



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Vol. 4. Issue.3., 2017 (July-Sept.)



INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INDIA

2395-2628(Print):2349-9451(online)

THE SELF AND THE OTHER IN ELIZABETHAN TRAVEL WRITING:
THE CASE OF RICHARD WRAG'S TRAVELOGUE

Dr. FATIMA ESSADEK

Assistant Professor, Faculty of Language Studies, Sohar University, Sohar
Sultanate of Oman
Email: fali@soharuni.edu.om



ABSTRACT

This paper presents a reading of a sixteenth-century travelogue written by Richard Wrag, one of the diplomats sent from Queen Elizabeth I to deliver her gifts to the Ottoman sultan Murad III in 1593. Wrag's travel account is one of the rare texts that document the first encounters between English people and the Ottoman world. The present inquiry engages with critical issues such as representation, subjectivity, identity and nationalism. The paper examines how the author represents the foreign inhabitants and terrains he encountered in Istanbul and exposes the propagandistic and political agenda embedded in the text. The analysis also reveals a lack of authorial self-representation in the travel narrative and suggests that such a textual feature is rather a typical mode in Elizabethan travelogues. The paper draws on critical paradigms elicited from cultural studies and postcolonial theory.

Keywords: Elizabethan Travelogue, Turks, Richard Wrag, nationalism, representations, subjectivity

In September 1593 an English ship named *The Ascension* arrived to Istanbul. The sight of the vessel was not a novelty: the outbound travel from the English isles to the capital of the Ottoman Empire increased in frequency during the last three decades of the sixteenth century. The rise in Istanbul bound traffic was closely connected with the establishment of diplomatic and commercial contact with the Ottomans. Launching the Levant Company in 1581 and appointing an English ambassador to Istanbul in 1582 facilitated travel to Ottoman territories and enabled a greater number of Englishmen to trade, visit and reside in the Turkish territories.

On board the ship a diplomatic delegation from Queen Elizabeth I was entrusted with the delivery of the royal gifts to sultan Murad III. We are particularly interested in one traveller who left us an account of the journey which is the subject of the present paper. Our traveler was Richard Wrag, one of the diplomats who conveyed the royal presents; he was an eyewitness of the presentation of the royal offerings and the ceremonial kissing of the sultan's hand. Afterward he spent eleven months in Istanbul and wrote a brief description of the city. His visit to the Levant was concluded with a trip to Syria, where he delivered a letter sent from Murad to the Pasha of Aleppo to recommend the kind treatment of English subjects.

The main theme of the 'discourse', as Wrag labelled it, was to describe a visit that symbolised the Queen's friendly contact and cooperation with sultan Murad; consequently, the portrait of the sultan as

England's friend was a taken-for-granted premise in this travel text. The configuration of the sultan in this new light certainly destabilised the conventional cliché of the sultan as the inveterate enemy of Christians. Furthermore, the sultan did not feature as just a partner but someone whom the English were desperately seeking his acceptance and approval; this transpires when the text supplied a straightforward narration of the saluting display that *The Ascension* performed in front of the sultan. After the ship's arrival to its destination, the English diplomatic delegation was keen to devise a special salutation to Murad. As the sultan was used to visit his seaside mosque twice or three times a week to perform religious duties, the ship waited for a suitable time when the sultan would be in his mosque to approach his palace and salute him. When that opportunity came, 'the shippe set out in best manner with flagges, streamers and pendants of divers coloured silke, with all the mariners, together with most of the Ambassadors men [...] [and] discharged first two voiles of small shots, and then all great ordinance twice over' (Hakluyt 6: 95-96). Wrag noted proudly that the sultan was delighted to watch 'the shippe in such bravery' (Hakluyt 6: 95).

