

EARLY MODERN HISTORY

Course description:

Although there are various debates pertaining to the beginning and the end of early modern period, for Europe, it is generally accepted as the time span of three hundred years between the end of the Middle Age in the 15th century and the beginning of the modern age starting with the 19th century. The aim of the course is to give a basic understanding of the political, social, cultural, philosophical and religious trends and events highlighting the birth our modern times. Although the concept of the early modern period applies strictly to the history of the West in general and to that of Europe in particular, the present course aims also to give the student a synchronic perspective of how Europe interacted with the world, especially with the its contemporary Islamic world as well as with the rest of the world during the age of wars and discoveries. Accordingly, a fundamental aim of the course is to give the student a critical understanding of the genealogy of the so-called "clash of civilisations" rhetoric, increasingly gaining popularity in today's world.

About the Professor

Mustafa Soykut is professor of early modern history at the Department of History of Middle East Technical University, Ankara. He has studied in Trieste and University of Bologna in Italy and received his PhD from Hamburg University in Germany. He received a number of scholarships in Italy and Germany and awards including the Distinguished Young Scholar Award of the Turkish Academy of Sciences for his research on Italy and the Ottomans. Professor Soykut also lectures on the culture and history of religion of the Indian sub-continent.

web page: <http://hist.metu.edu.tr/prof-dr-mustafa-soykut>

Contents

Unit I: Temporal, spatial and conceptual confines of Early Modern European History

Unit II: The Renaissance, Reformation and Counter-Reformation

Unit III: Towards a modern "clash of civilisations"

Unit IV: Europe, its neighbourhood, the world at large and the Enlightenment

General Instructions:

First unit: 4 weeks

Second unit: 4 weeks

Third unit: 4 weeks

Fourth unit: 2 weeks

The course is designed for a duration of 14 weeks. Students are required to write four essays on each unit choosing a theme within that unit covered by the textbooks and based on one of the books listed under the readings list.

The first unit is to be studied for four weeks and aims at providing a general outlook on the modern age. Stephen J. Lee's *Aspects of European History 1494-1789* covers the main aspects from the later 15th century to the 18th. The other two textbooks and Lee's book are to be read in their entirety. In addition at least one of the books under the readings list are to be taken as the theme of the short essay for that unit.

The second unit also covers four weeks and concentrated on various aspects of the Renaissance and the Reformation.

The third unit also covers four weeks and examines the relations between Islam and Europe within the context of European-Ottoman relations and examines the political, civilisational and cultural conflicts of the "self" and the "other" in European history in relation to its immediate neighbour.

The fourth unit covers two weeks and highlights the general aspects or characteristics of the Enlightenment.

The students must write four short essays for each chapter (1200-1500 words) and a final essay of aprox. 5000 words. The textbooks for each chapter are obligatory readings and at least two books from the reading list in each chapter must be read and at least one should be incorporated into the theme of the short essay for each chapter.

The final essay can choose any theme covered by in any chapter of the course and in addition to the textbooks and reading lists, it must have an additional reference section at the end of the essay of the books and articles used for the final essay.

Technical Instructions for the Short Essays and the Final Essay:

The text must be submitted in a word document written in Times New Roman 12, 1,5 space and 1 inch margin on the right and left of the page. It must use the humanities citation footnote format (not the social sciences format bracket within the text). The sources must be cited by using the Chicago Manual of Style

(see <http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/home.html>)

The quotations from the sources used in the essays cannot exceed 5% of the total text. Any quotation exceeding 4 lines should be "indented" in the body of the text.

The universally accepted ethical rules on plagiarism apply.

Unit I: Temporal, spatial and conceptual confines of Early Modern European History

The fundamental question is where the early modern age begins and where it ends as well as its fundamental difference from the middle Ages. It is generally accepted that the early modern period starts with the Italian Renaissance and ends with the French Revolution. Roughly the three hundred years in between distinctly mark certain characteristics different from the Middle Ages. The Renaissance is one of them. The Renaissance is a period in world history marked by maxim of the ancient 5th century B.C. Greek philosopher Protagoras "man is the measure of all things". What does this maxim actually mean? It means that the cosmic, philosophical and political order of the Middle Ages thereto based on Christian theology and cosmology is questioned and an alternative

model in all aspects of life were presented. Actually the term Renaissance was coined by the 16th century erudite Giorgio Vasari and later taken up by the 19th century historians. The men of the Renaissance called the new movement "humanism". The choice of the term was not accidental. It implied that the cultural and political vision of Europe was now shifting towards a secular axis not dominated by the prescriptions of the Church. When we mean the Church in the 15th and the early 16th centuries we naturally refer to the Catholic Church, which had united medieval Europe under the umbrella of *universitas christiana* or rather Christian universe. Certain other beginnings have also been proposed for the beginnings of the early modern age: the Fall of Constantinople, the Byzantine capital to the Ottoman Turks or the discovery of the New World in 1492. Arguably these two events mark the end of the last Roman Empire of the East and the opening of Europe to the Americas. However, they seem to be a consequence of certain socio-economic and political changes in the late medieval period as well as the rise of the Ottoman Empire in Eastern Europe rather than single milestone events which changed the course of European history by themselves alone. The Reformation, although ignited by an Augustinian monk of Germany on the backwaters of "civilised" Europe then, is also connected to the cultural changes in the Renaissance and they will be the subject of the second unit.

If one looks at the political map of Europe and the significant actors of the 15th as well as the early 16th century Europe, the Mediterranean world is definitely the main scene where the major political, military and cultural highlights are happening. This in a way, is a continuation of the centrality of the Mediterranean world inherited by the Italian states, Spain, the Holy Roman Empire (Habsburg Empire) and the Ottoman Empire. The unification of the states of Castile and Aragon in 15th century Spain and the discovery voyages undertaken by the Spanish monarchy, the Renaissance with its focal point in Italy and the transformation of the Ottoman State into an empire with their conquest of Constantinople and the end of the Byzantine Empire as well as the major power in Central Europe, the Habsburgs make these states the focal point of the early modern age.

For Spain, the unification of the crowns of Castile and Aragon, the major powers of the Iberian peninsula, open the gate for Spain to be the major power in the western Mediterranean throughout the 16th and much of the 17th century. The discovery of the New World in 1492 not only mark the subsequent colonisation of South America and parts of North America by the Spanish, but also the first organised "ethnic cleansing" in European history with the expulsion of the Muslims from the Iberian peninsula who had ruled much of the peninsula since the 8th century as well as the expulsion of the Iberian Jews who then took refuge in the Ottoman, other Mediterranean and North African lands. The colonisation and the subsequent enslavement and the conversion of the Mesoamerican and South American natives to Christianity was not only a source of great income for the Spanish crown later in the 16th century under the Habsburg Spanish kings. It was also the meeting of two worlds hitherto separate and the destruction of many native cultures and civilisations of pre-Columbian America in certain ways much more advanced than the European ones.

The political structure of the Italian peninsula, the cradle of the Renaissance was, on the other hand, far from united. Northern and parts of central Italy consisted of numerous independent and semi-independent principalities and republics who were starting to assert themselves ever more as significant political actors thanks to the Renaissance

ideas of secular legitimisation of power as opposed to divine rule sanctioned by the church or by the emperor. Furthermore, economic and fiscal competition between these states were a novelty in their growth, fuelled by various industrial and commercial pursuits of the states. Each prince or ruler was trying to outdo its rivals by trying to attract more money through fiscal incentives; more artists and art works through the patronage system; and more political power through a complex system of ever shifting alliances within or outside the Italian peninsula. Italian Wars of 1494–1498 and the invasion of Italy by the French King Charles VIII is an example of the political fragmentation of Italy. So much so that certain Italian states even sought an alliance with the Ottomans in the case of Pope Alexander VI, who were thought to be the arch-enemy of Christendom.

Central Italy with its various dependent states was on the other hand ruled by the Papal States or by the Papacy. The Papacy did not have a strong army of its own and depended on shifting alliances to protect itself. However, since the end of the Western Roman Empire in the 5th century, it not only saw itself as the head of Western Christianity, but also as the heir to the glories of ancient Roman emperors who claimed universal sovereignty. South of the Papal States including most of southern Italy was in the hand of the Aragon dynasty of the Spanish from the 15th century onwards and although it changed hands and transferred to the Bourbon dynasty in the early 18th century, it mostly remained in Spanish control until the 19th century. All of these three parts of Italy would only be united in the Italian Risorgimento or “awakening”, namely unification in mid 19th century. Until then Italy remained fragmented and paradoxically, perhaps because of its fragmentation, became the home of the Renaissance.

The other major European power in the 15th and 16th centuries in the Balkans, parts of Central Europe and the Eastern Mediterranean was the Ottoman Empire. It had grown from a frontier principality in Anatolia, modern day Turkey on the fringes of the Byzantine Empire to become a major European power by the 16th century on continental Europe together with France, the Habsburg Empire and Spain. Details of Ottoman growth and expansion will be given in Unit IV: Towards a modern “clash of civilisations”.

A direct consequence of the Reformation is the process called the Counter-Reformation. Apart from the celebrated Martin Luther, according to the other reformers Calvin and Zwingli, Luther’s reformation was not a real reformation because rather than reforming the Church, Luther had set loose a series of dynamics which caused the alliance of the newly reformed Lutheran Church with the German political entities of the Holy Roman Empire which is going to be one of the major causes of the Thirty Years’ War between 1618-1648, which shaped for good the political and religious fragmentation of Europe after the Treaty Of Westphalia. Europe was now divided into the Catholic Mediterranean, Lutheran Germany and Scandinavia, the Anglican reformed Church of England and the Calvinist Netherlands and Scotland. The Catholic Church tried to counteract the loss of blood with its own reformation called the Counter-Reformation between the Council of Trent and the Treaty of Westphalia between 1545-1648. The details of the Counter-Reformation will be discussed further in Unit III: The Renaissance, Reformation and Counter-Reformation.

While the 16th and the 17th centuries are marked with the major rivalries between the Habsburg Empire and the Ottomans in Central Europe; between the Ottomans and Venice in the eastern Mediterranean; between the French and the Habsburgs and the English and the Spanish in Western Europe, the Portuguese, the Spanish and the Dutch were also competing with each other in the colonies in the Americas and South and South East Asia. England became prominent actor of such a competition in the 18th

century competing against the French and the Portuguese in India and by establishing colonies already in the 17th century in North America. In fact, by establishing the political and religious boundaries of Europe after civil unrest within and after the Westphalian settlement in general, the Protestant Western Europe shifted its attention to the overseas expansion. Trade, commerce and the bounties of Asia and America became the driving forces for the economy of countries like Spain and Portugal in the 16th century and for the Dutch and the British in the 17th and 18th centuries.

Textbooks:

Kamen, Henry, *Early Modern European Society*, Routledge, 2000. (the entire book)

Lee, Stephen J., *Aspects of European History 1494-1789*, Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1984. (the entire book)

Rietbergen, Peter, *Europe. A Cultural History*, Routledge, 1998. (the entire book)

Readings:

Black, Christopher F., *Early Modern Italy: A Social History*, Routledge, 2001.

Black, Jeremy, *War in the Early Modern World. 1450-1815*, Routledge, 1999.

Parker, Geoffrey, ed., *The Thirty Years' War*, Routledge, 1984.

Setton, Kenneth M. and Winkler (eds.), Henry R., *Great Problems in European Civilisation*, N.J.: Prentice Hall Inc.: Englewood Cliffs, 1966.

Tallett, Frank, *War and Society in Early Modern Europe, 1495-1715*, Routledge, 1992.

Unit II: The Renaissance, Reformation and Counter-Reformation

Before venturing into what the Renaissance is, some generally accepted misconceptions about the Renaissance must be addressed. It is generally thought that the Renaissance is the demarcation line ending the Middle Ages and starting the early modern era by its contribution in the field of sciences and arts by breaking the yoke of scholastic thought of the Church. In other words, it is thought to be a quasi anti-clerical movement which changed the religious and institutional structure of the Middle Ages. These points of view are highly retrospective and erroneous and certainly do not reflect the views of the humanists from the late 14th century well into the 17th century.

It is unclear when the Renaissance exactly started and when it ended. However, there is general consensus among the historians of the subject that it started in Italy and particularly in Florence in the later 14th century and spread gradually towards central and Northern Europe towards the end of the 15th century. Another misconception is the view that the Renaissance, as the original term coined by the 16th century art historian Giorgio Vasari termed *rinascimento*, was a rebirth. A rebirth of the classical age of the antiquity. This was taken up in the age of romanticism of the 19th century and became established by the Swiss historian Jacob Burckhardt that the Renaissance was indeed the rebirth of the Graeco-Roman antiquity after the so-called dark ages of the medieval era. The

Renaissance era was not the first time in which philosophers, artists and intellectuals became interested in the antiquity. In fact such knowledge was to a certain extent available to the Muslim and Jewish scholars in Muslim Spain and Arab, Turkic and Persian scholars throughout the Middle East and Central Asia. Nor did it appear for the first time in Italy or in Florence. As the discovery of the ancient Greek texts were of fundamental importance in the Renaissance, these were already read by Muslim scholars in various places in the Islamic world as well as in the Eastern Roman Empire (Byzantium) whose language was naturally Greek. So why did the phenomenon called humanism allegedly did not appear until late 14th century conditions were ripe in Italy? Another cliché pertaining to the causes of the Renaissance is the alleged fundamental role of humanists who fled Constantinople after it fell to the Ottomans in 1453 and contributed to the learning of Greek sources in Italy. While there were such humanists who arrived in Italy after 1453, their role is certainly underestimated. Instead, the role of translations of the Greek classics into Arabic by Muslim scholars in Spain and the Middle East and their subsequent translations into Latin by Sephardic Jews play a much more important role. There is also an alleged late Byzantine Renaissance of the 14th century, however, the Renaissance is a unique Italian and later European phenomenon which such be considered within the *ad hoc* economic, political and cultural parameters of the early modern European history.

The fourteenth century late medieval Italy, saw the weakening of the feudal system and the increasing independence of the northern Italian states from the Papacy and the Holy Roman Empire with an increased desire to assert their legitimacy to rule which was not sanctioned by divine or imperial authority. This was coupled with the socio-economic structural change caused by the Great Plague or Black Death of the later 14th century. There was also the wealth gained by these northern Italian states in the trade with the Orient through the eastern Mediterranean, mercantilism and the foundation of a modern banking system which appeared in republics such as Florence and Venice in the later Middle Ages.

The patronage system of the rulers of these states extended towards humanists and artists, not only provided the rulers with a new secular source of legitimacy based on the secular antiquity, but the production of the art works themselves became a lucrative commercial commodity. The patronage of the Medici family of Florence of artists such as Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo Buonarroti and the architect Brunelleschi transformed the city into the vanguard of the Renaissance. It is no coincidence that the Council of Florence convened in 1439 for the attempted unification of the Byzantine Church with the Catholic world was convened in Florence thanks to the prominence of the city both as a cultural and an economic centre of Europe under the auspices of Cosimo de' Medici. Other Italian states like Venice under several of its Doges, Mantua under the Gonzaga family, Urbino under the Montefeltro family, Milan and the Papacy itself became centres of humanistic culture under its rulers. The neo-platonic academia reopened in Florence after its suppression by the Christian Roman emperors a thousand years ago. Humanistic culture extended itself to arts, philosophy, literature and all aspects of inquisitive thinking.

However, the Renaissance or rather humanism as called back then, was not really a re-birth of the Graeco-Roman antiquity. It was rather a **re-interpretation** and **adaptation** of it to the early modern period. In fact, the term Renaissance coined by the 19th century Burckhardt was inspired by the *The Lives of the Artists* written by the 16th century

Giorgio Vasari. What Vasari intended by *rinascimento* or rebirth was strictly referred to the arts and in particular to painting. Vasari thought that the "two dimensional art of Byzantium devoid of perspective" in painting was not worthy of the great achievements of ancient Greeks and Romans and that art had in a way degenerated into a monotonous style after the skills of the ancients were lost in Eastern Roman Christian Empire. What Vasari anachronistically ignored was the commandment of the Old Testament: "thou shalt not not make graven images". It was a Byzantine compromise between the Hebrew ban of idolatry of the Old Testament and the Greek tradition of representing their gods in sculpture and painting. So the Byzantines ended up not making graven images i.e. sculptures of God, nevertheless represented them in wonderful mosaics. This was not the Byzantine ignorance in arts but rather following a fundamental Christian commandment. So Vasari's "rebirth" of the arts became "an age of rebirth" in the romanticism of the 19th century, together with many other aspects of medieval Europe which were romanticized anachronistically such as the King Arthur, the age of chivalry and so on. In fact this romanticization was in part a reaction to 18th century Enlightenment's crude rationalism which tended to de-mystify the sacred.

As in the case of Enlightenment, Western historiography also tends to portray the Renaissance as a "break-off" with the Church. Although there were humanists who implicitly or rarely explicitly professed atheism, generally the humanistic culture was not characterized by particular antagonism to the Church. On the contrary, atheism was considered to be a vice among the aristocrats of the time in many writings of the time. Furthermore, many renowned humanists such as Pope Pius II, Cardinal Bessarion of Byzantine origin and Erasmus of Rotterdam were clergymen themselves. Not to mention that the Medici Popes themselves were great patrons of the Renaissance in 16th century Rome.

Accordingly, the humanist tradition provided Rome a reconciliation of antiquity with the Christian perception and therefore re-interpreting both of them and re-defining the entity that we know as Europe today. That is why the Renaissance is taken as the birth of modern Europe as opposed to the *universitas christiana* of the medieval world. In a way it also helped divide Europe with its strict connection to the Reformation as opposed to a united Europe, at least from a Christian point of view, under the auspices of the universal Church.

The Counter-Reformation or some historians would rather call it the Catholic Reformation was a measure of the Catholic church firstly to recover the loss of blood of the faithful to the Protestants. The Council of Trent on the theological and canonical front and the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of Faith established in 1622 on the missionary front were the greatest achievements. However, there was also a more rigid church after the Reformation. The Inquisition which was a medieval institution was re-enforced and became active on a mass scale with its persecutions and legendary witch-hunts in a way that the Middle Ages have never witnessed. In other words, the Reformation made the Catholic Church more aggressive due to the perceived threat of Protestantism.

Textbooks:

Burckhardt, Jacob, *The Civilisation of the Renaissance in Italy*, trans. S. G. C. Middlemore, 1878. (the entire book)

Hunt, Jocelyn, *The Renaissance*, Routledge, 1999. (the entire book)

Po-chia Hsia, R. ed, *A Companion to the Reformation World*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2004. (parts I, II, III, IV, V, pp.1-411)

Mullett, Michael A., *The Catholic Reformation*, Routledge, 1999. (chapters 1,2,3,4,5, pp.1-175)

Readings:

Baron, Hans, *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance. Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny*, Princeton University Press, 1955.

Bernard, David K., *A History of Christian Doctrine. The Reformation to the Holiness Movement. A.D. 1500-1900. Volume 2*, Word Aflame Press, 1995.

Bisaha, Nancy, *Creating East and West: Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

Burke, Peter, *The Renaissance*, Hong Kong: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1997.
Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Duffy, Eamon, *Saints and Sinners. A History of the Popes.*, Yale University Press, 1997.
Faroghi, Suraiya, *The Ottoman Empire and the World Around It*, Tauris & Co. Ltd., 2004.

Frazer, Charles A., *Catholics and Sultans. The Church and the Ottoman Empire. 1453-1923*,
Goffman, Daniel, *The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge University

Mullett, Michael A., *Martin Luther*, Routledge, 2004.

Parry, G. J. R., *A Protestant Vision. William Harrison and the Reformation of Elizabethan England*, Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Stephens, John, *The Italian Renaissance. The Origins of Intellectual and Artistic Change Before the Reformation*, New York: Longman, 1990.

Vasari, Giorgio, *The Lives of the Artists*, trans. Julia Conaway Bondanella and Peter Bondanella, Oxford University Press, 1991.

Unit III: Towards a modern "clash of civilisations"

"From the later fourteenth century to the beginning of the twentieth, Europeans tended to identify Islam with the Ottoman Empire" are the words of Kenneth Setton in his book entitled *Western Hostility to Islam and Prophecies of Turkish Doom*. Since its beginnings, the new religion of Islam, has been considered by Christianity to be an illegitimate offshoot of the Abrahamic lineage. It was only in the aftermath of World War II that the Catholic Church recognised the Muslims as people who believe in the legitimate God of monotheism, however failed to recognise Islam as an independent religion. After the fourth century A.D., with Roman state patronage under Emperor Constantine, Christianity was transformed from a persecuted religion into a religion which started to persecute its former persecutors. Constantine was the founder of New Rome, Constantinople, which subsequently turned into a world metropolis in the following

centuries, its identity strictly connected to the Christian faith. The Eastern Roman emperors with their capital in Constantinople, later called Byzantium by the West, actually never called themselves Byzantines, but rather referred to themselves simply as Roman Emperors. Constantine's most important legacy as far as Christianity was concerned was the Council of Nicaea convened in 325, which established the dogma of much of what we know today as western Christianity. Various Christian traditions in the eastern and western part of empire were declared as heresy and the Roman State declared the accepted version of Christianity for the coming millennia. Naturally, there was dissidence from within the Roman State among the populace as well as the holders of power. Julian the Apostate (331/2-363) was one of these examples.

Another instance of the marriage between Christianity and the Graeco-Roman heritage occurred in the age of Renaissance. In Renaissance, despite the efforts of humanists to move from divine based cosmology of the medieval ages towards the ancient world view which accepted "men as the measure of all things", Christianity hardly lost its grip on the society and how people reasoned. In fact, many famous humanists were clergy men themselves as Pius II, Bessarion and Erasmus of Rotterdam. Unlike the Age of Enlightenment and the later scientific revolution where open decent against the church was condoned, the Catholic Church continued to enjoy its privileges throughout the Renaissance in determining the order of the day.

While these independent developments were taking place in Western Europe, the advent of Islam in the seventh century and the expansion of the Islamic Empire from its original homeland in Arabia to vast lands throughout the Mediterranean as far as the Iberian Peninsula enabled the crystallisation of the Western European civilisation in an *universitas christiana* from the early Middle Ages onwards. Although Byzantium faced the same Islamic expansion, the power of the Byzantine state was not concentrated in the hands of the church but rather that of the emperor. Byzantium managed to continue many state and military institutions of Rome centuries after the collapse of the Western Roman Empire. In the Middle Ages Constantinople continued to be the largest metropolis in Europe and the Middle East. The economy of the empire still remained largely based on trade as opposed to the feudal structure of Western Europe. Its head, the emperor, remained the supreme temporal and religious authority. Most of the clashes between the temporal and the religious figureheads, which occurred in Europe between the popes and the emperors were largely unknown Byzantium. The perceived "caesaro-papism" of Byzantines by Western European standards insured the subordination of the Byzantine Church to the emperor. The same dynamics between the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Emperor continued to a great extent after fall of Constantinople between the Sultan and the Islamic scholars, the *ulema*.

For these reasons, western European historiography, which considered the Byzantines as a "despotic oriental" state also regarded the Ottoman State in a similar manner. Accordingly, the glorious adjective "Roman" was striped off from the Eastern Roman

Empire and the new name "Byzantium" was given to the so-called "caesaro-papist" empire, a name never used by the Eastern Romans themselves. In fact, the Byzantine emperors gave themselves the title "emperor and autocrat of the Romans". In the same fashion, the "infidel" Ottomans were not exclusively, but mostly perceived as the "Asiatic despots" in Renaissance literature. This tradition of the Ottoman sultans to claim to be the Roman Caesars continued into the next centuries as attested by treaties made with European sovereigns.

Islam represented for Italy and for Europe, a threat of military nature as well as that of a cultural one in terms of representing the "other", vis-à-vis Europe. