che finalmente l’Italiano ch’e destro & gagliardo, e prudente. Ma quanto o Soldati saresti uoi piu degni di lode, se allora che uoi andate alla Guerra ui spogliaste de uitij, uestendoui delle uirtu militari all’usanza de’Turchi, I quali non sapendo cioche sia contesa fra loro, giuoco, o bestemmia, si contentono del puro pane e dell’acqua, scernendo le uiuande, le lasciue, e l’altre cose souerchie che impediscono le uittorie?” *Informatione*, A4v.

⁶³ “nondimeno i Gianizzeri non si reputano punto inferiori di forze, perche se quegli sono huomini ualorosi per le habitationi horride e faticose nel lequali essi nascono, questi all’incontro sono scelti sale piu fiere nationi di Europa, e de i piu robusti si eleggono fra le migliaia delle persone i piu membruti e di cuore, laquale scelta fatta di molti buoni et ridotti in un picciolo drappello di migliori, e in suprema eccellenza di gagliardia e di valore,” “Dedicatory letter,” in *Historia Universale*, vol. 1 (1560).

customs is not straightforward as he oscillates between the good and the bad character that people in the Ottoman army develop. For example, the Azamoglan (new recruits; *acemi oğlans*) who are the former Christian children taken in child levy, become rough and rude, because they are raised in captivity and are trained to recognize the authority of no parent, but that of the sultan.⁶⁴ Also, the Peicz have their body mutilated in childhood so that they would not be able to feel emotions that would cloud their focus in battle.⁶⁵ Thus, because they lack emotions, they also have no empathy and steal money from merchants.⁶⁶ The Janissaries, the majority of which were coming from Christian lands, also pillaged Jews and Christian merchants from Constantinople.⁶⁷ On the other hand, Sansovino tells that the Janissary leaders were paid well because they were honorable and virtuous.⁶⁸ Also, he praises the Persians for being civilized and considers them to be the most honored among other nations integrated into the empire, because they are raised virtuously and their mind is noble.⁶⁹ Even for the *Deli*, who were the first to run in a fight to scare the opponents, Sansovino believes they are of great valour, have great minds and personal strength.⁷⁰ Sansovino also underlined that a certain type of Janissaries,

who live together, will become equals in love and maybe in valour as, the more they fight, they become very affectionate towards one another they look to stick all together, and they treat each other with that dignity they have acquired and that superiority they have among other soldiers. And an open profession from being unique not only in battlefield, they brag that they have never been

⁶⁴ *Informatione*, A6r.

⁶⁵ “Hanno la pelle de piedi tanto dura, che ferrandosi come i cauali, dicono alcuni che non sentono la puntura de chiodi. Et altri dicono che essendo Fanciulli si caua loro la milza, accio che in correndo non sentano impaccio e dolore,” *Informatione*, A8r.

⁶⁶ “Vsano molte insolenze, perche fanno stare i mercanti di danari, e gli angareggiano, conciosia che incontrano molti che per non dar il proprio cauallo, dano loro tre feudi e quattro, e perche dietro al primo si spediscono spesse uolte de gli altri, e talhora se ne spaccia piu d’uno insieme, la grauezza uien ad esser tanto maggiore,” *Informatione*, A8v.

⁶⁷ “E anco lor lecito nella morte del Signore, di faccheggiar i Giudei e i mercantanti Christiani che allora si truano in Constantinopoli,” *Informatione*, A6v.

⁶⁸ “Le paghe loro non sono uagli, ma secondo i meriti che procedono dalla propria uirtu, e non dale raccomandazioni altrui, sono honorati,” *Informatione*, A7r.

⁶⁹ “Percioche questa gente ualorosa e molto ciuile, e che uiue sotto proprio Re, diletlandosi de costume nobili, e delle virtu, ama di uestire e di apparire honorata fra gli altri. [...] Si allevano virtuosamente [...] e l’animo loro e nobile e Honorato,” *Informatione*, A9r.

⁷⁰ “costoro di grosso ingegno, forti di persona, e di gran ualore” (they have large minds, personal strength and of great valor,” *Informatione*, A9v.

defeated since their order was founded, but hand in hand being what is valuable among us, yet gloriously distant from the same, they assume to conquer the world.⁷¹

Thus, although Sansovino does not have a constant position regarding how living under the Ottoman customs and laws affected human character, he did believe it could be improved. This last passage shows, even when the Ottoman soldiers are trained to be heartless and fearless towards their enemies, they are still capable of developing higher intellectual capacities, such as affection towards those who live in the same community, as well as a sense of belonging to that community.

Therefore, although he wrote his works under various influences and for different purposes, there is a constant thread in the larger picture of the Ottoman Empire. The oxymoronic portrayal of the Ottomans that stems from it has three complementary and intertwined levels. On a larger scale, there is a contrast between the way in which he portrays the image of the Sultan and that of his subjects. Though he was not an advocate for princely rule, he admired the manner in which sultans managed to order their dominions. On the other hand, he criticized how Ottoman subjects, although living in such an organized polity, were still lacking morals and their behavior was vicious. On a second level, a closer look into his portrayal of the sultans reveals that the appreciation for the sultans faced all Ottoman rulers, but Selim II, who was the embodiment of the bad prince. On a third level, the closeup shows that the Ottoman subjects were not all barbarous and disorganized. In fact, Sansovino praised the obedience, order, and organization of the Ottoman army, but considered inherently flawed

⁷¹ “Ha quest’altro iannizzero la Zarcola in capo zensa pennacchio, all’usanza de’Giesuati quando non fosse tanto alta. Con la ueste appiccata alla cintura, con le calze larghe, e con la scimitarra a canto, armato anco egli di panno e di tela: ma di molta bravura nel volto, poi che co’mostracchi suplisce al difetto dell’armi. Questi tutti che uiuono insieme, e che per lo continuo praticare si fanno pari in amore e forse in ualore, tanto piu uagliano combattendo, quanto che essendo piu affettionati l’uno all’altro cercano di mantener tutti insieme e ciascun da per se quello honore che par loro di hauere acquistato, e quella preminenza che essi hanno oltre a gli altri Soldati. Et facendo aperta professione d’esser singolari non pure in battaglia campale, uantandosi di non esser mai stati rotti da poi in qua che fu trouata l’ordinanza loro, ma a corpo a corpo, siando qual si uoglia ualoroso fra noi, glorisamente lodando se medesimi, presumono di uincere il mondo,” *Informatione*, A9v.

the character of the people composing it. Although he seems to be remotely aware that the ethnic composition of the Ottoman army would make a general assumption on the decaying nature of the Ottomans wrong, Sansovino emphasized that the socio-cultural practices affected the character of the people more than the laws of the polity in which they lived. Even though political and religious factors partly shaped this contradictory image of the Ottomans that stems from his works, Sansovino's own contribution as a humanist editor and gatherer also influenced this portrayal to a great extent.

I.2. Richard Hakluyt's Image of the Ottomans

“The Spaniardes have exercised moste outrageous and more than Turkishe cruelties in all the west Indies”⁷² noted the opening sentence of a chapter in a pamphlet intended to promote the colonization of the Americas. Richard Hakluyt wrote it in 1584 and presented to Queen Elizabeth that she may read it. The *Discourse Concerning Western Planting*, as it was titled, was meant to become official propagandistic material that would motivate Englishmen towards establishing settlements across the ocean in the name of the Queen. Though never published, and kept in manuscript until the nineteenth century, the *Discourse* sheds light on Hakluyt's perception of the Englishmen, but also on how he envisioned the world order. At a first glance, such a comparison between the Spanish and the Ottomans might be confusing. How could a Protestant priest compare for the better Muslims with Catholics? However, the dichotomy between pious Christians and barbarous Muslims that was becoming blurrier by the end of the sixteenth century, had its roots in events that had taken place about a century earlier.

Although at a distance of about thirty years, there were two major events in the second half of the fifteenth century that were to change more than the diplomatic, economic, and political dynamics between European and newly entered into the picture states. The conquests of Constantinople in 1453 and of the Americas after 1492, brought closer to European minds foreign cultures and organizational systems. If to a certain extent the Ottomans were more familiar, what European sailors discovered in the Americas was entirely unknown. However, because of the congruence of these events in time, the manner in which Europeans merged ideas about these cultures was similar.⁷³ Influenced also by the intellectual developments of

⁷² Richard Hakluyt, *A Discourse Concerning Western Planting*, Charles Deane, ed. (Cambridge: Press of John Wilson and Son, 1877), 71.

⁷³ Joan-Pau Rubiés noted that sixteenth-century erudites did not regard the American discoveries as something essentially distinct from the accounts of the Levant, Russia or Asia. Similarly, Nancy Bisaha underlines that the assertions of intellectual superiority over the native Americans resulted from the humanists' own

humanist culture, sixteenth-century erudites shaped the rhetoric on the “other” in various forms. From history books, political treaties, propagandistic pamphlets to travel narratives, cosmographies, and engraved plates, the image of the foreign, exotic, and under-civilized cultures was a recurrent motif in printed materials. The sources used to compose these identities were not only contemporary. Although the ways of gazing began to change by the 1500s, and a more inquiring attitude replaced the religious angle in the traveller’s eyes, much of the material the humanists referenced to was coming from medieval chronicles or accounts. Through recycling passages from these sources, old tropes persisted mixed with the perceptions of contemporary travellers.⁷⁴

Though sometimes the sole topic of a publication, the description of the Ottomans or the native Americans was often complementary material through which humanists were able to better define their European identities. By combining older and newer material, humanists used a rhetorical strategy through which they appealed to long established religious arguments and definitions of their Christian identities and reinterpreted them to fit the contemporary interests and debates. If in the case of the native Americans it was enough to claim that the absence of a universal religion meant the lack of an official administrative and military organization and thus they could be conquered, when it came to the Ottomans the situation was more complicated. Since the latter were part of an expanding empire that had its own central organization, which was also quite familiar to Europeans, it was becoming more difficult to define them as an under-civilized power which needed Christian principles to function properly. In order to not undermine the image of authority and superiority they were trying to build for themselves in relation to native Americans, Europeans first had to shape in

understanding of Western culture and its inherent superiority. The conditions under which such a humanist discourse emerged, she continues, were provided by the Ottoman expansion and the narrative surrounding it. See Rubiés, “Travel writing and humanistic culture: a blunted impact?,” *Journal of Early Modern History* 10, no. 1 (2006), 131-168; Nancy Bisaha, *Creating east and west*.

⁷⁴ See Justin Stagl, *A History of Curiosity. The Theory of Travel 1550-1800* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995).

comparable terms the way in which they defined both themselves and the Ottoman Empire, before trying to plea for developing connections with an empire they so far feared.

Furthermore, with the diversification of the political and confessional scenery of the sixteenth century, clashes between states' interests often happened. Alliances were formed not only between state rulers, but also between confessional groups; France and England were leaving behind their rivalry to ally against the Spanish; the Ottoman Empire was becoming a potential military and economic ally in front the expanding Spanish Empire. Such dynamics characterized the second half of the sixteenth century, as many European powers began to develop imperial ambitions and they started looking at other societies through the mirror of their political aims.⁷⁵ The English were no exception from this, as by the end of the 1500s, intellectuals began shaping paper-projects in which the Englishmen were imagined as members of a nascent imperial power.⁷⁶

This was the context in which Richard Hakluyt carried out his editorial and publishing activity. Born in 1553 around London, Hakluyt did his undergraduate studies at Westminster School. In 1570 he was accepted to Christ Church College in Oxford, where he got his BA in 1574 and his MA in 1577; after finishing his studies, he was offered a post as a lecturer at Oxford. Although a priest by profession, Hakluyt developed a passion for cosmography and maritime discoveries inspired by his lawyer cousin, Richard Hakluyt from Middle Temple. Through the same cousin, Hakluyt got acquainted with many contemporary intellectual characters, such as cosmographer André Thevet, cartographers Abraham Ortelius and Gerard Mercator, with Elizabeth's circle of humanists who were envisioning projects of maritime

⁷⁵ Pagden, *Lords of All the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain, and France c. 1500 – c. 1800* (New Heaven: Yale University Press, 1995) and *Facing each other: the world's perception of Europe and Europe's perception of the world* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000).

⁷⁶ David Armitage, „Literature and Empire” in *The Oxford History of the British Empire, Vol. I The Origins of Empire. British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century*, Nicholas Canny, ed. (Oxford University Press, New York, 1998), 99-123.

discovery, as well as with mariners and merchants who were constantly travelling by sea. Because of his earnest interest in these matters, Hakluyt was co-opted by the Queen's Secretary, Sir Francis Walsingham, into his diplomatic circle of interests.⁷⁷ Starting from 1582 Hakluyt put to good use his knowledge of French, Portuguese, Spanish, Latin, and Greek, as he started his activity as a translator and editor. During his life, more than 30 titles appeared published under his name, most of which were either translations or compilations of travelogues and ethnographic material about the Americas.⁷⁸ A couple of pieces that were his original works were a pamphlet *A discourse concerning western planting* (1584) and a commentary on Aristotle's *Politics* which he sent together to queen Elizabeth. The grandest project Hakluyt worked on were the two editions of *Principall Navigations, Voyages, and Discoveries of the English Nation* (1589, 1598-1600). A compilation of over a thousand pages comprising material ranging from history chronicles, travelogues, bord journals to commercial patents, diplomatic reports, and capitulations, *Principall Navigations* was meant to include under its covers all the journeys that Englishmen have ever made in the world, as Hakluyt himself writes in the prefaces.⁷⁹

Scholars have extensively analysed Hakluyt's *Principall Navigations*, paying great attention to the documents regarding the Americas, emphasizing their role as promotional material for the establishment of transatlantic colonies and commerce.⁸⁰ There are albeit few

⁷⁷ "Introduction" in *The Original Writings and Correspondence of the Two Richard Hakluyts*, ed. E. G. R. Taylor, vol. 1 (London: Hakluyt Society, 1935), 1-69.

⁷⁸ Edited works: Richard Hakluyt, ed. *Divers Voyages touching the Discovery of America and the Islands Adjacent*, ed. John Winter Jones (London: Hakluyt Society, 1850); Translations: *A notable historie containing foure voyages made by certayne French Captaynes vnto Florica by Monsieur Laudonniere*, transl. Richard Hakluyt (London: Thomas Dawson, 1587); *The Discoveries of the World from their first originall unto the yeere of our Lord 1555. Briefly written in the Portugall tongue by Antonie Galvano*, transl. Richard Hakluyt (London: George Bishop, 1601); *De Nouo Orbe or The Historie of the West Indies, Contayning the actes and aduentures of the Spanyardes, comprised in eight Decades. Written by Peter Martyr a Millnoise of Angleria*, transl. Richard Hakluyt (London: Thomas Adams, 1612).

⁷⁹ "Letter to the readers" in Richard Hakluyt, *Principal Navigations, Voyages, and Discoveries of the English Nation* (London: George Bishop, 1589); "Letter to the Readers" in *Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation*, vol. 1 (London: George Bishop, 1598).

⁸⁰ Hakluyt became an important figure in the anglophone historiography starting from mid-19th century. His *Principall Navigations* were often used as an argument for the emergence of English national identity in early modernity and to trace the ideological formation of the British Empire. In all these studies, the emphasis falls on

studies that touch upon Hakluyt's documents about the Ottomans. Though most of these analyses integrate the sources about the Orient from *Principall Navigations* into a larger picture of English-Ottoman interactions or the English depictions of the Ottomans, the authors acknowledge Hakluyt's role in bringing together the material. However, most historians usually stress that the oxymoronic image of the Ottomans resulting from *Principal Navigations* is the result of Hakluyt's commercial and diplomatic influences in his choice of material.⁸¹ While not rejecting this argument, I believe that Hakluyt's agency in shaping the image of the Ottomans in his collection goes beyond the economic and diplomatic interests of the crown.

The purpose of this chapter is to analyse the image of the Ottomans in *Principal Navigations* by looking at how the details from the compiled materials are congruent with Hakluyt's larger understanding of civilization. My argument is that from Hakluyt's collection stems an ambivalent image of the Ottoman Empire that inspires both fear and respect and is the result of a clash between the types of sources integrated in the collection. Although it seems as though Hakluyt lets the texts speak for themselves, he selected them carefully. As the types of documents in *Principal Navigations* range from grant letters, commercial patents, and diplomatic reports to history chronicles, pamphlets, and pilgrims' accounts, a look only into

Hakluyt's activity as an agent of state who promoted colonial expansion towards, almost exclusively, the Americas. See Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan writing of England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); Anthony Pagden, *Lords of all the World*; David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Michael Braddick, *State Formation in Early Modern England*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Peter C. Mancall, *Hakluyt's Promise. An Elizabethan's Obsession for an English America* (New Heaven and London: Yale University Press, 2007).

⁸¹ The English portrayal of the Ottoman Empire has been of interest to scholars ever since Samuel Chew's *Crescent and the Rose*. In nowadays' studies, the emphasis falls on the representation of the 'Turks' in English literature, especially dramaturgy, where Hakluyt's collection is used as a source of inspiration by late sixteenth or seventeenth century play-writers. Also, Hakluyt's diplomatic and economic connections are often referred to in studies dealing with the establishment of the Levant Company or the development of the relations between Queen Elizabeth and the Ottoman sultans. See Samuel Chew, *The Crescent and the rose: Islam and England during the Renaissance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1937); Matthew Dimmock, *New Turkes: dramatizing Islam and the Ottomans in early modern England* (Routledge, 2017); Gerald MacLean, *Looking East: English writing and the Ottoman empire before 1800* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008); Anders Ingram, *Writing the Ottomans, Turkish History in Early Modern England* (Hampshire, Palgrave Macmillan, 2015); Jerry Brotton, *This Orient Isle: Elizabethan England and the Islamic world* (New York: Penguin, 2016); Gerald MacLean and Nabil Matar, *Britain and the Islamic world, 1558-1713* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); Nabil Matar, *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the age of discovery* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000).

the first type listed above brings into foreground, as historians have already argued, a contradictory image of the Ottoman Empire. However, an analysis that shifts the emphasis from “official” documents could highlight not only the existence of such an ambivalent image in *Principal Navigation*, but also Hakluyt’s own understanding of it. As the aim of the present inquiry is to underline the existence of an paradoxical image of the Ottomans as a result of the compiler’s ideas and editorial input, I will only refer to Hakluyt’s potential intended audience, but will not treat the issue of the real audience, spread, and popularity of the texts as it would go beyond the scope of the analysis.

To pursue this research, I analyze the material included in *Principal Navigations*. Although both editions contain accounts related to travels in three main directions, as Hakluyt himself stated in the prefaces, for the purpose of this study I will refer only to those accounts that explicitly offer cultural and ethnographic details about the Ottomans. Thus, I look at material included in the parts that touch upon missions and voyages in the “South and Southeast” parts of the world, by which he refers to the travels in Asia and on the shores around the Mediterranean, as well as several accounts about enterprises towards the Tsardom of Russia.⁸² Because Hakluyt was not the author of these sources, his own attitude towards the Ottomans can only be speculated. To reconstruct as accurately as possible what could have been his standpoint in regard to the Ottomans, I also refer to the paratext of his works, as I do in the chapter on Sansovino, that is, the prefaces and dedicatory letters which are under his authorship. Unfortunately, since, unlike Sansovino, Hakluyt’s mentions regarding the Ottomans in the paratext are relatively scarce, I also use other sources which are known to have been written by Hakluyt, the prefaces to other collections or translations and his original works. In doing so, I gain a better grasp of his ideas about what constituted a civilization and how he might have perceived the Ottomans in relation to it.

⁸² “Letter to the Readers” in *Principal Navigations* (1589).

Though I trace in the next part of the thesis the editorial input and the humanist ideas behind composing *Principal Navigations*, the manner in which Hakluyt portrayed the Ottoman Empire can be better understood if one looks at his other works, as well as to the general contemporary attitude towards the Ottoman Empire. By the beginning of the seventeenth century, the idea of civility began to be closely linked with personal identity in European minds. In general terms, civility was understood as a set of acquired traits and behaviors that regulated man's natural instincts. It represented man's capacity to dominate his human nature by using his higher intellectual assets. Civility was also a synonym for civilization, as it designated a society that had central organization and administration, where individuals would behave according to an established set of laws.⁸³ The dichotomy between civility and barbarism was masked under the idea of a hierarchy between states that were destined to have imperial aspirations and states that should be servile.⁸⁴ For the English, civility was associated with their portrayal of a nascent imperial identity.⁸⁵

As many humanists from the continent, the English erudites looked at Rome for an ideal model of empire. They were not, however, limited to it as they also looked at contemporary empires that could provide models for colonization. To this extent, both the Spanish and the Ottomans furnished examples for establishing and expanding an empire. But there were differences between how Englishmen perceived the two polities. One was considered to have a cruel and barbarous expansionist policy, while the other was admired for its discipline and law. As Anna Suranyi underlines, by mid-seventeenth century, protestant writers found favorable similarities between the ceremonial practices of the Muslims and their own.⁸⁶

⁸³ Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process*, (Oxford: John Wiley and Sons, 2000).

⁸⁴ Anna Suranyi, *The Genius of the English Nation: Travel Writing and National Identity in Early Modern England* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008), 18.

⁸⁵ See Suranyi, *The Genius of the English Nation*; Anthony Pagden, *Lord of all the World*.

⁸⁶ Suranyi, 42; Suranyi's study, although lacking at places deeper analysis or substantial argumentation, still offers a new perspective in its attempt to trace the formation of the English nationhood and idea of empire outside the very nationalist historians circle. She brings not only an interdisciplinary approach to the topic, but also shifts the emphasis from the discourse on the formation of the English empire only in relation to the New Indies to a two-pronged discourse about the Irishmen and the Ottomans.

Besides discipline and law, English travelers admired more features of Ottoman culture and civilization, such as opposition to idleness, and their ability to peacefully win converts to Islam.⁸⁷ Though this rhetoric was more contoured towards the middle of the seventeenth century, traces of its formation can be found in Elizabethan England. For example, the 1599 edition of *Principall Navigations* includes a note by Richard Hakluyt from Middle Temple. It is a letter from 1582 addressed to the English merchants that offered advice on how they could identify the best quality cloths at the Porte. Though Hakluyt's purpose was to improve the English commercial endeavors, the letters has several interesting details. In the beginning, he arguments that the English merchants should actively participate in the increase of the common goods of their country, as it would also offer individual benefits, because this is what all men who are not raised in a barbarous society do.⁸⁸ Although the rest of the text contains practical advice, Hakluyt from Middle Temple encourages English merchants to adopt some of the Ottoman practices, as they led to the development of a very organized and prosperous industry.

On the other hand, the Spanish empire was the counterexample. And this was the ideological angle from which Hakluyt wrote about the "cruelties of the Spaniardes." As he wanted to ascribe the mission of "civilizing" the native populations of the Americas to the Englishmen, he built through his *Discourse concerning western planting* a case for his compatriots competence in comparison with other peoples in Europe and, for more than one reason, the best counterexample were the Spanish. In this pamphlet, Hakluyt addressed the issue of civility, by stating that only a society who is not capable of committing barbarisms would be able to provide a good enough model for the native populations of the Americas.⁸⁹

⁸⁷ Gerald MacLean and Nabil Matar, *Britain and the Islamic World*, 37.

⁸⁸ "Since al men confesse (that be not barbariously bred) that men are borne as well to seeke the common commoditie of their Countrey, as their owne priuate benefite, it may seeme follie to perswade that point, for each man meaneth so to doe", "Remembrances for master S. to give the better occasion to informe himselfe of some things in England, and after some other things in Turkie, to the great profite of the Common weale of this Cuntrey. Written by the foresayd master Richard Hakluyt, for a principall English Factor at Constantinople 1582" in *Principal Navigations* (1599), 161.

⁸⁹ "Cap XI. That the Spaniardes have exercised moste outrageous and more then Turkishe cruelties in all the West Indies, whereby they are every where there become moste odious unto them, whose would joyne with

And in this context, for Hakluyt the Ottomans appeared the more civilized although he refers to them only a couple of times in the *Discourse*. Besides briefly complaining about the large sums the English crown had to spend for the gifts for Selim II and for keeping an embassy in Constantinople, he completely leaves out from his argument the Ottoman Empire and its people for the rest of the text.⁹⁰ But his silence is also a message. Although I focus in a future chapter on the factors that influenced Hakluyt's composition, it would suffice to say that his lack of criticism towards the Ottomans in the *Discourse* was most probably linked with the recent re-establishment of the English-Levant trade.⁹¹ Furthermore, since the pamphlet was addressed to Elizabeth and its purpose was rather the promotion of transatlantic commerce, Hakluyt's potential antipathies towards the Ottoman Empire would have been a redundant topic. And indeed, his opinion of the Ottomans might have been diligently masked under the official interests of the crown in the *Principal Navigations*. In the epistle dedicatory from the translation of Peter Martyr of Angleria's *Decades of the New World* (1587), Hakluyt stated that the civilizing mission, which was a noble deed, stood in the hands of the Englishmen who had to bring reason to those Christian princes who were in discord and whose subjects were in chaos because of the deeds of the Ottomans.⁹²

Nonetheless, Hakluyt might have used the example of the Spanish humanists to build a parallel between the encounters with both the Ottomans and the native Americans. As he included some accounts of Spanish explorers of the Americas in *Principal Navigations*, he

us or any other moste williunglye to shake of their moste intolerable yoke, and have beconne to doe yt already in divers places where they were lords heretofore," *A Discourse Concerning Western Planting*, 71.

⁹⁰ "For the new trade in Turkey, besides the greate expences in mayneteninge a kind of ambassador at Constantinople, and in sending of presents to Selym the Graunde Segnior," *A Discourse Concerning Western Planting*, 14.

⁹¹ Alfred C Wood, *A history of the Levant Company* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1935), 6.

⁹² "For the posterity no greater glory can be handed down than to conquer the barbarian, to recall the savage and the pagan to civility, to draw the ignorant within the orbit of reason, and to fill with reverence for divinity the godless and the ungodly. And this is the truer in our present wretched and more than disastrous age, when to the increase and advantage of the followers of Mahomet, the greater part of the Christian princes fiercely intent on their own domestic dissensions heap up civil tumults and Thyestean tragedies day by day, and without any end," Taylor, *Correspondence of the Two Richard Hakluyts*, vol. 2, 368.

might have been aware that the Spanish humanists developed their definition of national identity based on their encounters with the Moors and native Americans, as they mirrored the mental constructions of Muslim otherness and the indigenous populations from across the ocean.⁹³ By bringing together under the covers of *Principal Navigations* sources relating to encounters with both types of societies, Hakluyt might also have simultaneously shaped the identity of the native Americans and the Ottomans along with that of the Englishmen.

Hakluyt envisioned the English nation as an interplay between three types of identity: politico-religious, socio-economic, and common historical background. The first one is associated with the ruler and the second with the subjects, while the third one encompassed both.⁹⁴ Though in both editions of *Principal Navigations* the arrangement of the accounts might seem merely chronological, by the time Hakluyt gets to the accounts from the 1500s a delimitation between historical narratives or travelogues and official documents can be observed. The sources present less the barbarous practices and cruel attacks of the Ottomans, and rather focus on the quality of Turkish cloths, the pashas' diplomatic skills, and the Sultan's humanity. Thus, although possibly involuntarily, the sources Hakluyt comprised in the collection present the socio-religious and then the politico-economic identities of the Ottomans. To trace the ambivalent image that springs from that material, I will employ the same structure and order Hakluyt offered for his readers.

When it comes to the socio-religious identity, Hakluyt goes back to the times of the Crusades and presents a passage from a history chronicle that related King Richard I's

⁹³ Matar, *Turks, Moors and Englishmen*, 98; For a detailed analysis on how the Habsburgs portrayed both the Ottomans and the native Americans in relation to themselves. See Carina Johnson, *Cultural hierarchy in sixteenth-century Europe: The Ottomans and Mexicans* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

⁹⁴ The best source for understanding Hakluyt's sketch of English national identity is the *Discourse concerning Western Planting*. It could be considered the first skeleton for the national project that later materialized in the form of *Principal Navigations*, as it encompasses all (and some more) ideas expressed in the compilation. His harsh criticism towards the idleness of English convicts and the high degree of vagabondage, thus the crown's incapacity to deal with social problems, was probably the main reason why the pamphlet never got into print. Nowadays, only one detailed analysis of this *Discourse* exists, but it focuses only on the representations of Spain in English and French cosmographies. See Jonathan Hart, *Representing the New World: The English and French Uses of the Example of Spain* (New York: Palgrave, 2001).

enterprise to Jerusalem. Here the author presented that, even in those times of conflict, Richard was able to make peace with the Turks in order to solve an ongoing dispute with the King of France.⁹⁵ Relating to the same events, Hakluyt extracts from various history chronicles the names of several Englishmen that accompanied Richard to Jerusalem. He provided, where available, both the Latin original and his English translation of the passages. Interesting to observe is that in the case of a certain Balwinus Devonius, Hakluyt's English translation notes that he accompanied the king in war against the "infidels" at Jerusalem, but the Latin version of the text contains no word that would translate as such.⁹⁶ Although seemingly an insignificant detail, this could hint towards Hakluyt's discontent towards the Turks and their conquest of the Holy Places. He continues to shape the image of The Ottomans in an unfavorable light through other accounts included in *Principal Navigations*. The chronicle about the siege of Rhodes paints them a bloody portrait. The author states the motive for writing down the events, and he intends to show what Suleyman, the cruel enemy of Christendom, has done.⁹⁷ Among the details of the events that the narrative offers, starting from the ideological implications of Sultan Suleyman and how the attack was planned, to the description of the war tactics and the reaction of the population, there are two passages that stand out. The author recounts an episode from the Christmas day when the Pasha followed by the Janissaries entered Rhodes and

⁹⁵ "[King Richard] who then being in Syria, and hearing thereof [that the French king was back in Normandy and wanted to sail to England and take his throne], made peace with the Turkes for three yeeres", "The worthy voyage of Richard the First, King of England into Asia, for the recouery of Ierusalem out of the handes of the Saracens, drawen out of the booke of Actes and Monuments of the Church of England, written by M. Iohn Foxe" in *Principal Navigations* (1589), 12.

⁹⁶ "In his time King Richard with all indeuour prepares a fleete and all things necessarie for waging of warre against the Infidels at Ierusalem, taking with him the Standers and Ensignes of the kingsome. This Baldwine eftsoones followed the King into Syria and Palestina, as one desirous to be partaker of his trauailes, pained, and perils in so holy a voyage." / (Lat. Orig.) "Cui muneri Baldwinus sollicitè inuigilans, egreium se pastorem exhibit, dominicum semen, quantum patiebatur eius temporis iniquitas, vbique locorum spargens. Richardus Anglorum Rex, acceptis tunc Rengi insigniis, summo studio classem, ac omnia ad Hierosolymitarum bellum gerendum necessaria parauit. Secutus est illico Regem in Syriam et Palestinam vsque Baldwinus, vt esset in tam Sancto (ut ipse putabat itinere) laborum, dolorum, ac periculorum particeps," "The life and trauailes of Balwinus Deuonius, sometime Archbishop of Canterburie" in *Principal Navigations* (1589), 14.

⁹⁷ "A brief relation of the siege and taking of the Citie of Rhodes, by Sultan Soliman the great Turke, translated out of French into English at the motio of the Reuerend Lord Thomas Dockwray, great prior of the order of Ierusalem in England, 1524" in *Principal Navigations*, vol. 2 (1599), 73.

pillaged the entire city, destroyed houses and the church icons. And because they had no trace of humanity left in them, the Janissaries stole the riches from the hospital and put on the run all the sick people, after which they vandalized martyrs' tombs and raped women.⁹⁸ From such a description the Ottomans appear not only as fearful warriors, but also as barbarians who had no respect for the structures of a civilized Christian community. The same author describes Suleyman after the battle as being "swollen and railed in pride and vaine glory, turned his heart against Rhodes."⁹⁹ Thus, the ruler was satisfied with the actions of his troops, as they acted in his name.

At only a few pages distance, in his description of the sultan's entrance in Aleppo, Anthony Jenkinson painted Suleyman and his army in counterpoint to their portrayal from the accounts on the Siege of Rhodes. His depiction abounds in visual details. The pompous display of fashion, figures, and forces would have undoubtedly astounded the readers, as this report emphasizes not only the wealth of the Ottomans, but also the pride they took in the rituals they performed. By choosing to integrate in his *Principal Navigations* this full display of the Ottoman civilization, Hakluyt presented his readers not only that Anthony Jenkinson got to Aleppo on his way to Muscovy, but also the structure of the Ottoman army, its ranks, and obedience in front of the Sultan.¹⁰⁰ About the same Jenkinson, Hakluyt lets his readers know

⁹⁸ "two or three days after the coming of the sayd Basha, his jannisaries and other of the campe entred into the Towne, which was on Christmas day, within the time giuen to us, and then the Turkes word was broken, if it were his will of not, I cannot tell. Neuerthelesse there was no sword drawen, and in that respect promist was kept. But they made pillage, and entered by force into the houses of the castle, and tooke all that they might and would/ after that they ransacked the houses, they entered into the churches, and pilled all that they found, and brake the images. And there was no crucifix, nor figure of our lady, nor of other saints, that were left whole. Then with great inhumanitie they went into the hospital of poore and ricke folke, called the Fermorie, and tooke all the siluer uessell that the sicke folke were serued with, and railed them out of their beds, and droue them away, some with great strokes and staues, and some were cast downe from the galleries. And when these hounds had done that acte, they went to the church of Saint John and tooke downe the tombes of the great masters, and fought if there were any treasure hid in them, and they forced certaine women and maidens," "A brief relation of the siege and taking of the Citie of Rhodes, by Sultan Soliman the great Turke, translated out of French into English at the motio of the Reuerend Lord Thomas Dockwray, great prior of the order of Ierusalem in England, 1524" in *Principal Navigations*, vol. 2 (1599), 95.

⁹⁹ "Siege of Rhodes" in Hakluyt, *Principal Navigations*, vol. II (1599), 73.

¹⁰⁰ "Janizaries, called the slaves of the Grand Signor [...] at the ende off thie staffe hard by the head of the speare, a horse taile died in a bloody colour, which is their ensigne: they be the challengers for the Turkes owne person [...] immediately after them came the great Turke himself with great pompe and magnificence, using

that he obtained a safe-conduct from Suleyman. This document not only allowed him to safely trade inside the Ottoman territories, but also implied that Ottoman merchants should help by any means and not cause him any harm.¹⁰¹ At a first glance this report seems to have only a commercial value, but it is not redundant to highlight that the Ottoman merchants needed an official document to constrain from plundering European merchants' ships which implies that piracy and pillage not only characterized their usual behavior, but were also tolerated by the Sultan. This idea is reinforced in another account Hakluyt included which had written as marginalia: *The malice of the Turkish merchants*. The author of this account calls the Ottoman merchants their mortal enemies, as they would sooner give their goods for free to anyone, than be the victims of the Ottomans' crimes.¹⁰² This conduct explains why the Ottomans at sea and in battles terrified Europeans. John Foxe's narrative about the release from Ottoman captivity of some Christians, that Hakluyt included in the collection, reinforces the fear of the Ottomans as the readers find out that the Christians were terrified to confront the fearless Ottomans in battle, especially since the latter were even happy to lose their lives in their attempt to conquer the Christian ship.¹⁰³ John Foxe goes further in his characterization of the Ottomans arguing

in his countenance and gesture a wonderfull maiestie, hauing onely on each side on his person one page clothed with cloth of gold, embrodered nost richly with the most precious stones, and upon his head a goodly white tucke, containing in length by estimation fiteene yards, which as of silke and linen wouen together, resembling something Callicut cloth, but is much more fine and rich, and in the top of his crowne, a little pinnach of white Ostrich feathers, and his horse most richly appareled in all points correspondent to the same," in *Principal Navigations* (1589), 81-82.

¹⁰¹ "Moreover, wee commaunde all our Captaines of our Ballies and their Liutenants, be they Foystes, or other vessels, that when they shall finde the sayde Ienkinson, or his factor, his shippe or shippes, with his seruants, and marchandise, that they hurt him not, neyther in bodie nor goods, but that rather they assist, and defend him against all such as secke to doe him wrong, and that they ayde and helpe him victuals, according to his want and that whosoeuer shall see these presents, obey the same, as they will auoide the penaltie in doing the contratie", "The safe conduct of priuiledge, given by Sultan Solymen the Great Turke, to Master Anthony Ienkinson in Aleppo in Syria, in the yeere, 1553" in *Principal Navigations* (1589), 83.

¹⁰² (marg. "The malice of the Turkish merchants") "In these partes be many Turkie merchants resident, which giue an outward shew, as though they were glad of our comming hither, but secretly thy be our mortall enemies, searching by all meanes to hinder our sales, because we should the sooner giuet ouer our trade thither, which in processe of time I hope will growe to better perfection," "The fourth voyage into Persia, made by M. Arthus Edwards Agent, Iohn Sparke, Laurence Chapman, Christopher Faucet, and Richanrd Pingle, in the yeere 1568 delcares in this letter written from Casbin in Persia" in *Principal Navigations*, vol. 1 (1598), 391.

¹⁰³ "Which the owner perceiuing, manfullt enouraged his companie, exhorting them valiantly to shewe their manhoode, shewing them that God was their God, and not their enemies, requesting them also not to faint in seeing such a heape [...] many a Turke bought it deerly with the losse of their liues [while trying to get from their

that it is their absence of manhood and lack of respect for their own state that makes them act so unrestrained.¹⁰⁴ The general idea that stems from these accounts that Hakluyt selected is one of fear towards the Ottomans, but rather respect towards their ruler.

Although among the pages of *Principal Navigations* Hakluyt included narratives that refer to other Muslim ethnic groups with which the Englishmen interacted, their portrayal follows the same line as that of the Ottomans. The Moors, the Arabs, and the Saracens were all depicted as cruel thieves who brought misery to the Christians through their inhumane actions.¹⁰⁵ The only other Muslim society, besides the Ottomans, that stands out and occupies a rather significant role are the Persians. Hakluyt included in the collection an ethnographic account of the Persian Empire written by Anthony Jenkinson. The description offers information ranging from religion, laws, customs, the habits of the “Shah” to manner of government, geography, and natural resources.¹⁰⁶ Jenkinson relates that the Persians are welcoming and their behavior is so pleasant that Christians might be tempted to join their religion. However, he goes on emphasizing that they were not always like this, they needed laws to regulate the thievery to better live in peace and prosperity.¹⁰⁷ If Jenkinson had only

ship to the Englishmen's],” “The worthie enterprise of Iohn Fox an Englishman in deliuering 166 Christians out of the captiuitie of the Turkes at Alexandria, the 3 of Ianuarie 1577” in *Principal Navigations* (1589), 150-151.

¹⁰⁴ “So it was that the Turks were victors, whereof they had no great cause to reioyce, or triumph. Then would it haue grieved any hard heart to see these Infidels so violently intreating the Christians, not hauing any respect of their manhood which they had tasted of, nor yet respecting their owene state, how they might haue met with such a bootie, as might haue giuen them the ouerthrow: but no reporse hereof, or any thing els doth bridle their fierce and tyrannous dealing,” “The worthy enterprise of Iohn Foxe and Englishman in deliuering 266 Christians out of the captiuitie of the Turkes at Alexandria of the 3 of Ianuarie 1577” in *Principal Navigations*, vol. 2 (1599), 132.

¹⁰⁵ Descriptions about the Moors are found in “The voyage of M Iohn Locke to Ierusalem” in *Principal Navigations*, vol.2 (1599), 106; about the Saracens in “The worthy voyage of Richard the First, King of England into Asia, for the recouery of Ierusalem out of the handes of the Saracens, drawn out of the booke of Actes and Monuments of the Church of England, written by M. Iohn Foxe” in *Principal Navigations* (1589), 12 and in “The voyage of William Longspee”, a notable and valiant gentleman of England into Asia, in the yeere 1248 and in the 32 yeere of the raigne of Henrie the 3 King of England” in *Principal Navigations* (1589), 19; about the Arabs in “The first voyage or iourney, made by Master Laurence Aldersey, Marchant of London, to the Cities of Ierusalem, and Tripolis, etc. In the yeere 1581. Penned and set down by himself” in *Principal Navigations* (1589), 181 and in “The voyage of M. Iohn Eldred to Tripolis in Syria by sea, and from thence by land and riuer to Babylon and Balsara. 1583” in *Principal Navigations* (1589), 232.

¹⁰⁶ “Preface to the Readers,” in *Principal Navigations* (1598).

¹⁰⁷ “This article was granted in respect of a custome among the Persians, being Mahumetans, whose maner is friendly to reiceive and wel entertaine, both with gifts and liuing, all such Christians, as forsaking their religion, will become of the religion of the Persians. Insomuch that before this priuiledge was granted, there was

laudatory words for the character of the Persians, his colleague from the Muscovy Company, Geffrey Ducket, expressed discontent toward the king's habits. He loathed the Shah's lust and condemned his sexual behavior.¹⁰⁸ Ducket believed that the king's withdrawn lifestyle and lack of interest in matters of state, turned the laws of the state he was ruling into a detestable policy. He underlined that the Persians disrespected Muslim precepts and lacked education in many noble disciplines.¹⁰⁹ However, Ducket noted that the Ottoman sultan greatly respected the king of Persia, although he was inferior to him in strength and power, as well as in administration and military equipment.¹¹⁰ Thus, although the purpose of Hakluyt's collection was to document the travels of the Englishmen, he managed to build indirectly a socio-religious identity of the Ottomans. Their ambivalent image that inspired the readers both fear and respect is mirrored in the authors' portrayal of Christian peoples as well as in the depiction of other Muslim groups.

The politico-economic identity of the Ottomans is built on the ideas of civility and equality between England and the Ottoman Empire and it stems from Hakluyt's selection of documents. Although this level of identity might have been heavily distorted by his patrons' influence, Hakluyt still left a few words of his own on the matter. In the dedicatory letter from

great occasion of naughty seruants to deceive and rob their masteres, that under the colour of professing that religion, they might loue among them in such safetie, that you might haue lo lawe agaynst them," "Notes concerning this fourth voyage into Persia, begun in the moneth of Iuly 1568 gathered by M, Richard Willes from the mouth of Master Arthur Edwards, which was Agent in the same" in *Principal Navigations* (1598), 392.

¹⁰⁸ "The king hath not come out of the compasse of his owne house in 33 or 34 yeeres, whereof the cause is not knowen, but as they say, it is upon a superstition of certaine prophecies to which they are greatly addicted: he is now about 80 yeeres of age and very lusty. And to keepe him the more lusty, he hath 4 wiues alwayes, and about 3000 concubines, and once in the yeere he hath all the faire maidens and wiues that may be found a great way about brought unto him, whom he dilligently pursueth, feeling them in all parts, taking such as he liketh, and putting away some of them which he hath kept before. [...] he takes a loth of bath and whenever he does that takes with him many wives and concubines, and they take care of him. putitng oil on him, washing him, cutting his nails etc", "Further obseruations concerning the state of Persia, taken in the foresayd fift voyage into those partes, and written by M. Geffrey Ducket, one of the Angents emploied in the same," in *Principal Navigations* (1598), 398-400.

¹⁰⁹ "Further obseruations concerning the state of Persia, taken in the foresayd fift voyage into those partes, and written by M. Geffrey Ducket, one of the Angents emploied in the same," in *Principal Navigations* (1598), 399.

¹¹⁰ "The Shaugh or king of Persia is nothing in strength and power comparable unto the Turke: for althrough he hath a great Dominion, yet is nothing to be compares with the Turks: neither hath he any great Ordinance or gunnes, or harquebuses [...] The great Turke hath this Shaugh in great reuerence, because he hath reigned king so long time," "Further obseruations concerning the state of Persia, taken in the foresayd fift voyage into those partes, and written by M. Geffrey Ducket, one of the Angents emploied in the same" in *Principal Navigations* (1598), 398-400.

the 1589 edition of *Principal Navigations* he was praising Elizabeth's success and unprecedented endeavor in establishing relations with both the king of Persia and the Ottoman Sultan.¹¹¹ In the second edition from 1599, Hakluyt felt the need to add moral arguments for this connection through Biblical references and emphasis on the normality among Christian states, not only those who were conquered or tributary, to have relations with these empires.¹¹² The majority of the documents that form the politico-economic identity are part of a diplomatic letters exchange between Elizabeth and Murad III. Although certain expressions and phrases are characteristic to diplomatics rhetoric, they nonetheless reveal the mutual attitude of the two rulers, as well as the position they gave to each other in their conceptions of world order.

For example, the letter sultan Murad sent in 1579 to Elizabeth noted:

Our stately Court and Countrey hath beene euer open for the accesse both of our enemies and friends. But because we are informed that your most excellent Regall Maiestie doth abound with good will, humanitie, and all kinde of louing affection towards us, so much the rather shall the same our Countrey be alwayes open to such of your subiects, as by way of merchandize shall trade hither: and we will neuer faile to aid and succor any of them that are or shall be willing to esteeme of our friendship, fauor, and assistance. [...] Therefore when these our Imperiall letters shall be brought to your most excellent Regal Maiestie, it shall be meet, according to our benevolence, humanitie and familiaritie towards your most excellent Maiestie, that you likewise beethinke your selfe of your like beneuolence, humanitie and friendshippe towards us.¹¹³

It was an invitation for developing commercial ties. A proposal where it seemed that Elizabeth had the option to choose whether to become a friend or a foe. But by appealing to

¹¹¹ "For, which of the kings of this land before her Majesty, had theyr banners euer seene in the Caspian sea? which of them hath euer dealt with the Emperor of Persia, as her Maiesty hath done, and obtained for her merchants large & louing priguileges? who euer saw before this regiment, an English Ligier in the stately porch of the Grand Signor at Constantinople? who euer found English Consuls & Agents at Tripolis in Syria, at Aleppo, at Babylon, at Balsara?" "Dedicatory Letter" in *Principal Navigations* (1589).

¹¹² "Now here if any man shall take exception against this our new trade with Turkes and misbeleeuers, he shall shew himselfe a man of small experience in old and new Histories, or willfully lead with partialitie, or some worse humour. For whi knoweth not, that king Salomon of old, enred into league upon necessitie with Hiram the king of Tyrus, a gentile? Or who is ignorant that the French, the Genouois, Florentines, Raguseans, Venetians, and Polonians are at this day in league with the Grand Signor, and haue beene these many yeeres, and haue used trade and traffike in his dominions? Who can deny that the Emperor of Christendome hath had league with the Turke, and payd him a long while a pension for a part of Hungarie?" "Dedicatory Letter" in *Principal Navigations*, vol. 2 (1599).

¹¹³ "The letters sent from the Imperiall Musulmanlike highnesse of Zuldán Murad Chan, to the sacred regall Maiestie of Elizabeth Queene of England, the fifteenth of March 1579" in *Principal Navigations* (1589), 163.

the queen's good nature, good reason, and civility the answer is already given. Interesting to notice is that the Sultan's offer seems a humble one. By advertising the supportive attitude of his people and what benefits a potential commercial alliance with his domains will bring, the document gives the impression that the polity under Elizabeth's authority was more powerful than his. The queen's response followed soon after:

Most imperiall and most inuincible Emperor [...] For the almight God, by whom and by whose grace we reigne, hath planted in us this goodnesse of nature, that we detest and abhorre the least suspicion of ingratitude and hath taught us not to suffer our selues to be ouermatched with the good demerits of other princes. And therefore at this time we do extend our good minde vnto your highnes, by well conceiuing, and publishing also abroad, how much we repute out selfe bound in an euerlasting remembrance for this good pleasure to our subiects [...] Which libertie we promise to your highnesse shal be as ample, and as large as any was euer given or granted to your subiects by the aforesaid princes your conferates, as namely the king of the Romans, or France, of Poland, and the common wealth of Venice [...] the assurance of your highnesse great affection to us and our nation does cause us also to intreat and use mediation on the behalfe of certaine of our subiects, who are deteined as slaues and captiues in your gallies, for whom we craue, that forasmuch as they are fallen into that miserie, not by any offence of theirs, by bearing of armes against your highnesse, or in behauing themselues contrarie to honestie, and to the law of nations, they may be delivered from their bondage, and restored to libertie, for their seruice towards us, according to their duetie: which thing shall yeeld much more abundant cause to us of commending your clemecie, and of beseeching that God (who onely is above all things, and all men, and is a msot seure reuenger of all ideolatrie and is ielous of his honor against the false gods of the nations) to adorne your most inuincible imperiall highnesse with all the blessings of those gifts.¹¹⁴

Not only did Elizabeth accept the Sultan's offer and acknowledged his authority, but she also appealed to his good nature to free the Englishmen who were kept captive. The rhetoric present in this letter shows that the sultan was treated from an equal position and this idea was reinforced by Murad's response to her request.¹¹⁵ By including these documents in the collection, Hakluyt did not only highlight that the Englishmen were treated as a potent nation,

¹¹⁴ "The answeere of her Maiestie to the aforesaid Letters of the Great Turke, sent the 25 of October 1579, in the Prudence of london by Maister Richard Stanley" in *Principal Navigations* (1589), 166.

¹¹⁵ "Wherefore according to our humanitie and gracious ingrassed disposition, the requests of her Maiestie were accepted to us, and wee haue graunted unto her Maiestie this priuiledge of ours agreeable to reason and equitie," "The interpretation of the letters or priuilege of the most mightie and Musulmanlike Emperor Zuldán Murad Chan" in *Principal Navigations* (1589), 169.

but also that the Ottoman Empire was a civilized polity worthy of becoming an ally. Interesting to notice is that in his translation from Latin, Hakluyt avoids using the word “Muslim” and replaces it either with “our holy faith and religion” or “the holy religion.”¹¹⁶ His evasiveness could indicate either towards his discontent with Islam or with his readership’s reserved attitude towards the religion of the Ottomans.

From other diplomatic reports Hakluyt included in *Principal Navigations* the readers could find out not only, for example, the wages of every military leader in the Ottoman army, but also the structures of Ottoman military administration. Such a document also presents the types of soldiers included in the army and the role they had. For example, from an extract that details the expenditures of the Ottoman army, one finds out that the Azamoglans were the children forcefully collected as child levy from the tributary Christian states.¹¹⁷ Besides this, there are also lists with “The Turkes chiefe officers” and the amount of ambassadors’ allowances.¹¹⁸ Interesting to notice is that these sources do not really fit into Hakluyt’s main purpose of the collection. They do not mention any enterprise made by Englishmen but are rather ambassadorial reports which offer insightful quasi-ethnographic material on the organization of the Ottoman administration. However, not all reports coming from the legates at the Porte keep a diplomatic or even positive tone. Ambassador Edward Barton complained about the murders and robberies the Ottomans committed and pitied all those people who had to live under the rule of such an “infidel prince,” as they cannot live in peace and prosperity since they do not follow the true knowledge of God.¹¹⁹ To this extent, the discourse on the

¹¹⁶ Dimmock, *New Turkes. Dramatizing Islam*, 89.

¹¹⁷ “A briefe extract specifying the certaine daily paiments, answered quarterly in time of peace, by the Grand Signor, out of his treasurie, to the officers of his Seraglio, or Court, successiue in degrees: collected in a yeerely totall summe, as followeth.” in *Principal Navigations* (1589), 203.

¹¹⁸ *Principal Navigations* (1589), 205-207.

¹¹⁹ “What insolencies, murders and robberies were committed not onely upon Christians but also upon Turks I omit to write, and I pray God in England the like may neuer be seene: and yet I could wish, that such amongst us as haue inioyed the Gospel with such great and admirable peace and prosperity under her Maiesties gouernment this forty yeeres, and haue not all this time brought forth better fruits of obedience to God, and thankfulness to her Maiesty, were there but a short time to beholde the miserable condition both of Chritians and other liuing under such an infidel prince, who not onely are wrapped in most palpable and grosse ignorance of

Ottoman Empire was not becoming more homogenous not even after the establishment of the Anglo-Ottoman alliance. Although the English admired the Ottoman administration, laws, and military organization, the religious rhetoric was still overshadowing any pragmatic interests.

Thus, although Hakluyt's scarce opinions on the Ottoman Empire might limit the analysis of how he perceived this polity only through official state interests filters, the image of the Ottomans that stems from his works merges a comparative reference, both implicit and explicit, to other empires and civilizations. His portrayal of the Ottomans is, in fact, the result of a clash between the types of documents included in the compendium and the purpose for including them there. Generally, the historical accounts and travelogues Hakluyt includes in the collection depict the Ottomans as barbarous people who committed the most heinous atrocities to those venturing into their territories, but the diplomatic and commercial reports describe them as being organized, proficient, and capable of expanding the Empire's economy. However, this double-sided contrast also fluctuates, as not all travelers had awful experiences with the Ottomans, and neither all ambassadors nor merchants thought their discipline to be praiseworthy. Ultimately, even if Hakluyt's purposes on compiling the material did not place the depiction of the Ottoman Empire into foreground, his contribution as a humanist editor and gatherer also influenced this portrayal to a great extent. Since from Sansovino's works results a similar conclusion, it is worth inquiring whether these editorial activities and personal input into the publications had any common ground, not necessarily in their particularities, but on a rather general process that both humanists might have followed when they envisioned the structure and compositions of their compendia.

mind, but are cleane without the meanes of the true knowledge of God: I doubt not but the sight/fight hereof (if they be not cleane void of grace) would stirre them up to more thankfulness to God, that euer they were borne in so happy a time, and under so wise and godly a prince professing the true religion of Christ," "A description of a Voiage to Constantinople and Syria begun the 21 of March 1593 and ended the 9 of August 1595 wherein is shewed the order of deliuering the second Present by Master Edward Barton her maiesties Ambassador, which was sent from her Maiestie to Sultan Murad Can, Emperous of Turkie" in *Principal Navigations*, vol. 2 (1599), 307.

Part II. Humanists' Agency in Constructing the Image of the Ottomans

The analyses of the previous two chapters raise two questions. First, what is the link between Sansovino, and Hakluyt in their portrayal of the Ottomans? Although at first glance the humanists' source choices seem to show an ambivalence of the collective image of the Ottomans, a closer analysis reveal that the antithesis is in fact most visible between the sultan's portrayal, on one hand, and that of his subjects, on the other. Even if in some places contradictory, both the English and the Italian collections display a dichotomy between the ruler's good nature and civil reason, and his subjects' lack of humanity and uncivilized character. Second, how could two humanists shape similar images of the Ottomans given that they performed their roles as editors in very particular socio-economic and politico-religious circumstances, and published compendia that were different both in kind and purpose?

Building upon the existence of a contradictory and inconsistent image of the Ottomans in Sansovino's and Hakluyt's works, this part of the thesis examines the depiction of otherness as a means of sixteenth-century humanists' self-fashioning. My argument is that such an image of the Ottomans was possible only because the collections and editorial activities of both Sansovino and Hakluyt were the instruments through which concerns, and ideas of the period were filtered. This part of the thesis is not divided into separate chapters on Sansovino and Hakluyt but traces "filters" that reflect the agency of the two editors. I have divided it into two sections which will track the editorial and intellectual input of both Sansovino and Hakluyt. For the first part, although the editorial input of the two humanists in constructing their compilations has been touched upon in historical studies, it is worth analyzing this aspect more closely to better understand the type and nature of the material in these compendia and how the compilers dealt with it. In the second part, to grasp how Sansovino and Hakluyt left their

intellectual imprint on the collections, I will look at how they expressed their thoughts regarding philosophical, political matters, and ideas on world order and civility. Although I refer in an earlier chapter to how they understood and defined these issues in other of their publications, in this part of the thesis I will refer to the external material they used. To do so, I will trace the references they provide in their works to understand how different kinds of publications formed Sansovino's and Hakluyt's work. To pursue these lines of inquiry I will refer, but not limit myself, to their correspondence, dedicatory letters, and prefaces from the materials that discuss the Ottomans.

II.1. Sansovino, Hakluyt, and Editorial Practices

Although the methods and purposes of historical writing have been constantly changing, there is one particular aspect that prevailed over time. Sometimes still employed even in today's discourses, the use of historical writing as auxiliary material in shaping ideological rhetoric was recurrent at the time Sansovino and Hakluyt carried out their publishing activity. Whether it was used for promoting a crusading ideal or for legitimizing a nascent imperial aspiration, history was a binder that brought under the same covers an array of arguments, artifacts, and affections that were meant to impress the readers. But to do so, the humanists had to learn the tricks of the trade.

By the time Sansovino and Hakluyt lived, the methods and uses of history writing began to diversify depending on the field of inquiry that employed it. Though in the sixteenth century historical inquiry was used not only in *studia humanitatis*, but also in disciplines that later were labeled as sciences, the analysis of past events and people was recurrent in political or philosophical commentaries, cosmographies and, ethnographic descriptions.¹²⁰ The approach to writing history during the sixteenth century became more systematic, as humanists began to be interested in finding better documentation and concern themselves with causality of events.¹²¹ At the same time, the all-encompassing concept of history also turned into a more man-centered, political, and secular one. For a better understanding of such matters, the historian should have had knowledge of and involvement in military and political events.¹²² However analytical and groundbreaking were the works coming from thinkers prepared as

¹²⁰ For the uses of *historia* in disciplines with scientific character see "Introduction" in Gianna Pomata and Nancy G. Siriasi, eds., *Historia. Empiricism and Erudition in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge and London: MIT Press, 2005). See also Anthony Grafton, *What was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

¹²¹ Grafton, "The Identity of History in Early Modern Europe: Prelude to a study of the *Artes Historicae*" in Pomata and Siriasi, eds., *Historia. Empiricism and Erudition*, 56-57.

¹²² Grendler, *Sansovino and Popular Culture*, 151; Moz, "Sansovino, a Polygraph," 115-116.

such, the depth and complexity of their ideas was often too much for ordinary men. It was between these lines that characters such as Sansovino and Hakluyt stepped in. Through their way of writing history, by organizing, simplifying, and translating for their intended audiences, Sansovino and Hakluyt have been ascribed the label of popularizers. While nonetheless true, such tags seem to oversimplify the imprint these humanists left in their works.

In fact, both Sansovino and Hakluyt, though in different ways, ascribed history an essential function. For the Venetian, the study of history was important not only because it provided models based on which one can learn, but also because by studying it, man can predict and shape his future actions¹²³ Nonetheless, for Sansovino, in matters of government contemporary politics provided more useful examples than the ancient texts as he stated in the dedicatory of *Historia Universale* from 1560:

I have abridged together as much as I could assemble for the eyes of those who read this History; they can both enjoy and find it useful. Despite how many good lessons the Ancient examples provide for our actions, I consider that the deeds of modern peoples, especially those of the Turks who live right under our eyes, should be points of infinite references and not neglected, as they offer us lessons that we cannot learn from the ancient things.¹²⁴

Thus, for Sansovino history represented a mixture between old and recent sources, where the focus falls on the latter. Whether it was editorial convenience, or he really stood by his assertion, the same words found their place in the preface of the 1573 edition of the collection. For Hakluyt, the role of history was to bring to the contemporary eyes forgotten material that should in fact be remembered, as he stated in the dedicatory letter of the 1589 edition of *Principall Navigations* that in this:

¹²³ See p. 19 above.

¹²⁴ “Ma perche gli scrittori sono stati molti e di varie nationi e difficil cosa e il poter vedere a pieno ogni cosa in questa material, pero io che ho sempre havuto grandissima contentezza si intender il gouerno, i modi e, il fondamento di quell Principato, ho ridotto insieme quanto per me si e potuto raccorre, occhio che coloro che leggeranno la presente Historia, possono hauerne diletto e utile parimente, stimando io che quantunque le cose de gli antichi ne arrechino buoni ammaestramenti nelle nostre operationi rendendone accorti, nondimeno quelle de moderni e specialmente de Turchi che ne uinon su gli occhi, non siano punto per infiniti risperri da tralasciarsi in dietro, cavando noi delle cose presenti, uie piu maggior srutto, che delle cose passate non facciamo,” “Dedicatory Letter” in *Historia Universale*, vol. 1 (1560).

worke of mine I have not included within the compasse of things onely done in these latter days, as though litle or nothing woorthie of memorie had bene performed in former ages; but mounting aloft by the space of many hundred yeered, haue brought to light many very rare and worthy monuments, which long haue miserably scattered in mustie corners, and retchlesly hidden in mistie darknesse, and were very like for the greatest part to haue bene buried in perpetuall obliuion.¹²⁵

And a look at his *Discourse concerning western planting* shows that Hakluyt's emphasis on unearthing obscure sources was his attempt to construct an English historical identity, one of the three pillars on which he envisioned the English nationhood.¹²⁶ Furthermore, due to their humanist education, Sansovino and Hakluyt got accustomed to the developments of historical writing, as much as they became aware of their contemporaries' publications that used historical arguments, aspects which I will emphasize below. Also, because political and religious facts influenced Sansovino and Hakluyt, their task became one of adopting and adapting the available historical discourse. Neither of the two humanists had direct experience with the Ottoman world. However, both Sansovino and Hakluyt found themselves in places where information was gathered and distributed across Europe, either by land or across the Chanel, where material was discussed, requested, and reprinted.¹²⁷ In the end, their compilations may have been products meant for popularization, but the process behind composing them was more complex. Fortunately, their methods can be dismantled, as Sansovino and Hakluyt left traces along the pages on how they envisioned the collections and their purposes.¹²⁸

As *Historia Universale* and *Principall Navigations* are two compendia that differ in purpose, they also have contrasting structures. Despite the possible material additions or

¹²⁵ "Dedicatory letter" in *Principal Navigations* (1589).

¹²⁶ See p. 14 above.

¹²⁷ See Bronwen Wilson, *The World in Venice*; Andrew Pettegree, "Centre and Periphery in the European Book World," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 18 (2008), 101–28.

¹²⁸ For a study with similar approach see Anthony Grafton and Joanna Weinberg. "Johann Buxtorf Makes a Notebook" in *Canonical Texts and Scholarly Practices: A Global Comparative Approach*, edited by Anthony Grafton and Glenn W. Most (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 275–98.

extractions, Sansovino roughly kept the same structure in all the four editions of *Historia Universale* that were printed during his lifetime. In the preface for the readers attached to the 1560 edition, he informs his audience that the first part of this compendium contains issues related to the religion of the Ottomans, starting with an account on the life of Muhammad, originally in Arabic but then translated into Latin, then the ceremonies and costumes of the clergy. He continues with a description of the ceremonials and habits of noblemen, followed by an Arabic prophecy on the fall of the Ottoman Empire. He ends this first volume of the collection with a pamphlet (*trattatello*) that depicts the miserable condition of “those who live under the servitude of the barbarians.”¹²⁹ In the preface to the second volume of the same edition, he remarks that besides the information on the laws of the Ottoman Empire and the native costumes of the “Turkish nation” that he encompassed in the previous volume, now he offers the readers “the great and notable deeds of their Princes and the things done during peace and war times.”¹³⁰ In the other three editions of this work, the material Sansovino includes in the compendium increases considerably. Sansovino recurrently inserted other works or pieces from other publications that dealt with related issues. For example, in the 1573 edition, he included letters sent by secretaries and cardinals stationed in Constantinople because they contained details about some official organization or daily life in the Ottoman capital. Furthermore, he also added his own pieces of work in the compendium, such is the case of his two pamphlets *Lettera o vero discorso* and *Informatione a Soldati Christiani* found in the 1582

¹²⁹ “Per farui interamente capaci, o benigni lettori, dello ordine della presente Historia ui diciamo che nella prima parte si contengono le cose appartenenti alla credenza de Turchi, nella seconda sono poste le guerre e l’altre operationi fatte da lor Principi in accrescimento di quello stato. Ma tornando alla prima parte, ui habbiamo dato a leggere la uita di Macometto in compendio tratta dale scritture de gli Arabi pero fatte latine, accioche ui sieno manifeste le bugie, le favole, le inettie, e le chimere della sua vana dottrina e de suoi costume, da popoli Orientali tanto esaltati [...] Dopo havete ordinatamente posti i costume prima de sacerdoti e le cerimonie loro ne gli office e poi dell’altre persone particolari cosi in casa come fuori cosi de nobili come de gli artigiani. Alli quali seguono la Profeia volgata tra Turchi per laquale essi credono che tosto habbia a uenire la rouina dell’imperio loro, e la dichiarazione delle parole d’essa profesia. Havete ancho un trattatello della miseria di coloro che vivono nella servitu de Barbari,” “Letter to the Readers” in *Historia Universale*, vol. 1 (1560).

¹³⁰ “tutti I fatti illustri e notabili de’loro Principi cosi in tempo di pace come di Guerra avvenuti, accioche,” “Letter to the readers” in *Historia Universale*, vol. 1 (1560).

edition, as well as translations of three accounts on sieges and one of a chronicle about the Saracens included in the 1573 edition, even if they only partly offer relevant details on the topics he states in the prefaces.

A look at what remotely resembles a table of contents in the 1573 edition, shows the evolution of this anthology, as it is perhaps the most elaborate and longest. If the contents lists added in the 1560 edition mentions only ten items, the 1573 one has 26. In the first volume of the princeps edition, the names of the authors do not always accompany the title of the works, while in the second volume, Sansovino lists only the names of the authors which he compiled, and in their arrangement seems to be no chronological or thematical order. The 1573 table of contents, however, looks very different. Besides the fact that Sansovino includes both the title of the works, their authors, and where the case, the name of the translator (only him though), their arrangement sheds light on the actual structure of the composition. Starting with the life and doctrine of Muhammad and ending with *Gionata navale de Venetiani col Turco* (The one day naval encounter of the Venetians with the Turk), Sansovino provides not only a chronological order of the items included in the compendium, but also a thematic arrangement. Furthermore, he also organizes the sources based on their type, as in the first part he includes the life of Ottoman princes, followed by information on the costumes and customs, then official reports from various European or Christian legates, and, towards the end, accounts on the Ottoman sieges in the Mediterranean. The similar table of contents inserted in the 1582 edition shows that he got rid of some of the texts included in the previous one, which is mentioned from the beginning, as the title page of the collection notes that this edition was modified in parts by the Inquisition. What is perhaps more interesting is that he does not mention anymore the names of the authors, besides that of Giovio, alongside the titles of the works as he did in the previous editions. From the structure and nature of the material, it comes to foreground that

Sansovino's compendium was more of an ethnographic and historical work, rather than a cosmographical or geographical one.

Although the manner in which Sansovino grasps the Ottoman Empire in his work is both diachronical and spatial, he emphasizes the first aspect. Hakluyt, on the other hand, tries to create a much more intricate interplay between the two perspectives in his *Principall Navigations*. If the above quoted passage from the dedicatory letter of the first edition indicates towards a construction of a diachronic documentary frame by introducing in his anthology old and new accounts, a little further down the lines in the preface to the readers attached in the same volume, he emphasized the same idea adding also a spatial element to it: "to incorporate into one body the torne and scattered limes of our ancient and late Nauigations by Sea, our voyages by land, and traffiques of merchandise by both."¹³¹ In the same preface, Hakluyt explains the structure of his compendium. *Principall Navigations* is divided into three parts or, as he calls them, "classes," based on the geographical area in which the travels were undertaken. The information that touches upon the Ottomans is mostly encompassed in the first part, where he presents the travels into Asia, starting from Antiquity until the present day. The emphasis of his short descriptive summary falls, unlike Sansovino's thematic structure, on the main geographic points to where the travelers went.¹³² The five pages long table of contents that follows after the preface sheds more clarity of the types of sources that Hakluyt compiles under the covers of *Principall Navigations*. The emphasis falls on the name of the location and of the person undertaking the voyage. The second edition from 1599 follows the same structure,

¹³¹ "Letter to the readers" in *Principal Navigations* (1589).

¹³² "For I find that the oldest trauels as well of the ancient Britains, as of the English, were ordinarie to Iudea which is in Asia, termed by them the Holy land, principally for deuotions sake according to the time [...] But of latter dayes I see our men haue pierced further into the East, haue passed downe the mightie riuier Euphrates, aue sayled from Balsara through the Persian gulfe to the Citie of Ormuz, and from thence to Chaul and Goa in the East India, which passages written by the parties themselues were herein to be read. To these I haue added the Nauigations of the English made for the parts of Africa, and either within or without the strights of Gibraltar: within, to Constantinople in Romania, to Alexandria, and Cayro in Egypt. to Tunez, to Goletta, to Malta, to Algier, and to Tripolis in Barbary," "Letter to the reader" in *Principal Navigations* (1589).

but the amount and type of material is much enlarged, as Hakluyt dedicates a volume to each of the three directions towards which Englishmen are supposed to have traveled.

The type of material used by both Sansovino and Hakluyt, as well as the profile of their authors is incredibly varied. In *Principall Navigations* can be identified almost 600 separate items representing a broad spectrum of travel genres. These include reprints from sixteenth century news pamphlets, transcriptions from private, commercial, and diplomatic correspondence, translated snippets from medieval Latin chronicles, longer translations from contemporary European histories, reproductions of ruttiers and ships' logs, and extracts of poetry in Latin and English. A look at Sansovino's *Historia Universale* reveals that he also employed a quite similar spectrum of sources. As their collections include a variety of authors ranging from clerics, soldiers, former captives, state informers, politicians, humanists, both humanists appear to have preferred sources resulted from the direct experience of the narrated events.¹³³

Since both *Historia Universale* and *Principall Navigations* contain such a wide range of material, it is questionable to what extent Sansovino and Hakluyt managed to shape it into a coherent body of text. In Sansovino's case the *Avvertimenti*, small summaries, and marginal comments that he inserted on some pages, seem to signal a rather abrupt transition from one text to another, without actually linking the materials. If, what historians have argued so far, Sansovino's work is only a hasty compilation which does not reflect his ideas, it is in the unnatural gathering of the text that it finds its roots, rather than in the lack of personal notes he left.¹³⁴ In Hakluyt's case, the mixture between geographical and chronological order gives the impression of a clearer categorization of the material, but many historians' readings of *Principall Navigations* resemble those of Sansovino's work. E. G. R. Taylor, for example,

¹³³ Bonora, *Ricerche su Francesco Sansovino*, 99-100.

¹³⁴ See note 24.

remarked that Hakluyt's collection was made to resemble a unified work, but it was rather just a cluster of material, united by the paratext.¹³⁵ MacCrossan also noted that the content of the narratives puts into question the smooth evolution of a meta-narrative of conquests and exploits that Hakluyt tried to construct by adding the standardized formula of "voyage" to each account.¹³⁶ Thus, it is at the paratext-level that one must look in order to grasp how Sansovino and Hakluyt perceived and altered the material they included in their compendia.

The reasons why Sansovino and Hakluyt compiled the material included in their collections can be grasped through their dedicatory letters and prefaces to the readers. We see that Sansovino was fascinated by the government and administration of the Ottomans and, thus, he offered his readers an anthology of well-known and recent publications on these matters. Hakluyt also explicitly states that he has gathered the material that show all the voyages that Englishmen have made, since Antiquity until the time he was writing. Interesting to note is that both humanists emphasized the idea that they included only accounts which were trustworthy, which were generally approved as veridic. In the preface of the second volume of the 1560 edition, Sansovino wrote that:

we have put together all the authors who have treated with truth the deeds of the said Empire, because the History which is not true, deserves to be called Fable, and as the truth is loved by the minds of free men.¹³⁷

Besides pointing out his recurrent high praise of the role of history, this passage underlines the importance historical truth held for Sansovino. He even strengthened this idea as he remarked that he put together all the material considered to be accurate in content, but it is up to the readers to decide by comparison which ones tell the truth or lies.¹³⁸ However, apart from "truth," accessibility and ideals of good editorship played an important role in that his

¹³⁵ Colm MacCrossan, "Framing 'The English Nation': Reading Between Text and Paratext in The Principal Navigations" in Claire Jowitt and Daniel Carey, eds., *Richard Hakluyt and Travel Writing in Early Modern Europe* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2012), 141.

¹³⁶ MacCrossan, "Framing the English Nation," 147.

¹³⁷ "Letter to the Readers" in *Historia Universale*, vol. 2 (1560).

¹³⁸ "Letter to the Readers" in *Historia Universale*, vol. 2 (1560).

statement seems to follow a hidden rhetorical strategy. In the preface of the first volume of the 1560 edition, Sansovino remarked that he altered and tweaked the accounts, that he:

reduced them in a much better language that the first form was not offering, bringing them back to their sound and true reading in all those places where it was missing not only the words, but the whole lines.¹³⁹

And further down the collection, at the beginning of each major narrative, he annexed commentary notes on the texts. For example, Regarding Cambini's account, *Della origine de'Turchi*, a history of the Ottoman Empire, Sansovino acknowledges that Cambini gathered the information orally, through acquaintances and friends, which makes it believable, but because it was copied and reprinted so many times, it contained mistakes and distortions, which he has now corrected.¹⁴⁰ He also modified Giovio's book because, even if it was historically accurate and written in the vernacular language, it was his purpose to correct, reform, and "to improve the writers which are flawed, not only in meaning, but even in words"¹⁴¹

If Sansovino took on the task of modifying the texts which he thought needed improvement, Hakluyt only pointed out the major issues he saw in the texts. In the 1589 edition from *Principall Navigations*, Hakluyt introduced the Latin version of John Mandeville's accounts. The version of the text found there is the only Latin one found in print and is quite different from those circulating on the continent on which all other English printed edition were based.¹⁴² What is perhaps more interesting to note is that Hakluyt inserted, in a compendium

¹³⁹ "Lequali tutte cose io so molto bene che ui saranno care, perioch'oltre alla lettura dillettevole e utile anchora, le hauerete ridotte in assai miglior lingua che prima non crano, ritornandole alla sua sana e vera lettione in tutti que i luoghi, oue mancavano non solamente le parole, la le righe intere," "Letter to the Readers" in *Historia Universale*, vol. 1 (1560).

¹⁴⁰ "E ben vero che gli cadde nella mente di spiegar con stile e con ordine piu conueniente (conueniente) alla Historia che non e questo, i concetti raccolti per lui dalla vocca de gli amici che l'informarono, la interrotti da quella ch'interrompe tutte che cose del Mondo rimase questo Sommario, ilquale hauendo noi trouato corrotissimo e guasto per la diuersita delle copie de gli Impressori ignoranti, lo habbiamo ridotto alla sua piu vera e sana lettura rendendolo correto e acconcio in piu luoghi," "Letter to the Readers" in *Historia Universale*, vol. 2 (1560).

¹⁴¹ *Historia Univesale*, vol. 2 (1560), 70-71

¹⁴² Matthew Dimmock, "Hakluyt's Multiple Faiths" in Claire Jowitt and Daniel Carey, eds., *Richard Hakluyt and Travel Writing in Early Modern Europe* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2012), 222.

meant to emphasize the language identity of the Englishmen,¹⁴³ a 30 pages Latin travelogue to which he also attached a commentary:

If in purging from the countless errors of copyists and printers the work of our countryman John Mandeville, the erudite and distinguished author - let Bale, Mercator, Ortelius and others be my witness - by the collation of many, and those the best copies, I have achieved any success, let them be the judges who are learned men, and who in particular are skilled in geography and antiquities. As for the accounts he gives about men of monstrous shapes in chapters 30, 31, 33 and here in there in the following chapters of his travels, though I do not deny that certain of them were possibly observed by him somewhere, yet they are, for the most part, clearly drawn from Caius Plinius Secundus - as will soon appear to anyone who will compare them with the chapters of Pliny which I have appended for this purpose - and all of these Pliny himself refers to their various authors, loth to put his trust in the majority of them. Farewell, and use this work with me - or produce a better!¹⁴⁴

Much as Sansovino, Hakluyt expresses his discontent with how copyists and printers distort the texts and confesses his attempts to restore Mandeville's text to its original form. However, a most interesting detail in this passage is his observation regarding the veracity of Mandeville's account. Using as backup reference the opinion of contemporary intellectuals, he debunks the truth in Mandeville's words and argues that he copied entire passages from Pliny the Younger. Hakluyt goes even further in sustaining his argument by attaching the exact passages from Pliny that Mandeville had copied.¹⁴⁵ This account never made it into the second edition of the *Principall Navigations*. In their quest for providing the readers with historically accurate material, Sansovino and Hakluyt blended under their editorial cover accounts

¹⁴³ Helgerson talks about Elizabethan humanists and how through their vernacular works tried to create a "kingdom of our own language," Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood*, 2.

¹⁴⁴ *Principal Navigations* (1598), 77; the translated passage here is from The Correspondence of the two Richard Hakluyts, vol 2, ed. Taylor, 395-396.

¹⁴⁵ *Principall Navigations* (1589), 77-79.

displaying a contradictory image. But for them, it was more important that the source was reliable, and the best way to prove that was by pinning the narrative to a figure, a name, an author.

Although they occasionally modified the texts or their translations, both Sansovino and Hakluyt treated carefully the issue of authorship. It is worth mentioning that the idea of authorship from nowadays has a very different meaning from that of the time when Sansovino and Hakluyt wrote. If today's authorship is associated with individuality and originality, in mid sixteenth century it relied upon collaboration and collective participation. Authorship was a shared endeavor between all the actors who modified any of the textual material included in a volume. Nonetheless hierarchical, it delineated the input of each actor. Thus, sometimes recognizing authorship manifested not by mentioning the name of the writer, but the name of the agent-source who provided the text.¹⁴⁶ Even in those narratives where the origin or the name of the author was uncertain, Sansovino and Hakluyt tried to provide explanations from where the material came from or through whom they got hold of it. For example, Sansovino introduces in the second volume of the 1560 edition a narrative letter on the Morean war written by the Secretary of Sigismund Malatesta. Though the name of the character is not given, he was most probably Jacopo Anastagi, Sigismund Malatesta's secretary from the 1430s to his death in 1465.¹⁴⁷ About this letter Sansovino writes in the *Avvertimento* that it has been falsely printed by a man who credited himself as the author. But, since Cambini, Spandugino, and Giovio who wrote on the Morean war, refer to this secretary's account, Sansovino observed

¹⁴⁶ Zoe Langer, "More is More: Sansovino's Editorial Additions as a form of Authorship on Dante's *Commedia* (1564)" in *Minor Publishers in the Renaissance*, Angela Dressen, Susanne Gramatzki, Berenike Knoblich, eds. (Kunsttexte 2/2017), 4.

¹⁴⁷ Many works on the painter Piero della Francesca and his time at the court of Sigismund of Malatesta mention that Sigismund's secretary was Jacopo, who was also a fellow citizen with della Francesca; James R. Banker, *Piero della Francesca: Artist and man* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 139. When talking about Malatesta's campaigns, Setton also refers to Spandugino's work where Sigismondo's secretary's relations about his activity in 1450s are published; Kenneth Meyer Setton, "The Papacy and the Levant, 1204-1571," *American Philosophical Society*, vol. 161 (1976), 252.

that it is the same material which was published under a false name. Thus, he took the liberty to publish the text in its original form.¹⁴⁸

As for Hakluyt, although he underlines in every account the name of the person who took part in the voyage, he does not always mention the author of the source. For instance, about the most recent diplomatic and economic documents he integrates in the collection, he briefly mentions in the preface that he got them through the merchants from the Mercers' Company or the English ambassadors stationed at the Porte. However obvious it might have been that they are official documents there is no mention of the authors of the documents. In a relatively old but still important study, Paul Wittek analyses the "Turkish" documents included in the *Principall Navigations* and traces their provenance as well as translations.¹⁴⁹ Thus, we find out that the documents coming from or directed for the Porte have been reproduced by Hakluyt in their Latin or Italian versions, to which he also provided his own English version. Wittek underlines that the translation from Ottoman Turkish to Latin was most probably done by Mustafa Chaush, as all the documents are from the period when he was the official translator under the employment of the English crown.¹⁵⁰ Hakluyt also got several documents in Ottoman Turkish, such as Jenkinson's safe-conduct, but for *Principall Navigations*, he actually translated a French version that Jenkinson gave to him.¹⁵¹ As much as Hakluyt valued accurate translation, when it came to the documents regarding the Ottomans he made concessions. In 1580, the Sultan granted England the first capitulation and, its text was translated and circulated in many copies. Nonetheless, Hakluyt's translation was made from a copy that was destined for the queen, which also contained elements of the "solemn imperial letter". Hakluyt's English version of the *The Charter of the priviledge granted to the English, & the league of the Great*

¹⁴⁸ *Historia Universale*, Vol. 2 (1560), 225.

¹⁴⁹ See Paul Wittek, "The Turkish Documents in Hakluyt's 'Voyages'," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, vol. 19, no. 57 (1942), 121-139.

¹⁵⁰ Wittek, "Turkish Documents in Hakluyt," 127-128.

¹⁵¹ Wittek, "Turkish Documents in Hakluyt," 136.

Turke with the Queenes majestie in respect of traffique, dated in June 1580 seems to be missing the benediction formula found in capitulations, that the Christian prince should embrace the faith of Islam before their end.¹⁵² However, these ideological and religious factors did not alter Hakluyt's role as a promoter of knowledge spread through translations. In the preface of the third volume of the second edition of *Principall Navigations* he urged other humanists to translate and publish for the intellectual growth of the commonwealth. Though his call appealed mostly to humanists interested in the Americas, he advised and helped others with their translations. John Pory in the preface of his *History of Africa*, Robert Parke in his version of Mendoza's *History of China*, and P. Erondelle in his translation of Lescarbot's *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, have all paid their gratitude to Hakluyt for his support and encouragement in translating these works.¹⁵³ Hakluyt himself performed as a translator, and his most famous piece was the English version of Peter Martyr's *Decades*.

In comparison with Hakluyt who, for the entire collection, referred to material written in English, Latin, German, Spanish, Portuguese, French, and Greek, Sansovino's range of material seems meek, as he knew only Latin, Greek, French, and possibly Spanish. Elena Bonora observed that Sansovino made no reference to the German literature on the Ottomans because, she emphasizes, the authorship of the texts circulating in the Reformation area was questioned.¹⁵⁴ Although Sansovino might have avoided those texts also because he did not read the language, his activity as a translator is nonetheless worthy of mentioning. Though many of his translations are not at all related to his Ottoman works, it is worth mentioning that he managed to translate into Italian several Byzantine history chronicles. After 1562 the Fugger family developed an interest for the production of byzantine historiography, and they set in motion a series of Greek historians whose works have been consulted only by scholars in the

¹⁵² Wittek, "Turkish Documents in Hakluyt," 137-138.

¹⁵³ "Introduction" in Richard Hakluyt, ed. *Divers Voyages touching the Discovery of America and the Islands Adjacent*, ed. John Winter Jones (London: Hakluyt Society, 1850), xxix-xxx.

¹⁵⁴ Bonora, *Ricerche su Francesco Sansovino*, 102.

past century.¹⁵⁵ It was in this context that Sansovino glossed *Della Historia di Niceta Coniate delle cose dell'Imperio di Constantinopoli libri VII*, a volume issued at his own printing press. He also translated into Italian Jacques Fontaine's *La Guerre du Rhodes* and in the same work, at the end, he also attached another piece, of his own translation, entitled *De i venti, e della bussola de navicare, di Giovanni Quintino a Sofo*. Hakluyt also introduced in *Principall Navigations* a translation of a continental account on the siege of Rhodes and although in the title is mentioned only the name of the English translator, it is possible that it was a version of Fontaine's text.¹⁵⁶

Thus, the manner in which Sansovino and Hakluyt shaped the image of the Ottomans finds one explanation in the editorial process of their compendia. An analysis of the paratexts permits insights not only into the ways in which the two humanists envisioned the portrait of the Ottomans, but also into how they fashioned themselves as good humanists through following specific ideals of editorial practice and the pursuit of historical truth. Probably the most emphatic aspect, which is common to both Sansovino and Hakluyt, is the manner in which they treated the idea of author and authorship. Furthermore, the two humanists greatly valued accurate translations, and they modified the material abridged in their compendia accordingly. With these factors in mind, it seems that Sansovino and Hakluyt wanted to prove that, besides the diplomatic, economic, and religious factors they filtered and adapted in their works, they also left their personal imprint in the materials.

¹⁵⁵ Moz, "Sansovino, a Poygraph," 122.

¹⁵⁶ "A brief relation of the siege and taking of the Citie of Rhodes, by Sultan Soliman the great Turke, translated out of French into English at the motio of the Reuerend Lord Thomas Dockwray, great prior of the order of Ierusalem in England, 1524" in *Principal Navigations* (1599), 72-103.

II.2. Sansovino's and Hakluyt's Intellectual Formation

In her study, Nancy Bisaha raises an important question: which sixteenth-century writings were the most influential ones in shaping the image of the Ottomans and how were they read?¹⁵⁷ In other words, what was the universe of representations that accommodated the various visions of the Ottoman Empire and how could Europeans access it? A look at Sansovino's and Hakluyt's editorial imprint partly answers this question, as it underlines their efforts of making available to the reading public a large amount of material that was circulating separately before. However, this line of inquiry is not enough to explain Sansovino's and Hakluyt's "internal logic" in building their compendia. What I refer here as the "internal logic" of the collections goes beyond the mere abridgement of material in *Historia Universale*, *Principall Navigations*, and some of their other works. It is a symbiosis between this editorial input and the ideas that Sansovino and Hakluyt correlated and cross-referenced which eventually formed the mental frame in which the two humanists accommodated the Ottomans.

The purpose of this part of the analysis is to show that, regardless of the similarity between the ambivalent image of the Ottomans arising from both Sansovino's and Hakluyt's works, the texts that formed their ideas were significantly different. It is worth noting that forcing a parallel analysis between all the material Sansovino and Hakluyt read, or had access to, would be artificial. The relevance of the following pages is not to find a dominant common ground in the list of authors, books, and people that Sansovino and Hakluyt had, but rather to underline how they shaped the imprint Sansovino and Hakluyt left in their works. Nonetheless, a pattern can be observed in the genre of texts or authors' profile despite the variety of texts and names with which the two humanists were associated. Both Sansovino and Hakluyt were

¹⁵⁷ Bisaha, *Creating East and West*, 174-187.

trained as humanists, at Oxford and Padua, from where they were able to develop a network of acquaintances. None of them ever travelled much: their examples serve better as early modern armchair scholars. Getting interested in other fields than their specializations, they also carried out editing, publishing, and translation activities. The popularity, status, and recognition of some of their close relatives allowed them to widen their connections and have access to a larger range of material and people, including diplomats, merchants, bishops, cardinals, state councilors, etc.

This is the general pattern emerging from historical studies dealing with sixteenth-century humanist culture. The multitude of works dealing with Tudor humanism or Italian academies present collective case studies focused only on one politico-geographical space or either generalize a common pattern in the profile of the humanists and their activities, and publications.¹⁵⁸ However, scholars also began to emphasize the intricacies of humanist culture the particularities that formed various intellectuals and their scholarly and literary pursuits.¹⁵⁹ While it is true that for instance Aristotle, and later Plato, the Church fathers, and later Erasmus, Cicero and then Machiavelli, were thinkers from which each sixteenth-century scholar often drew their arguments, a closer look reveals that the mind-web in which they crafted the image of the Ottomans was far more complex. They indeed reinterpreted the classical tradition, but, importantly, they also infused it with contemporary, which they also reinterpreted. The latter aspect is the focus of this chapter.

¹⁵⁸ Mike Pincombe, *Elizabethan Humanism. Literature and Learning in the later Sixteenth Century* (New York: Routledge, 2001); Jonathan Woolfson, *Reassessing Tudor Humanism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002); Paul Oskar Kristeller, "Humanist Learning in The Italian Renaissance," *The Centennial Review of Arts & Science* 4, no. 2 (1960), 243-66; Jane Everson, Denis Reidy, Lisa Sampson, eds., *The Italian Academies 1525-1700: Networks of Culture, Innovation and Dissent* (New York: Routledge, 2016).

¹⁵⁹ Anthony Grafton, *Defenders of the Text: the Traditions of Scholarship in an age of Science, 1450-1800* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991); Anthony Grafton, "The Humanist as Reader," in *A History of Reading in the West*, Guglielmo Cavallo and Roger Chartier, eds. (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999), 179-212; Lisa Jardine and Grafton, "'Studied for Action': How Gabriel Harvey Read his Livy," *Past & Present*, no. 129 (1990), 30-78; Margaret Meserve, *Empires of Islam in Renaissance Historical Thought*.

It was between these frameworks that Sansovino and Hakluyt filtered their information gathered about the Ottomans, and though not modifying its meaning, they adapted it to their own interests and purposes. As in the previous parts of this thesis, in order to pursue this line of inquiry, I will use Sansovino's and Hakluyt's texts, paratexts, and correspondence. At places it might seem that the referential analysis might go beyond what might have directly influenced the two humanists in shaping the image of the Ottomans. However, their compendia and publications regarding the Ottoman Empire are an integral part of both Sansovino's and Hakluyt's entire publishing and editing activity which inevitably impacted the content and nature of materials about the Ottomans.

Although Sansovino's main text about the Ottomans was the *Historia Universale*, his pamphlet *Lettera o vero discorso sopra le predittioni per la guerra del Turco* (1570) is probably the best example to illustrate the formation process of his scholarly thought in the context of contemporary sources, social webs, and his self-fashioning attempts. Written against the backdrop of the Ottoman-Venetian war, and more exactly, around the battle of Lepanto, Sansovino's pamphlet was meant to instigate a Christian crusade based on historical, philosophical, and religious arguments. In this pamphlet, Sansovino puts aside the repetitive tropes of uncivilized and cruel Ottomans, and brings into the foreground, almost bragging, his knowledge of ancient and contemporary texts. Addressed to Alvise Michiel, the son of the art collector Marcantonio Michiel, Sansovino's letter advocates the fall of the Ottoman Empire based on three types of arguments. The first one uses syllogistic interpretation of philosophical texts: the Ottomans are destined to fall into ruin because their polity is based on false religion and political institutions that go against natural reason.¹⁶⁰ The second one is scientific and

¹⁶⁰ "L'altra e la legge ch'e tirannica, perche e contraria alla ragion naturale, attento che lo huomo nascendo libero per natura, quella comanda ch'egli sia schiauo, adunque essendo contrario ad ogni ben regolato e ragioneuol uiuere per religione e per legge, e necessario che il suo fine uenga in qual che tempo, e uenendo in tempo, perche non puo venire piu in questo ch'in altro?" *Lettera o vero discorso*, A3r.

based on astrological predictions and the third one is mystical as it is based on divine revelations and apocalyptic prophecies.¹⁶¹

From the ancient authors, Sansovino quotes Titus Livius, Herodotus and Josephus Flavius and his *Guerra Giudaica*, as well as Ptolemy and his astrological science. He holds in great consideration Thomas Aquinas's words and with them strengthens the idea that no principality which is not under the sign of God is destined to fall.¹⁶² Besides Aquinas, another medieval scholar whom he cites is Guglielmo Parisiense. Although the title of the work is not given, here Sansovino most probably refers to Guglielmus Arvernus, Bishop of Paris, and his *De Rhetorica Divina*.¹⁶³ The text of his prophecy, which Sansovino paraphrases, talks about a king who will come and take the reign from an infidel prince, restoring the true faith and bringing prosperity to the lands.¹⁶⁴ Since the formulation of the prophecy is ambiguous, without specifying which king or which true religion, Sansovino opens the way for an interpretative analysis as he presents how the Ottoman erudites have read this text in the favor of the sultan.¹⁶⁵ Whether he had access to translations of Arabic or Ottoman Turkish texts is not specified, but it is possible that he read the interpretation made by the Ottomans in other works he had access to, as he himself notes this. The second Ottoman prediction about the fall of their Empire that Sansovino quotes belongs to Muhammad. Although he doesn't mention the source from where he took the information, it was probably taken from Josephus Flavius, as Sansovino points that this prophecy was confirmed by the Jews, or from the same account on the life of the Prophet that he published in the editions of the *Historia Universale*.¹⁶⁶ He refers to a third Ottoman

¹⁶¹ "La seconda cosa e che le predittioni che ne promettono che questo fine sia uicino, ne fanno certi che Dio sia dalla noastra e ce hora sia questo tempo ond'io voglio che noi consideriamo questa parte come notabile, perche si vede che inanzi che seguitino i grandi accidenti in una citta, o in una Prouincia uengono segni che gli pronosticano, o huomini che gli predicono," *Lettera o vero discorso*, A3r.

¹⁶² *Lettera o vero discorso*, A3r.

¹⁶³ "Guilelmus, Arvernus," Deutschen Nationalbibliothek, accessed June 4, 2020, <http://d-nb.info/gnd/118632981>.

¹⁶⁴ *Lettera o overo discorso*, A3v.

¹⁶⁵ *Lettera o vero discorso*, A3v.

¹⁶⁶ *Lettera o vero discorso*, A3v.

prophecy about the fall of the Sultan's Empire specifying that he read it in Laonikos Chalkokondyles's *Histories*.¹⁶⁷ As I have already mentioned above, Sansovino got acquainted with Byzantine chronicles around mid-1560s and this can be seen also in this pamphlet. Besides Chalkokondyles, he quoted Leo VI Sophos's prophecy and Sansovino admired that he was interested in "the secret science through which one could predict the future."¹⁶⁸

When it comes to astrological and apocalyptical prophecies, Sansovino further refers to famous names, such as Girolamo Savonarola or Nostradamus, but also to a few other interesting characters, as were Antonio Torquato or Luca Gaurico.¹⁶⁹ Of Antonio Torquato's prophecy about the fall of the Ottomans in 1567, from *De Eversione Europae Prognosticon* (1491-1495), Sansovino writes that it turned out to be untrue.¹⁷⁰ Interesting to observe is that this is not the only past prediction which did not fulfill, but it is the only one from the *Lettera* on which Sansovino comments. His remark might be a response to Torquato's fame and success. Between 1491 and 1495 he made prophecies that were more or less general, especially those regarding particular countries. The 1534 edition of *De Eversione* contains Torquato's predictions about the Sack of Rome and of Luther's coming.¹⁷¹ Sansovino might have referred to it in *Lettera* as he comments on the "arrival of the toxic Lutheran faith."¹⁷² Most interesting to observe is that although the pamphlet was written under the surveillance of the Catholic

¹⁶⁷ *Lettera o vero discorso*, A3v.

¹⁶⁸ *Lettera o vero discorso*, A4r.

¹⁶⁹ From Gaurico he quotes, most probably, *the Axiomaticum prognosticon anni 1525 editum Venetiis mense novembris 1524*. Gaurico was trained as a medic, but the study of astronomy grew on him and he moved from Padova to Bologna where he started publishing predictions. Because he made a wrong prediction about the church, he was condemned as a heretic. Interesting about Gaurico is that he wrote against Pico della Mirandola, who was supported by almost all contemporary supporters of astrology; Franco Bacchelli, "Luca Gaurico," in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 52 (1999), accessed June 4, 2020, http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/luca-gaurico_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/

¹⁷⁰ *Lettera o vero discorso*, A4v.

¹⁷¹ Torquato was for a while in the late 1490s to the court of Matthias Corvinus, to whom he dedicated *De Eversione*. His prophecies were printed in over five editions until the one in 1534; Eugenio Garin, "Antonio Torquato," in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 4 (1962), accessed June 4, 2020,

¹⁷² *Lettera o vero discorso*, A4r.

church, many of the names Sansovino mentions here were condemned as heretics by the same institution.

Historians have pointed out that Sansovino was oscillating between his personal beliefs and official role in the religious scenery of the second half of the sixteenth century.¹⁷³ As can be seen from his commentary letters on Boccaccio's *Decamerone*, Sansovino strongly condemned the corruption of the clergy and many of the practices of the Church. Scholars have underlined that if Sansovino ever had any involvement in heretical or protestant movements, it would have been in the first part of his life, as he was in contact with other intellectuals who translated the works of the early Protestants.¹⁷⁴ However, Sansovino might have discreetly kept these beliefs since, the first volume of the *Historia Universale* from 1560 was dedicated to Bartolomeo Compagni, a Florentine merchant who worked in the service of Henry VIII Tudor and the Edward VI. Furthermore, as late as 1580s, the Inquisition was suspicious of his praise of administrative and military Ottoman organization and their obedience to the sultan.¹⁷⁵ Because of this, the 1582 edition of *Historia Universale* was, as the title page notes, "modified in many parts by the orders of the Saintly Inquisition," and Sansovino excluded from it the account on the life of Muhammad, and introduced Pope Pius II invitation to Mehmed to convert to Christianity, as well as his own two crusade-propagandic pamphlets, *Informatione a soldati Christiani* and *Lettera o vero discorso*. However, even in these publications, Sansovino may have tried to show that he was not following the directive lines of the Catholic church. If in *Lettera* he managed to quote authors condemned by the Inquisition, and in *Informatione* he

¹⁷³ Moz, "Sansovino, a Polygraph," 117-118; Maria Cristina Panzera, "Francesco Sansovino e l'Umanesimo Veneziano: la Fonte Nascosta dei Modelli di Lettere del Del Secretario," *Italianistica*, XLI/2 (2012), 40.

¹⁷⁴ "Introduction" in Francesco Sansovino, *Lettere ovvero dieci giornate del Decamerone di M. Giovanni Boccaccio*, ed. Cristina Roaf (Bologna: Casa Carducci, 2003), xxii-xxiii; Moz, "Sansovino, a Polygraph," 250.

¹⁷⁵ The fact that Sansovino lived in Venice reinforces this idea. Venetian printers have been in conflict with the Counter-Reformation institutions on matters of censorship and, by 1603, this issue turned into an open controversy by breaking diplomatic relations between Venice and the Papacy; Epstein, "Sansovino and Italian Political Thought," 13.

moved from playing with the texts to playing to the words. In the passages where he condemns Selim II's breaking of capitulations, Sansovino noted:

Because our enemy, having seen that we were living in peace and without any care, under the peace treaty which had been concluded already under his father and his predecessors, he has broken it [peace treaty] without any faith/loyalty, the treaty that had been reinforced by him under oath but with feigned good faith and confirmed by our Senate, having thus said farewell to the ancient capitulations giving by this an exceedingly disgusting example of infidelity and to eternal disgrace to his tenebrous name. Which said breaking, when it occurs between dynasties of princes, when it is missing that said faith/loyalty which is the pillar of justice, gives birth to confusion, to disputes, and eventually to war. [...] I am opposed to meeting those common sayings, which the choice of ambitious and rapacious men has placed in proverb, that is, that faith/loyalty is broken by the unfaithful, and if it is broken, that it is broken by reason of reigning, because when time and place had been conceived of me, I would show vividly, that man does not keep his promise and faith/loyalty; made by him by way of force, beyond punishment, it also deserves to be held by men.¹⁷⁶

In these lines, Sansovino seems to interchangeably refer to both faith and loyalty by using the term “fede,” thus giving the readers freedom to interpret the passages as seems more suitable for their interests.

Although *Lettera* is only one example of how Sansovino's mental categories were built, it nevertheless emphasizes a few relevant aspects of his role as an editor. The fact that it got published as a pamphlet instigating Christian crusade – regardless Sansovino's choice of authors – shows only his skillful versatility as a rhetorician and compiler. As I have already shown in a previous part of this thesis, he emphasizes the identity of the authors, not the title of the texts, and furthermore he displays his familiarity with a wide variety of sources, ranging from classical texts and religious works to astrological and apocalyptic treatises. These aspects

¹⁷⁶ “Hauete adunque primieramente a credere che la giustitia la quale e dalla parte nostra, ui condurra al fine desiderato da uoi, percioch' il nostro nemico, uiuendo noi con animo tranquillo & sicuro, sotto quella pace che si fece gia sotto il padre & gli auoli suoi, ha rotto empianente la fede, da lui con finta purita d'animo giurata & confermata al nostro Senato, partendosi con troppo infame essemplio d'infedelta e con perpetua vergogna del suo oscurissimo nome, dall' antiche capitulationi. La qual rottura quando cade fra Principi, mancadosi di quella fede ch' e la uesa base della giustitia, nasce la confusione, la contesa, e finalmente la Guerra. [...] Ne mi s'opponghino all'incontro quei detti volgari, che la scelerita de glio huomini ambiciosi e rapaci ha posto in prouerbio, cioe che si rompa la fede all'infedele, e se si rompe, che si rompa per cagion di regnare, percioche quando mi fosse concedutto tempo e luogo, mostrerei uiuamente, che lo huomo non mantenendo la promessa e la fede, in qualunq; modo fatta e obligata da lui, oltre al castigo, merita anco di non esser tenuto per huomo,” *Informatione*, A2v.

point towards Sansovino's attempts at fashioning himself as scholar whose greatest ability is to give to his readers, in a comprised form, the knowledge he possessed and which they desired.

The manner in which Sansovino presented himself to the readers, and how this self-presentation contributed to his image of the Ottomans, can be grasped also by looking at his *Del Secretario Libri VII* (1580). Although the purpose of this publication was to be a guide on how the ideal secretary should be fashioned, Sansovino offered in the last two books samples of his own correspondence to illustrate how good letters should look like. If in the seventh book he included his *Lettera overo discorso*, in the sixth he shared a carefully selected part of his correspondence. From Cardinal Amulio, Cardinal Cesis, Cardinal di Pisa and Giovanni Soranzo, orator to Pope Pius V, he received in 1570 and 1572 letters of gratitude. Judging by their content, these churchmen were thanking Sansovino for sending copies of his works about the Ottomans.¹⁷⁷ Along the same lines is the letter he received from Sigismund of Poland in 1572, where the king was praising his history of the Ottomans as he was delighted by its contents.¹⁷⁸ Sansovino sent the *Historia Universale*, accompanied by an epistle, to the king through his councilor, Peter Zborowsky, to whom he also dedicated his *Gl'annali Turcheschi* in 1573, probably as a sign of gratitude for delivering his work to the king. Since Sansovino's original letters were not kept, and these ones were published by him, it is worth noting that this seems to be a way in which he fashioned himself as a well-connected and appreciated humanist under the patronage, or at least good graces, of important figures of the period. In fact, Sansovino began from an early age to gravitate around important intellectual figures, such as Pietro Aretino, who very much influenced his fashioning as a well-connected scholar. This aspect was reinforced by the end of the 1550s when he was probably coopted in the Venetian Academia della Fama, under Federico Badoer's tutelage. Although the project of the Academy did not

¹⁷⁷ Francesco Sansovino, *Del Secretario Libri VII* (Venice: Vincenzo Valgrisi, 1580), 165-169.

¹⁷⁸ *Del Secretario Libri VII*, 170.

last for many years, there are details which indicate that Sansovino was indeed a member. For instance, his commentary on Dante's *Divine Comedy* (1561) and the first edition of *Il Secretario* (1564) are projects deriving from Badoer's Academy.¹⁷⁹

At the same time, it is possible that Badoer influenced Sansovino in his perception of politics and image of the ideal prince.¹⁸⁰ His views would only add a layer to the vast range of literature and ideas about these matters to which Sansovino was exposed. For example, a look at *Historia Universale* reveals that Sansovino reflected both Paolo Giovio's and Jacques Fontaine's opinion when constructing the image of Suleyman. The former painted his narrative with full respect for the enemy, while the latter focuses on the inhumanity of the sultan in the context of the siege of Rhodes. And in the prefaces of his *Hitoria Universale*, Sansovino repeatedly praises Suleyman, his governmental skills, and respect towards his subjects. This belief was not contradictory since, as I have emphasized in a previous part of the thesis, although Sansovino preferred republican government over princely rule, he was more interested in the nature of good government, regardless its form. From his political works emerges that Sansovino wanted to promote the idea of a government that organizes the society based on tranquility, good morals, and prevailing harmony.¹⁸¹ And from what he has read, during the rule of Suleyman, the Ottoman society attained these ideals. However, Sansovino was influenced also by other texts in his understanding of ideal government and its ruler. As I pointed out above, he took on Aristotle's idea that the best form of government should appeal to a man's intellectual soul, rather than his sensitive and vegetative powers, and this could be attained only in a republic. Though these ideas were recurrent in all his works touching upon

¹⁷⁹ Simone Testa, *Italian Academies and Their Networks 1525-1700: from Local to Global* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 109-110.

¹⁸⁰ Badoer was preoccupied with instructing civil servants, an aspect that comes out of a letter send to his diplomat friend Andrea Lippomano. Badoer advocatd to him the importance of active life, which would shape not only his knowledge, but also his character, and would make him at the same time a better judge of the character of the people. His main focus were the contemporary events and state affairs, rather than historical ones; Testa, *Italian Academies and Their Networks*, 94-95.

¹⁸¹ Donald Epstein, "Sansovino and Italian Political Thought," 71.

political matters, whether original or compilations, they are best reflected in Sansovino's *Concetti Politici* (1578).

As any sixteenth-century erudite interested in political matters, Sansovino was acquainted with the recent treatises published on the topic. That he read and recycled ideas from Machiavelli and Guicciardini comes as no surprise, as Vincent Luciani also emphasized in a couple of studies.¹⁸² In fact, Luciani's articles show that Sansovino took the majority of the terms defined in *Concetti* from these two humanists, especially from Machiavelli. Luciani observed that Sansovino omitted several important precepts found in *Discorsi* but that these omissions have nothing to do with Machiavelli's unorthodox reflections condemned by both Catholics and Protestants, but rather with Sansovino's editorial choices, as he wanted to comprise the maximum of information in the minimum form.¹⁸³ As I have shown in a section above, Sansovino believed that Rome was the best form of government and any polity that came close to it was worthy of praising, an idea he took from Machiavelli. Furthermore, the Florentine was also speaking through Sansovino when the latter described in *Informatione* the role of the ruler as a moderate beast, noting that Selim II liked to be more feared than loved.¹⁸⁴ Through reading Machiavelli, Sansovino probably adopted and adapted ideas belonging to other humanists. As Bisaha pointed out, Machiavelli echoed Salutati in his works when noting that a nation's worth is related to the character of the people and their prosperity, rather than their ancestry or religious beliefs.¹⁸⁵ A strikingly similar idea seems to have found its place in Sansovino's *Informatione* since, as I have argued above, he did not associate the term "Turk"

¹⁸² Vincent Luciani, "Sansovino's Concetti and Their Debt to Guicciardini," *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, no. 65 (1950), 1181-1195; Luciani, "Sansovino's Concetti and Their Debt to Machiavelli," *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, no. 67 (1952), 823-844.

¹⁸³ Luciani, "Concetti and their debt to Machiavelli," 839.

¹⁸⁴ *Informatione*, A5v.

¹⁸⁵ Bisaha, *Creating East and West*, 178; 194.

solely with a religious identity, but rather with the sultan's subjects' socio-culturally built character.¹⁸⁶

Much like Sansovino, Hakluyt also combined in his works ideas coming from various authors and disciplines. When it comes to the classical heritage of his humanist formation, the most prominent influence appears to be coming from Aristotle's ideas. Born out of the lectures he gave at Oxford, Hakluyt's commentary on Aristotle's *Politics* reveal his position regarding the social order and the organization of the ideal polity.¹⁸⁷ Written in Latin, the commentary was probably conceived at the same time with the *Discourse Concerning Western Planting* since Hakluyt sent them together to the queen in 1584. As well as the *Discourse*, it never got published, but two versions of the manuscript were kept.¹⁸⁸ Ryan has argued that this commentary reflects the Tudor philosophical method of analysis, which still drew heavily from medieval authors. Because of this, he continues, it was not unusual to identify in Hakluyt's marginal and intratextual notes references to Thomas Aquinas.¹⁸⁹ Since it was addressed to the queen, it was most likely meant to be a complementary material next to the ideas he expressed in the *Discourse*, rather than material meant for a larger audience. Hakluyt did not intend to teach Elizabeth political philosophy and the art of government, as he noted that "even the Muscovite, Ottoman, and Persian monarchs were astounded at her prudence and more than human felicity in reigning."¹⁹⁰ Nonetheless, he wanted to sustain his opinions on matters such as constitutional change, good citizenship, wealth of a people, foreigners toleration and

¹⁸⁶ See p. 21 above.

¹⁸⁷ "Preface" to "Commentary of Aristotle's *Politics*" in *The Correspondence of the Two Richard Hakluyts*, vol. 1, ed. Taylor, 203.

¹⁸⁸ There are two copies of Hakluyt's commentary on Aristotle kept in the British Library: MS Royal 12. G. XIII and MS Sloane 1982. The one presented to the queen is entitled "Analysis, seu resolutio perpetua in octo libros Politicorum Aristotelis" (Christ Church, Oxford, September 1, 1583). The Sloane manuscript is dated 1588 and copied by Hakluyt, but it misses the prefatory letter and may have been made by him for the benefit not only of undergraduates, but also of students preparing for inception as masters of arts; Lawrence Ryan, "Richard Hakluyt's Voyage into Aristotle," *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol. 12, no. 3 (1981), 74.

¹⁸⁹ Ryan, "Hakluyt's Voyage into Aristotle," 81.

¹⁹⁰ "Dedicatory Letter," B. L. MS Royal 12. G. XIII in Ryan, *Hakluyt's Voyage into Aristotle*, 75.

acceptance into the ruling structure, wealth of a people by echoing Aristotle.¹⁹¹ In fact, since Hakluyt criticized in the *Discourse* how the English government dealt these issues at the time he was writing, there is a change that this commentary was the back-up plan of his ideas through Aristotle's established name.

Hakluyt's prefaces and dedicatory letters reveal that, besides Aristotle, there were a few other names he deemed worthy of quoting or paraphrasing to sustain his own arguments and ideas. In the preface of the 1589 edition, Hakluyt echoed Herodotus when explaining that his reasons for bringing under one cover all the material found in *Principall Navigations* were "to bring Antiquities smothered and buried in darke silence, to light, and to preserve certaine memorable exploits of late yeeres by our English natione atchieued, from the greedy and deuoring iawes of obliuion."¹⁹² If he shed light on obscure texts in the main body of his compilation, Hakluyt displayed his familiarity with the ancient authors in the preface to the readers, as he directly quoted Herodotus, Pliny the Elder, and Cornelius Nepos, Aristotle, and Tacitus in the same way as Sansovino did, without specifying the title of the work, but emphasizing the name. To counterargument the Spanish discovery of the West Indies, Hakluyt underlined that Plato already knew about the existence of the continent, only under the name of Atlantis. But however much he valued historical truth and held into great consideration ancient and modern authors who wrote the truth, there was no history in the world which is to be entirely believed, except that from the Bible.¹⁹³ If Hakluyt's statement is to be taken for granted, then his comparison between Solomon and king Hiram of Tyre and Elizabeth's Levant connections was a rhetorical strategy through which he wanted to emphasize that the queen would have conducted business with anyone who helped her turn England into a "temple of

¹⁹¹ Jonathan Woolfson, "Between Bruni and Hobbes: Aristotle's *Politics* in Tudor Intellectual Culture" in *Reassessing Tudor Humanism*, Jonathan Woolfson, ed. (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 199.

¹⁹² "Letter to the readers" in *Principal Navigations* (1589).

¹⁹³ "Letter to the readers" in *Principal Navigations* (1589).

Protestantism.”¹⁹⁴ In fact, in his attempt to support Elizabeth’s connection with the eastern lands, Hakluyt also refers to Lucius Florus’s *De Gestibus Romanorum* to compare how the establishment of diplomatic relationships between the Roman emperor and certain peoples, probably the Chinese.¹⁹⁵ Furthermore, Hakluyt states that Britons got to Jerusalem in the time of Vespasian, as he “read in Joseph Bengorion a very authentick Hebrew author, a testimonie of the passing 20000 Britains valiant souldiours.”¹⁹⁶ Here it is possible that Hakluyt made a mistake in his reference and wanted in fact to quote Josephus Flavius’s history of the Jews, as he was the one talking about Joseph ben Gurion as being one of the chief leaders of the first Jewish-Roman War.

But Hakluyt’s references to ancient authors seem to be limited to these. Though in *Principall Navigations* he introduces some accounts on Roman emperors’ travels in Britannia, the better part of his corpus of references is made up of medieval chronicles or material almost contemporaneous with his own editorial activities. The sixteenth-century author that probably influenced Hakluyt the most was Giovanni Battista Ramusio and his *Delle navigationi et viaggi* (1550, 1556, 1559). By applying humanist philological methods of manuscript collation and logically ordering the material based on geography, Ramusio tried to replace the recurrent Ptolemaic worldview with a narrative mental map of all regions inhabited by men.¹⁹⁷ Though the travelogues arranged in *Delle navigationi* theoretically indicate towards all the places where European explorers have ventured, it does not contain references to the Ottoman Empire. Yerasimos notes that Sansovino might have compiled his *Historia Universale* after realizing the gap in Ramusio’s collection.¹⁹⁸

¹⁹⁴ Jerry Brotton, *This Orient Isle*, 134.

¹⁹⁵ “Dedicatory Letter” in *Principal Navigations* (1589).

¹⁹⁶ “Letter to the readers” in *Principal Navigations* (1589).

¹⁹⁷ Joan-Pau Rubiés, “Travel writing and humanistic culture: A blunted impact?” *Journal of Early Modern History* 10, 136.

¹⁹⁸ Yérasimos, “De la collection de voyages,” 26.

In the dedicatory letter to Francis Walsingham from the first edition of *Principall Navigations*, Hakluyt lets his readers know that his passion for cosmography and geographical discoveries was instilled by his lawyer cousin who showed him a map of the world, accompanying it with words from biblical passages.¹⁹⁹ For Hakluyt, however, Ramusio's cosmography was the starting point for getting acquainted with cartography and travel literature and cited the text when he needed a written proof by an external objective writer than the Englishmen have arrived first in certain locations. Hakluyt's admiration for Ramusio's collection made him encourage John Florio to translate all three volumes and, as Taylor noted, Florio's version bears Hakluyt's imprint through the additional information he included.²⁰⁰ Besides Ramusio, Hakluyt shows that he was also very familiar with the texts of other cosmographers. In the preface of the 1589 edition of the *Principall Navigations* he refutes the arguments that Munster, Gemma Frisius, Zieglerus, Kranzius, Saxo Grammaticus, Olaus Magnus, Peucerbis put forward, since he attached for the readers a treaty that offered accurate information about Iceland, as their geographical descriptions contained many errors.²⁰¹ The first hand geographical knowledge that Hakluyt possessed encouraged him also to write a letter to Abraham Ortelius in which he offered the cartographer advice on how to properly draw maps that would help the sailors better. And indeed, Hakluyt's trust in the geographical observations he possessed were rightful as he began to take notes and archival documents from merchants and sailors coming back to Bristol.²⁰² He emphasized the first-hand encounter with sources also in the preface of the 1589 edition of *Principall Navigations* where he expressed his

¹⁹⁹ "Dedicatory Letter" in *Principall Navigations*, 1589.

²⁰⁰ *Correspondence of the Two Richard Hakluyts*, ed. Taylor, 21-22

²⁰¹ "And here had I almost forgotten to put the Reader in mind of that learned and Philosophical treatise of the true state of Iseland, and so consequently of the Northern Seas an regions lying that way: wherein a great number of none of the meanest Historiographers and Cosmographers of later times, as namely, Munster, Gemma Frisius, Zieglerus, Kranzius, Saxo Grammaticus, Olaus Magnus, Peucerbis and others, are by evident arguments convinced of manifold errors: that is to say, as touching the true situation and Northerly latitude," "Letter to the readers," in *Principal Navigations* (1589).

²⁰² Peter C. Mancall, *Hakluyt's Promise*, 57.

gratitude towards the Bishop of Chester who granted him access into the stately library and allowed him to copy ancient manuscripts and modern journals.²⁰³

Although Hakluyt did not travel much besides his time at the French court, he developed a wide network of acquaintances whose names were renowned in various fields. At Oxford, through his lawyer cousin from Middle Temple, he got acquainted with William Camden, Saville family, and a farther distance, people such as Philip Sydney. While he was serving as chaplain to the English ambassador in France, due to his official position, but also to his vast knowledge on geographical discoveries and navigations, Hakluyt was welcomed among French societies of cosmographer, merchants, and sailors. He acquainted the Homems, a family of cartographers who were in the service of the queen of France, and he asked one of them to make a map for Walter Raleigh's upcoming expedition.²⁰⁴ Hakluyt also met the French royal cosmographer, Andre Thevet with whom he argued in the end over Hakluyt's unauthorized use of a manuscript that the Frenchmen lent him.²⁰⁵ A few years later he got to know the engraver and publisher Theodore de Bry for whose work Hakluyt provided travelogues and a series of illustrations about the colonization of Roanoke. In fact, together with de Bry he had in mind the preparation of an edition of the *Geography* of Abu Al-fida Ismael, a work after which Hakluyt has been looking for a while.²⁰⁶ Probably because Ramusio refers to it in his *Navigazioni et viaggi*, Hakluyt also asked the English merchant, John Newberry, to look for a copy in his travels into the Ottoman Empire. Although Hakluyt's letter was not kept, in *Principall Navigations* he introduced Newberry's response which stated that

²⁰³ "I must acknowledge my selfe most deeply bounden unto the right reuerend, graue and learned prelate, my very good lord the Bishop of Chichester, and L. high Almner unto her Maiestie, by whose friendship and meanes I had free accesse unto the right honor, my L. Lumley his stately library, and was permitted to copy out of ancient manuscripts, these two journals and some others also," "Letter to the readers" in *Principall Navigations* (1589).

²⁰⁴ *The Correspondence of the Two Richard Hakluyt*, ed. Taylor, 33.

²⁰⁵ Marry Fuller, "Richard Hakluyt's Foregin Relations" in *Travel Writing, Form, and Empire. The Poetics and Politics of Mobility*, ed. Julis Kuehn & Paul Smethurst (New York: Routledge, 2009), 48.

²⁰⁶ "Introduction" to *The Correspondence of the Two Richard Hakluyts*, vol. 1, ed. Taylor, 47.

he couldn't find a copy of the book.²⁰⁷ Eventually Hakluyt obtained information on this Arabic geography since in a letter to Emanuel van Metteren provided instructions on where to find copies: "Regarding Abilfeda Ismael, if that work is not to be had from the Library in Heidelberg of my friend Mr. Paulus Melissus, I can refer him to some of my friends at Venice who have copies translated into Latin."²⁰⁸

It seems that when it came to cosmographies, Hakluyt was much more interested in the geographical information they provided, rather than the descriptions of governments and societies, as was Sansovino. The reference to Abu Al-fida Ismael's *Georgaphy* is perhaps the only mention to a text related to the Ottoman space associated with Hakluyt's personal interests. Although he was very well connected and read in matters of cosmography, geography, and history, most of the material gathered from these sources refers to other regions of the world, not those under the authority of the Ottoman sultan. His apparent silence regarding the Ottoman Empire does not indicate that he did not read or did not have access to such sources. In fact, it is very possible that Hakluyt was familiar with the passages touching upon the Ottoman Empire from Munster's *Cosmographia Universalis* or with the contents of Thevet's *Cosmographie du Levant*. Rather, the type of sources Hakluyt used to illustrate the presence of the Englishmen into the Ottoman empire might be more related to his role as an agent of the crown. The image of the Ottomans that springs from Hakluyt's *Principall Navigations* does not find its main roots in the mass of literature that was circulating in Europe at that time about the Ottoman Empire. It is rather a symbiosis between Hakluyt's personal and humanist interests in geography and cosmography, his "patriotic" duty to present the travels of

²⁰⁷ „since my coming to Tripolis I have made very earnest inquirie both there and here, for the booke of Cosmohrapgie of Abilfada Ismael, but by no meanes can heare of it. Some say that possibly it may be had in Persia, but notwithstanding I will not faile to make inquirie for it, both in Babylon, and in Balsara, and if I cand finde it in any of these places, I wil send you from thence”, in *The Correspondence of the Two Richard Hakluyts*, vol. 1, 198.

²⁰⁸ *The Correspondence of the Two Richard Hakluyt*, vol. 2, 420.

Englishmen, and his role as a promoter of the crown's economic and diplomatic interests into the Ottoman Empire.

Since he left very few words of his own these matters it can only be speculated how his interests as a humanist are reflected in the choice of material touching upon the Ottomans. However, his humanist skills as an antiquarian and collector do not collide with his official roles. To this extent, in the part from the *Principall Navigations* where details about the travels to the Ottoman lands are included, Hakluyt abridged passages from authors such as John Foxe, John Mandeville, Richard Eden, or even Pliny the Elder. Alongside sections from these historians and travelers, the 1589 edition of *Principall Navigations* also had the first ever printed English account of captivity. Captives would often gain in a completely different manner knowledge about the local societies, their languages, customs, informal practices. It is Hakluyt's merit to realize that narratives written by former captives offered valuable information about the Ottoman society that could not be found in travelogues or commercial and diplomatic reports.²⁰⁹ In *Principall Navigations* there is no direct indication towards the sources that provided Hakluyt with his material on the Ottoman Empire, but in the dedicatory letter and preface to the readers of the second volume of the 1599 edition, he left a few clues. As I mentioned in a previous part of this thesis, Hakluyt expressed his gratitude towards Richard Staper and Edward Osborne, two merchants from the Clothworkers' Company, for the material they gave him. The reason why these materials are included in the collection, although their nature and content barely fit the general pattern of the other compiled documents, could be linked with the fact that Hakluyt received a yearly stipend from the two merchants.²¹⁰ In the same 1599 preface, Hakluyt acknowledges ambassador William Harborne's contribution with documents to the volume. Also, though not explicitly mentioned, since the letters that establish

²⁰⁹ MacLean, Matar, *Britain and the Islamic World*, 128.

²¹⁰ Jerry Brotton, *This Orient Isle*, 50.

the commercial alliance between Elizabeth and Murad were exchanged during Edward Barton's embassy to the Porte, it is possible that he was the one who provided Hakluyt with Latin copies of the texts.

Through referencing in *Principall Navigations* a wide range of authors and sources Hakluyt diligently argues for the dispersion of Englishmen in all the corners of the world. Nonetheless, his editorial effort proves much more. Hakluyt as well as Sansovino, fashions himself as actor involved in the exchange and distribution of information. Like Sansovino, he also emphasized the name of the persons from whom he gathers the information and makes it somehow implicit that because the information is coming from such a renowned person, his sources had to be authentic and that he wielded editorial authority over such claims to true knowledge.

Ultimately, the list of works that have formed Sansovino's ideas clearly does not limit to the names and titles mentioned above. However, through this line of inquiry my purpose was not to trace exhaustively the formation of his ideas, but rather to underline how Sansovino adopted ideas from very different types of authors and genres of texts, and then adapted them into other finite products, his works. Though with many differences, Hakluyt also went through a similar process. His *Principall Navigations* are indeed a useful example of how a large array of texts, considerably many more when in fact compared to Sansovino's, were carefully selected, translated, and edited. But Hakluyt was also trained as a humanist who was very much integrated in the intellectual networks of his time, aspects to which he pointed out in his prefaces, dedicatory letters, and correspondence. Interesting to note is that only three years after Hakluyt published his last volume of *Principall Navigations*, Richard Knolles wrote *History of the Turkes* (1603). About this last work, Ingram mentions in his study that Knolles drew upon the works of historians such as Flavio Biondo, Andrea Cambini, Paolo Giovio, and

Francesco Sansovino.²¹¹ Since Hakluyt and Knolles were contemporaries it would be worth inquiring whether the two knew each other and, assuming this was true, if Hakluyt ever had access in any way to Sansovino's ideas or publications. In any case, even if neither Sansovino, nor Hakluyt knew of the other's works, and regardless the different religious, political, and intellectual factors to which they were exposed, they nonetheless used the same editorial process which made possible the emergence of a similar image of the Ottomans from their publications.

²¹¹ Ingram, *Writing the Ottomans*, 7.

Conclusion

A close-reading of the dedicatory letters, prefaces, correspondence, and paratexts of both Sansovino and Hakluyt revealed that the ambivalent image of the Ottomans that stems from their printed materials is the result of their humanist editorial practices and intellectual endeavors reflected in the works. The contradictory portrayal of the Ottomans that stems from Sansovino's works has three complementary and intertwined levels. On a larger scale, there is a contrast between the way in which he portrays the image of the Sultan and that of his subjects. On a second level, a closer look into his portrayal of the sultans reveals that the appreciation for the sultans held true for all Ottoman rulers but for Selim II who was seen as the embodiment of the bad prince. On a third level, the closeup shows that Ottoman subjects were not all barbarous and disorganized. In the end, even though political and religious factors partly shaped this contradictory image of the Ottomans that stems from his works, Sansovino's own contribution as a humanist editor and gatherer also influenced this portrayal to a great extent.

Contrary to Sansovino, Hakluyt's image of the Ottomans merges a comparative reference, both implicit and explicit, to other empires and civilizations, rather than presenting it a self-standing entity. As he took a perspective that was more geographical in nature (compared to Sansovino's historical one) Hakluyt's portrayal of the Ottomans is the result of a clash between the types of documents included there, more than it is one that derives from the information in the sources. Yet, this ambivalence is in itself fluctuant as not all travelers had awful experiences with the Ottomans, and neither ambassadors nor merchants thought their discipline to be praiseworthy. Ultimately, even if Hakluyt's purposes on compiling the material did not place the depiction of the Ottoman Empire into foreground, his contribution as a humanist editor and gatherer also influenced this portrayal to a great extent.

However, since the degree of interest of the two authors towards the Ottoman world is quite different – as for Sansovino this seems to be a central concern, while for Hakluyt a more tangential one – the common ground between the two is their own self-fashioning as prolific editors and their attempts at establishing names for themselves as humanist authors. And it is from this aspect that an explanation of why the image of the Ottomans was so ambivalent by the end of the sixteenth century emerges. As humanists needed to establish the authority and integrity of their arguments, they put a lot of emphasis on the veracity of the sources they use and on the credibility of their authors. Even if the compendia of both Sansovino and Hakluyt reflect the influences of various external factors and actors – such as the Inquisition, the political, or economic interests of the government for example – the final shape of their editions mostly reflects the agenda and practices of the two humanists themselves. Precisely because there were other external factors whose influence is seen in the two compendiums, both Sansovino and Hakluyt wanted to put to good use their own humanist education and show their own contribution to the works.

In fact, if the editorial activity based on the texts to which the humanists were exposed is the main shaping agent of the image of the other in such works it might be worth inquiring, on a deeper level, how the meaning and message of some texts has been changed over time based on how they were used, quoted, paraphrased, and reinterpreted by thinkers who, in their turn, quoted each other and added even more layers of information. This would be a topic for future research.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Hakluyt, Richard Hakluyt, ed. *Divers Voyages touching the Discovery of America and the Islands Adjacent*, ed. Winter Jones, John. London: Hakluyt Society, 1850.

———. *A Discourse Concerning Western Planting*. Deane, Charles eds. Cambridge: Press of John Wilson and Son, 1877.

———. *Principal Navigations, Voyages, and Discoveries of the English Nation*. London: George Bishop, 1589.

———. *Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation*, 3 vols. London: George Bishop, 1598-1600.

Sansovino, Francesco. *Historia Unviersale dell'origine et imperio de' Turchi*. Venice: Altobello Salicato, 1582.

———. *Concetti politici*. Venice: Giovanni Antonio Bertano, 1578.

———. *Del Secretario Libri VII*. Venice: Vincenzo Valgrisi, 1580.

———. *Dell'istoria universal dell'origine, et imperio de Turchi parte seconda*. Venice, 1560.

———. *Dell'istoria universale dell'origine, et imperio de Turchi parte prima*. Venice, 1560.

———. *Gl'annali Turcheschi overo vite de principi della casa Othomana*. Venice, 1573.

———. *Historia unviersale dell'origine et imperio de' Turchi*. Venice: Michel Bonelli, 1573.

———. *Informatione a soldati Christiani et a tutti coloro che sono su la pottentissima armata della serenissima signoria di Venetia*. Venice, 1570.

———. *Lettera o vero discorso sopra la predittioni fatte in diversi tempi da diverse persone illustri*. Venice, 1570.

Taylor, E. G. R, ed. *The Original Writings and Correspondence of the Two Richard Hakluyts*, 2 vols. London: Hakluyt Society, 1935.

Secondary Sources

Armitage, David. "Literature and Empire." In *The Oxford History of the British Empire Vol. I, The Origins of Empire. British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Nicholas Canny, 99-123. Oxford University Press, New York, 1998.

- . *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Bisaha, Nancy. *Creating East and West: Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.
- Bonora, Elena. *Ricerche su Francesco Sansovino: Imprenditore librario e letterato*. Memorie / Classe di scienze morali, lettere ed arti, vol. 52. Venice: Istituto Veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti, 1994.
- Braddick, Michael. *State Formation in Early Modern England*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Brotton, Jerry. *This Orient Isle: Elizabethan England and the Islamic World*. New York: Penguin, 2016.
- Brummett, Palmira. “The Lepanto Paradigm Revisited: Knowing the Ottomans in the Sixteenth Century” In *The Renaissance and the Ottoman World*. Ed. Anna Contadini and Claire Norton Farnham, 63-93. Surrey: Ashgate, 2013.
- Chew, Samuel. *The Crescent and the rose: Islam and England During the Renaissance*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1937.
- Çirakman, Asli. *From the “Terror of the World” to the “Sick Man of Europe”: European Images of Ottoman Empire and Society from the Sixteenth Century to the Nineteenth*. New York: Peter Lang, 2002.
- Cochrane, Eric. *Historians and Historiography in the Italian Renaissance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Coles, Paul. *The Ottoman Impact on Europe*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1968.
- Dimmock, Matthew. “Hakluyt’s Multiple Faiths” In *Richard Hakluyt and Travel Writing in Early Modern Europe*. Claire Jowitt and Daniel Carey, eds., 219-228. Surrey: Ashgate, 2012.
- . *New Turkes: dramatizing Islam and the Ottomans in early modern England*. City: Routledge, 2017.
- Dursteler, Eric. *Venetians in Constantinople: Nation, Identity, and Coexistence in the Early Modern Mediterranean*. Baltimore, John Hopkins University Press, 2006.
- Elias, Nobert. *The Civilizing Process*. Oxford: John Wiley and Sons, 2000.
- Epstein, Donald Epstein. “Francesco Sansovino (1523-1583) and Italian Political Thought,” PhD diss. University of Oregon, 1972.
- Everson, Jane; Reidy, Denis; Sampson, Lisa, eds. *The Italian Academies 1525-1700: Networks of Culture, Innovation and Dissent*. New York: Routledge, 2016.
- Frazee, Charles A. *Catholics and Sultans: The Church and the Ottoman Empire, 1453–1923*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

- Fuller, Marry. "Richard Hakluyt's Foreign Relations." In *Travel Writing, Form, and Empire. The Poetics and Politics of Mobility*. Julis Kuehn & Paul Smethurst, eds., 38-52. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Genette, Gérard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of interpretation*, Vol. 20. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Ghobrial, John-Paul. *The Whispers of Cities: Information Flows in Istanbul, London, and Paris in the Age of William Trumbull*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Goffman, Daniel. *The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Graf, Tobias. *The Sultan's Renegades: Christian-European Converts to Islam and the Making of the Ottoman elite, 1575-1610*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Grafton, Anthony Grafton and Weinberg, Joanna. "Johann Buxtorf Makes a Notebook." In *Canonical Texts and Scholarly Practices: A Global Comparative Approach*, eds. Anthony Grafton and Glenn W. Most, 175-198. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Grafton, Anthony. "The Humanist as Reader." In *A History of Reading in the West*. Guglielmo Cavallo and Roger Chartier, eds., 179-212. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999.
- . *Defenders of the Text: the Traditions of Scholarship in an age of Science, 1450-1800*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- . *What was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Grendler, Paul. "Francesco Sansovino and Italian Popular History 1560-1600." *Studies in the Renaissance* 16 (1969): 139-180.
- Hart, Jonathan. *Representing the New World: The English and French Uses of the Example of Spain*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- Hartog, François Hartog. *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*. Trans. Janet Lloyd. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Helgerson, Richard. *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan writing of England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Ingram, Anders. *Writing the Ottomans, Turkish History in Early Modern England*. Hampshire, Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- Jardine, Lisa, and Grafton, Anthony. "'Studied for Action': How Gabriel Harvey Read His Livy." *Past & Present*, no. 129 (1990): 30-78.
- Johnson, Carina. *Cultural hierarchy in sixteenth-century Europe: The Ottomans and Mexicans*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Kristeller, Paul Oskar. "Humanist Learning in The Italian Renaissance." *The Centennial Review of Arts & Science* 4, no. 2 (1960): 243-66.

- Langer, Zoe. "More is More: Sansovino's Editorial Additions as a form of Authorship on Dante's *Commedia* (1564)" In *Minor Publishers in the Renaissance*. Angela Dressen, Susanne Gramatzki, Berenike Knoblich, eds., 1-24. *Kunsttexte* 2/2017.
- Luciani, Vincent. "Sansovino's Concetti and Their Debt to Guicciardini." *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, no. 65 (1950): 1181-1195.
- . "Sansovino's Concetti and Their Debt to Machiavelli." *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, no. 67 (1952): 823-844.
- MacCrossan, Colm. "Framing 'The English Nation': Reading Between Text and Paratext in The Principal Navigations." In *Richard Hakluyt and Travel Writing in Early Modern Europe*. Claire Jowitt and Daniel Carey, eds., 139-151. Surrey: Ashgate, 2012.
- MacLean, Gerald MacLean and Matar, Nabil. *Britain and the Islamic world, 1558-1713*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- MacLean, Gerald. *Looking East: English writing and the Ottoman empire before 1800*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Mancall, Peter C. *Hakluyt's Promise. An Elizabethan's Obsession for an English America*. New Heaven and London: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Matar, Nabil. *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the age of discovery*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.
- Meserve, Margaret. *Empires of Islam in Renaissance Historical Thought*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008.
- Montaigne, Michel. *Essays*. Tr. John M. Cohen. Middlesex: Penguin, 1958.
- Moz, Adriano. "Francesco Sansovino. A polygraph in Cinquecento Venice: His Life and Works." PhD diss. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985.
- Necipoğlu, Gülru. "Süleyman the Magnificent and the Representation of Power in the Context of Ottoman Hapsburg-Papal Rivalry." *The Art Bulletin* 71, no. 3 (1989): 401-427.
- Pagden, Anthony. *Facing each other: the World's Perception of Europe and Europe's Perception of the World*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000.
- . *Lords of All the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain, and France c. 1500 – c. 1800*. New Heaven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Panzer, Maria Cristina. "Francesco Sansovino e l'Umanesimo Veneziano: la Fonte Nascosta dei Modelli di Lettere del Del Secretario," *Italianistica*, XLI/2 (2012): 11-33.
- Pettegree, Andrew. "Centre and Periphery in the European Book World." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 18 (2008): 101–28.
- Pincombe, Mike. *Elizabethan Humanism. Literature and Learning in the later Sixteenth Century*. New York: Routledge, 2001.

- Pippidi, Andrei. *Visions of the Ottoman world in Renaissance Europe*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2013.
- Pomata, Gianna and Siriasi, Nancy G., eds. *Historia. Empiricism and Erudition in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge and London: MIT Press, 2005.
- Preto, Paolo. *Venezia e i Turchi*. Florence: G. C. Sansoni, 1975.
- Rothman, Nathalie. *Brokering Empire: Trans-Imperial Subjects Between Venice and Istanbul*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2016.
- Rubiés, Joan-Pau. "Travel writing and humanistic culture: A blunted impact?" *Journal of Early Modern History* 10, 1: 131-168.
- Ryan, Lawrence V. "Richard Hakluyt's Voyage into Aristotle." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 12, no. 3 (1981): 73-84.
- Stagl, Justin. *A History of Curiosity. The Theory of Travel 1550-1800*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Subrahmanyam, Sanjay. *Courtly encounters: Translating Courtliness and Violence in Early Modern Eurasia*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2012.
- Suranyi, Anna. *The Genius of the English Nation: Travel Writing and National Identity in Early Modern England*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008.
- Testa, Simone. *Italian Academies and Their Networks 1525-1700: from Local to Global*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- Thomas Crane, Mary. *Framing Authority: Sayings, Self, and Society in Sixteenth-Century England*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Valensi, Lucette. *The Birth of the Despot: Venice and the Sublime Porte*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1993.
- Valeri, Elena. "Francesco Sansovino" In *Christian-Muslim Relations. A Bibliographical History, volume 6, Western Europe (1500-1600)*, eds. David Thomas, and John Chesworth, 565-578. Boston: Brill, 2014.
- Vaughan, Dorothy M. *Europe and the Turk: A Pattern of Alliances, 1350-1700*. New York: AMS Press, 1976.
- Viktus, Daniel. "Early Modern Orientalism: Representations of Islam in Sixteenth-and Seventeenth-Century Europe." In *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of Other*. Eds. David R Blanks and Michael Frassetto, 207-230. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999.
- Wilson, Bronwen. "Reflecting on the Turk in late Sixteenth-Century Venetian Portrait Books." *Word & image* 19, no. 1-2 (2003): 38-58.
- . *The World in Venice: Print, the City, and Early Modern Identity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.

Wittek, Paul. "The Turkish Documents in Hakluyt's 'Voyages'" *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, vol. 19, no. 57 (1942): 121-139.

Wood, Alfred C. *A history of the Levant Company*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1935.

Woolfson, Jonathan. "Between Bruni and Hobbes: Aristotle's *Politics* in Tudor Intellectual Culture." In *Reassessing Tudor Humanism*. Jonathan Woolfson, ed., 197-222. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.

———. *Reassessing Tudor Humanism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.

Yérasimos, Stéphane. "De la collection de voyages à l'Histoire Universelle." *Turcica* 22 (1988): 19-41.