The text intimated to the English reader facts that he would never encounter in other Elizabethan texts. The realities of England's friendly diplomatic contact with the Turks was not in the slightest acknowledged or reflected in other contemporary genres. The theme of Anglo-Ottoman contact was an improbable ingredient in the plot of any Renaissance drama; Samuel Chew notes that there 'are few allusions to the Levantine merchants in Elizabethan literature' (181). Likewise, histories did not allude to the exchange of friendly overtures between the Queen and the sultans, while church prayers and sermons might be the last place to expect a mention of Anglo-Ottoman contact, let alone a reference to a Muslim ruler as a friend or commercial partner. The engagement with real events made travel genre provide unpredictable narratives. The travel account under discussion belongs to a new textual genre that emerged during the Elizabethan era. Generated by the expansion in travel and exploration, the early travel accounts provided real travel experiences documented by Englishmen who were able for the first time to see the sultans, to walk in their seraglio and to witness thrilling events in Istanbul. The factual material in travel texts gave them a licence to circulate and normalise information that was inexistent in other types of contemporary texts; as a result, the sultan in the text did not feature as a ranting tyrant, as he appeared on the stage, nor the grand enemy of Christianity as the religious texts depicted him but a ruler whom the English subjects were eager to please and to have business with.

The reconfiguration of the Turks as diplomatic and commercial partners constituted a watershed moment in the representations of Muslim Turks as the text inaugurated a type of discourse that did not only disagree with other types of early modern genres, but also contradict them. The Muslims, who were for centuries fit into a static cultural mould as infidels and enemies to Christianity, are now simply friends and commercial partners. While Wrag's travelogue, along with other travel accounts¹ written by late-sixteenth-century travellers to the Ottoman Empire, liberated the Turks from the stereotypical representation of a mere heathen antagonist, other contemporary Elizabethan texts still held to the medieval rhetoric towards the Turks and their sultans. In a sermon preached by the priest Thomas White at Paul's Cross on 17 November 1589, the Ottoman sultan was considered England's heretic enemy not a friend (White 1589).

The delivery of the Queen's present was delayed due to a dispute between the Grand Vizier and the English ambassador Edward Barton. According to Wrag the row was triggered when an Englishman called John Field was imprisoned and threatened with the death penalty after the escape of some Genoese prisoners. Field had frequented the prison and had been detected delivering a letter to one of the prisoners days before the escape. When Barton intervened to free the Englishman the Vizier insulted him. In turn, the ambassador decided to make a complaint to sultan Murad against the Vizier through using a popular way whereby the plaintiffs boarded a boat and sailed close to the sultan's seraglio. They held their petitions to their foreheads so they could be seen by the sultan, who used to send his servants to collect people's appeals. In the petition Barton wrote:

that except his highnesse would redresse this so great indignitie, which the Vizir his slave had offered him [Barton] and her majestie in his person, he was purposed to detaine the Present

until such time as he might by letters over-land from her majestie bee certified, wither she would put up so great an injurie as it was. (Hakluyt 6: 97)

Wrag related that the ambassador received the answer within a short time, requesting him to go to the divan, where the Vizier presented him with a gown of cloth of gold, embracing him with courteous, conciliatory words. A dispatch sent to Venice by Matheo Zane, the Venetian ambassador in Istanbul, dated 6 September 1593, offers a different scenario of the incident. Zane identified Field as Barton's barber; the English ambassador 'being questioned by the Grand Vizir on this subject was the object of violent threatening language; so much so that his Dragoman fled in terror lest he should be arrested; and the Ambassador himself on his departure felt the same alarm and appealed to the sultan'(Brown 9: 104). Barton pleaded for his personal safety and the sultan granted him immunity against the Vizier's threats. Meanwhile the Vizier presented a note to the sultan accusing Barton of disobedience because he refused to hand in the suspect. Barton was detained later by the Vizier and, because he had no other option, the ambassador sent for Field and delivered him to the Vizier. Barton was set free.

The two versions of the story differ significantly. Zane did not mention the reconciliation between the Vizier and Barton and the warning in the latter's petition, but it is probable that Wrag, who was an insider within the English diplomatic community, had close access to such information. However, a basic knowledge of the nature of Anglo-Ottoman diplomatic dealings during the sixteenth century would show that it was not likely that the English ambassador would dare to use such strong and threatening language in his petition to the sultan. The discrepancies in the details prove that the English diplomat introduced a rather selective narrative. Wrag chose to talk about the complaint and reconciliation and disregarded other information concerning Barton's refusal to hand over Field, his subsequent detention and final surrender of his barber. By looking at the inclusions and omissions in the account, it can be concluded that the author strove to depict the English ambassador as an innocent, dignified and brave victim.

By this stage in the narrative the nationalistⁱⁱ sentiments in Wrag's text become discernible. His national pride in narrating the details of *The Ascension's* salutary display is evident. It has also been demonstrated how he overplayed the ambassador's dignity and courage. Indeed, Wrag considered the anecdote that related the clash between Barton and the Vizier as not 'dishonourable for our *nation* [emphasis added], or that worthie man the ambassador'(Hakluyt6:96). Accordingly, the rationale behind the inclusion of the event in the narrative seemed to be the boosting of a nationalist pride. Wrag deemed it a daring move from Barton to complain about the Vizier who was the second most powerful person in the Turkish Empire after the sultan himself. Wrag's text displayed a patriotic feeling that celebrated Englishness, whether in the ship's spectacle or in the actions of the man who represented the English nation in Istanbul. The factor that made the articulation of nationalist sentiment more vocal in the text was the author's position in an alien terrain. Travel involves contacting and confronting the Other, which inevitably leads to a heightened sense of one's own ethnic and cultural difference. Wrag, for example, mentioned that Barton's deed received 'the admiration of all Christians that heard of it, especially of the French and Venetian ambassadors'(Hakluyt 6:97). Thus, the awareness of these Others, including the Christians, helped the author to realize and express his Englishness.

On 7 October 1593 the ambassador with seven of the embassy men, all dressed up in rich clothes, headed to the sultan's palace for the formal occasion of kissing the sultan's hand. Wrag described in detail the grand reception offered to the English delegates. The English visitors were provided with 'very richly furnished' horses to carry them to the palace and were welcomed into a grand court which was prepared with 'great pompe' for the guests(Hakluyt6: 98). The author chose to convey the splendour of the occasion in terms of figures: he estimated that two thousand palace staff greeted them, and that their banquet consisted of about one hundred dishes served by up to fifty servants. According to the sultan's orders, gowns of cloth of gold were presented to Barton and his companions; the ambassador received two gowns, one of gold and the other of crimson velvet. The Queen's gift was brought in. It consisted of '12 goodly pieces of gilt plate, 36 garments of fine English cloth of a colors, 20 garments of cloth of gold, 10 garments of sattin, 6 pieces of fine Holland, and certain other things of good value'(Hakluyt6: 100).

Wrag's account of the reception highlighted the formal splendour of the ceremonies and the wealth and luxury surrounding the Ottoman sultan, but a closer look reveals the author's real motive: his detailed description of Murad's magnificent world was primarily intended to show the esteem and generous welcome given to the Queen's representatives. Here again Wrag's propagandistic and nationalist agenda comes to the surface to highlight the English achievements in Istanbul. Indeed, Wrag's account is similar to a news report that hails the successful completion of the English mission to deliver the royal presents. The author spent several months in Istanbul, travelled to Aleppo, and had an interesting return trip that took him to Cyprus, Italy, Germany and France, but he wrote little about these adventures. Instead one single event that took a few hours occupied the lion's share in his account. The title of Wrag's travel narrative, '*A description of a Voyage 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, Emperour of Turkie*', clearly illustrates the author's main interest in the travelogue.

After the banquet, the ambassador and his companions moved to another stone-paved court, where the sultan's marble house was situated. The *Bustangi-bassa*ⁱⁱⁱ with another pasha stood at the door of the reception room, where Murad was sitting in state, dressed in a gown of cloth of silver. Murad sat on a platform covered with a green satin carpet embroidered luxuriously with silver, oriental pearls and great turquoises. The rest of the room was covered with a carpet of carnation satin embroidered with gold. The two pashas at the door held each diplomat by the arms and led them one by one to where the sultan was sitting. After kissing Murad's hand, they moved backwards to the door with their faces towards the sultan. Afterwards *Barton delivered his requests* and the sultan 'answered in one word, Nolo, which is in Turkish as much as, it shal be done: for it is not the maner of the Turkish emperor familiarly to confer with any Christian ambassador, but he appointeth his Vizir in his person to graunt their demaunds if they be to his liking' (Hakluyt 6: 101).

What is intriguing about Wrag's report on the delivery of the Queen's presents is that it is narrated from the third person perspective, although the English diplomat was an eye-witness. It is noticeable that the travelogue derived from an author who recorded the observable experience but did not often feature in the narrative himself, and on the few occasions when he inserted himself into his text he did so just to relate information concerning his arrival, departure or meeting with certain people. Generally speaking, Wrag was not an author who gave away much of his views and reactions; he seldom expressed what he thought of the people and events he described. This textual strategy absents the author from his narrative and leads naturally to the minimization of his subjective^{iv} presence in almost the whole text—except on one occasion when his individualistic voice emerges briefly in a final advice to his countrymen, which we will turn to shortly.

Mary Fuller observes a noticeable absence of the authorial voice in early modern travel writing; in her view, these travelogues appear to be directed towards the external world and were thus incapable of speaking about the self (8). She ascribes the lack of personal voice to the writers' intention to be as transparent as possible: 'the task of the writer is almost more to transcribe or to copy *from* the world of objects and events rather than to author a text as such' (8). Fuller's explanation is to some extent relevant to our text where Wrag's elimination of his autobiographical presence gives his account the impression of a disinterested narrative. The detached authorial stance is discernible throughout the text; for example, at the end of his travelogue he gave an account of Hinduism, (Hakluyt 6:110-12) which he heard from a Jew he met on the ship that took them from Cyprus to Venice. Wrag related a dispassionate report of the beliefs and practices of the Hindus without expressing any personal opinion or judgement. It is worth noting that the goal of giving a comprehensive, authentic account was on the mind of our author, who addressed his dedicatee, his uncle Mr. Rowland Hewish, Esquire^v: 'If for lacke of time to put it in order I have not performed it so well as it ought, I crave pardon, assuring you that to my knowledge I have not missed in the truth of any thing' (Hakluyt 6: 93).

Although Fuller makes a point when she attributes the absence of authorial self-representation in early modern travelogues to the authors' effort to produce transparent narratives but the absence of subjectivity seems more of an unconscious characteristic in Wrag's account. Authorial self-representation in this Elizabethan travel text seemed as yet subdued compared to that in later ones. A Romantic, Victorian or

modern travel writer might pursue his narrative judging, criticizing and thinking with a loud voice; but our sixteenth-century traveler seems to withdrew himself into the shadow and turned the spotlight on the observed world. I have noticed that such a textual feature is present in other travel narratives written during the same historical period. The travelogue penned down by a contemporary of Wrag, John Sanderson, who served the English ambassadors in Istanbul and the Levant Company,^{vi} has the same authorial characteristic. Sanderson was a first-hand witness of many incidents that took place in Istanbul. In his memoir he gave vivid accounts of the soldiers' uprisings during the reigns of sultans Murad's and Mehmed III. His travelogue also documents the massacre that took place at Mehmed's accession to the throne in 1595, when he killed nineteen of his brothers, and his procession out of the city to launch an offensive against Hungary in 1596. In narrating these events the writer adopts a dry and realistic style devoid of his personal voice. Just on two occasions we are reminded of Sanderson's presence when he mentions that he 'did see them [Mehmed's slain brothers] caried to buriall' (Sanderson 58) or when, describing the horrible execution of a Jewish woman during the soldiers' revolt, he asserts that 'I did so see' a part of her body after she had been mutilated (Sanderson 85). The two personal references, nonetheless, did not constitute any authorial subjectivity as he did not express his interiorized thoughts and reactions but in fact he just tried to affirm his credibility by stressing the fact that he was there in person and he witnessed everything with his own eyes. These emphatic testimonies reveal a sense of anxiety on the part of the narrator who seems eager to substantiate the authenticity of his stories but they are far from being examples of authorial self-representation.

Another travel account left to us from this period is the well-known travelogue of the organ maker Thomas Dallam who was ordered by the merchants of the Levant Company to manufacture a special organ to be sent as a gift from the Queen to sultan Mehmed. Throughout his journey Dallam kept a diary that recorded the events of his trip, dedicating a considerable portion to document his stay in Istanbul, where he spent weeks in Mehmed's palace assembling the organ. He recounted his meeting with the sultan and gave an exceptional description of the sultan's harem. Written originally as a personal memoir, the text is supposed to focus on the interior self but in fact, more often than not, the text was about the external world. On just few occasions Dallam managed to be a subjective narrator. One time when he described his reaction when the English ambassador Henry Lello told him that he had to stay longer in Istanbul to remove the organ to another location in the palace. His reaction was one of panic and confusion:

I was in a wonderfull perplexities, and in my furie I told my lorde [Lello] that that was now come to pass which I ever feared, and that was that he in the end would betray me, and turne me over into the Turkeys hands, where I should Live a slavish Life, and never companion with Christians. (Dallam76).

The other instance when he described his ruptured state when he watched the harem. Dallam was given an exceptional glimpse of the women's quarters in Mehmed's palace. One of the servants he had befriended allowed him to peep through a tiny window into the sultan's harem. Through a hole, gridded with strong iron bars, Dallam saw thirty women playing with a ball. Dallam exceptionally gave us a piece of his personal views when he considered them as very pretty and admitted that the sight pleased him 'wonderous well.' Dallam's individualistic voice emerged in these episodes because they are moments of emotional intensity when the author could not restrain his reactions but other than that he stayed as an impersonal narrator of his journey. He often eliminated his authorial presence and assumed the position of a mere reporter who related to us how the outer world looked like.

The fact that the lack of subjective self-representation is present in all the above mentioned narratives, even the private memoir, shows that it is not an authorial peculiarity but a generic textual feature. Indeed, Dallam's account contradicts Fuller's view that early modern travel authors adopted this technique to give their narratives the impression of objectivity. Fuller's explanation is relevant to the texts that were intended for publication, but it does not account for texts that were not originally written for wider circulation, such as Dallam's diary. Dallam did not need to exhibit his authorial objectivity because he did not write it for publication—hence the fact that his diary was not published until 1893. This leads us to the conclusion that the lack of self-representation is rather an unconscious authorial characteristic in sixteenth-century travel texts.

The root of the lack of authorial subjectivity lies in the authors themselves who fail to assert their subjective presence and emphasise their personal feelings and thoughts. I propose that the authors, like other people in that century, were unconscious of their individuality because the concept of subjective individualism in the West emerged and took a clear shape during the following centuries. My conclusion concurs with the views of the recent criticism that argues that the idea of a centred, self-conscious, and self-determining individual originated during the seventeenth century.^{vii}

After attending the formal ceremony, Wrag remained in the Ottoman capital for several months and witnessed the preparations of the Turkish army to attack Hungary. Hearing that Murad threatened to lead the army in person, Wrag commented for the first time directly on the sultan in what happened to be a sarcastic vein: 'but like Heliogabalus, his affections being more serviceable to Venus than to Mars, he stayed at home'(Hakluyt 6: 103). Unlike other contemporary English travelers to Istanbul such as Sanderson and Fynes Moryson, who wrote about Murad's numerous concubines and children, Wrag did not refer to the sultan's private life but with this fleeting comparison he gave away much about Murad's personality. The comparison to the Roman Emperor Elagabalus, who was known for his sexual excess and decadence^{viii}, exposed the sultan as a decadent lustful ruler.

Wrag added, in what looks like a postscript, that in spite of the magnitude of the Turkish army, the Christians achieved victory and struck terror in the Turkish soldiers who, according to many reports, fled the field of battle. It is worth noting how rapidly Murad can be transformed from being a friend of a Christian monarch into an enemy to Christianity. The two paradoxical representations are determined by their narrative context. The first framework demanded a neutral depiction of Murad as he was the recipient of England's friendly overtures, while the other context was related to the campaign against Hungary, which naturally invoked anti-Ottoman sentiments. These heterogeneous representations are a clear indication of the complicated dualistic nature of the relation between early modern Europe and the Ottomans, which was reflected in contemporary publications.

Wrag's propagandistic and political agenda became apparent with a final advice given to his English addressees after he had witnessed the chaos wrought by Turkish soldiers in Istanbul. According to the author, the army had committed crimes against the inhabitants of the city for two months. He prayed that similar atrocities might not be seen in England, where his fellow Englishmen were unaware of and ungrateful for the blessings they were enjoying. He addressed his countrymen reproachfully:

I could wish, that such amongst us as have enjoyed the Gospel with such great and admirable peace and prosperity under her Majesties government this forty years, and have not all this time brought forth better fruits of obedience to God, and thankfulness to her Majesty, were there but a short time to behold the miserable condition both of Christians and others living under such an infidel prince.(Hakluyt 6: 103).

Religion played a pivotal role in defining identities in the early modern world, where the internal discord between Catholicism and Protestantism and the friction and conflict between Christianity and other religions, especially Islam and Judaism, fed into the formation of opposing religious communities. Thus, Protestantism enabled Elizabethans to articulate their individuality and realize their difference from Catholic Spaniards and Muslim Turks. It is not surprising, then, that Wrag, upon encountering the chaos in Istanbul, instantly invoked his religious belief to establish his difference from the 'infidel' Turks and credit his own faith with the prosperity, stability and security in his native land. In a cosmopolitan city like Istanbul, where people of diverse races and religions interacted and intermingled, Englishness was, according to Wrag, distinguished mostly by the 'true religion of Christ' and the English Queen. The author's identification with established authorities is another manifestation of the presence of an English nationalist identity in the text. The Queen's leadership is considered as a quintessential English attribute that starkly contrasts with the sultan's chaotic, irreligious rule.

Undoubtedly, there is an embedded political message that Wrag wished to impart to his readership. Wrag acted as a propagandist who manipulated his experience abroad to find favour with his sovereign, whom he considered 'so wise and godly a prince'(Hakluyt6:103). The English diplomat was in the service of the English government so it is not unexpected that he had this political agenda. The author found in the figure of the

sultan a ready-made foil to Elizabeth but he seemed to exaggerate the disadvantages of living under Murad's rule to promote her Majesty's image.

As mentioned previously, Wrag dedicated his travel account to his uncle Mr. Rowland Hewish, Esquire. It was a common practice for Elizabethan writers to dedicate their works to individuals of higher social rank because by 'addressing a person of status writers hoped to gain protection and reward for their work, either in money or kind, endorsement of their composition, and gain kudos for themselves' (Wheale⁶³). Wrag used formal rather than familiar language in his dedication. For example, he drew upon *excusatio propter infirmitatem*^{ix}, a rhetorical trope which demeans the writer and thereby exalts the addressee; he addressed his uncle: 'Sir, considering the goodness of your Nature which is won't kindly to accept from a friend, even of meane things being given with a good heart, I have presumed to trouble you with the reading of this rude discourse of my travailes into Turkie' (Hakluyt 93). Such a formal, ingratiating language indicates that Wrag had already enjoyed some favours or was intending to get more from his relative. The author's flattering remarks on the Queen should be seen in this light; Mr. Hewish, who was from the privileged class that identified itself with the Crown^x, would have welcomed any favourable comments on his sovereign.

Wrag's message to his fellow Englishmen reveals that he intended his work to be circulated for a wider readership. Sixteenth-century readers would expect a confirmation of the ascendancy of the English moral, religious and political system, and Wrag had to satisfy those expectations. The author thus assumed a higher moral and religious ground towards the Turks. Wrag was aware that England could not match the wealth and power of the Ottoman state; he personally observed the splendour and affluence of the sultan's palace and described Istanbul as a vibrant, strong and rich city. Therefore, he resorted to religious criteria to establish the pre-eminence of the English nation and to fulfill his readership's anticipations. Wrag's final remarks on his prosperous home country living under the Gospel also reaffirm the author's own religious adherence. Jonathan Burton remarks that 'English readers were likely to see the actions of any Christian in the Levant as suspect and potentially unregenerate' (156). Travel writing of the period often dwelt upon the transgressions committed by English sojourners in Ottoman territories, such as moral decadence and religious conversion.^{xi} This may explain Wrag's emphasis on his own Protestant steadfastness and his reason for telling his dedicatee Mr. Hewish 'If you aske me what in my travels I have learned, I answered as a noble man of France did to the like demaund, Hoc unumdidici, mundi contemptum: and so concluding with the wise man in the book of the Preacher, that all is vanitie' (Hakluyt 93). Such an authorial disclaimer seemed to be aimed to guard against any suspicion entertained by his readers that his travel experience had any effect whatsoever on him. The appeal to the book of the Preacher projects an image of the man as a stoic Protestant who was not lured by worldly vanity. However, it is not clear whether vanity here is attached to the knowledge he acquired from his travels or to the world he saw on his journey. What he learned was not vain; had it been, he would not have been interested in writing and publishing it, but he might have intended to impart that the world he had encountered was all vanity; dismissing the Ottoman world of wealth, luxury and power as illusory and evanescent might be interpreted as an attempt to compensate for feelings of imperial envy or inferiority.

Notes

ⁱ The Elizabethan travel accounts that document the Anglo-Ottoman contact were those of John Sanderson, Thomas Dallam and Fynes Moryson.

ⁱⁱ The word "nationalism" is used in this paper to denote the "sentiments of attachment to and pride in the nation" (Smith 24). The discussion, then, does not focus on the modern ideological and political uses of the word.

ⁱⁱⁱ *Bustangi-Bassa*: the head-gardener, a formal title; his actual responsibility was the management of the imperial household.

^{iv} Edward Finegan defines subjectivity as "the expression of self and the representation of a speaker's (or, more generally, a locutionary agent's) perspective or point of view in discourse – what has been called a speaker's imprint" (1). Despite the fact that Finegan deals with subjectivity as a linguistic term, I find his definition most suitable to express the notion of subjectivity as it is conceived in this paper.

^v Rowland Hewish, or Huyshe, was one of the landed gentry in Devonshire (J. Burke 760).

^{vi} Sanderson had first arrived in Istanbul in 1584 to stay for four years serving the Levant Company. He was then employed by the first English ambassador to Istanbul William Harborne as the 'maister of his howse', and he also worked as assistant to an English factor called William Shales in Egypt. He returned to Istanbul in 1591 to work again for the Company for a further eight years. Sanderson made his third and last visit to the Ottoman capital in 1599.

^{vii} Although the idea that the rise of individualism originated in the Renaissance era goes back as far as 1860—when the Swiss cultural historian Jacob Burckhardt located Renaissance Italy as the setting where man became conscious of his individuality—such a Burckhardian thought has become highly contested nowadays. Peter Burke found flaws in Burckhardt's argument. Burke argues that the examples of the self discussed in Burckhardt's study are the upper-class male Italian minority (18). John Jeffries Martin expresses his disagreement with Burckhardt and argues that the notion of the self before the end of the sixteenth century was far removed from the understanding of the individualistic self that emerged during the seventeenth century in the Puritan sermons, the writings of the neo-Stoics and Descartes's philosophical work(124).

^{viii} See David S. Potter 2004, pp. 156-57 and Fik Meijer 2004.

^{ix} *Excusatio propter infirmitatem* (an excuse for mental weakness) is used by writers to express the insignificance of their theme and their lack of talent to handle the subject properly, leaving their addressees to average everything out fairly (Genette 207-8).

^x Arnold Hauser refers to the political alliance between Elizabeth and the landed gentry when he explains how, in the sixteenth century, "the rich bourgeoisie and landowning or industrially active nobility formed the new ruling class. The stabilization of society is expressed in the alliance between the Crown and this new class" (75).

^{xi} John Sanderson, commented on the great alteration in the behaviour of the English ambassador Edward Barton after he had spent many years in Istanbul. Apparently, Barton turned "from serving God devoutly and drinkinge puer water" to drinking much wine and frequenting prostitutes (Sanderson 10).

Work Cited

- Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1991. Print.
- Brown, Horatio F, ed. *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy (1592-1603)*. London. 1897. Print.
- Burton, Jonathan. *Traffic and Turning: Islam and English Drama, 1579-1624*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2005. Print.
- Burke, John A. *Genealogical and Heraldic Dictionary of the Landed Gentry of Great Britain and Ireland*. London, 1863. Print.
- Burke, Peter. "Representations of the Self from Petrarch to Descartes." Pp. 17-28 in *Rewriting the Self: Histories from the Renaissance to the Present*, ed. Roy Porter. London: Routledge, 1997. Print.
- Chew, Samuel C. *The Crescent and the Rose: Islam and England During the Renaissance*. New York: Octagon Books, 1965. Print.
- Cox, Edward G. *A Reference Guide to the Literature of Travel: Including Voyages, Geographical Descriptions, Adventures, Shipwrecks and Expeditions*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1969. Print.
- Dallam, Thomas. 'Master Thomas Dallam's Diary', in Theodore Bent (ed.), *Early Voyages and Travel in the Levant*, London, 1893. Print.
- Finegan, Edward. "Subjectivity and Subjectivisation in Language: An Introduction." Pp. 1-15 in *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation: Linguistic Perspectives*, ed. Dieter Stein and Susan Wright. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. Print.
- Fuller, Mary. *Voyages in Print: English Travel to America, 1576-1624*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. Print.

- Greenfield, Liah. *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*. Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1993. Print.
- Genette, Gérard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Print.
- Hakluyt, Richard. *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation*. Glasgow: MacLehose, 1903. Print.
- Hasting, Adrian. *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Print.
- Hauser, Arnold. *The Social History of Art: Renaissance, Mannerism, Baroque*. London: Routledge, 1999. Print.
- Jeffries, John Martin. *Myths of Renaissance Individualism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006. Print.
- Meijer, Fik. *Emperors Don't Die in Bed*. Trans. S. J. Leinbach. London: Routledge, 2004. Print.
- Smith, Anthony D. "National Identity: Modern and Medieval?" Pp. 21-46 in *Concepts of National Identity in the Middle Ages*, ed. Simon Forde, Lesley Johnson and Alan V. Murray. Leeds: University of Leeds, 1995. Print.
- Potter, David S. *The Roman Empire at Bay, AD 180-395*. London: Routledge, 2004. Print.
- Sanderson, John. *The Travels of John Sanderson in the Levant 1584-1602*, ed. William Foster. London: U of Cambridge Press, 1931. Print.
- Wheale, Nigel. *Writing and Society: Literacy, Print, and Politics in Britain, 1590-1660*. London: Routledge, 1999. Print.
- White, Thomas. *A Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse the 17. of November An. 1589*. London, 1589. Print.
-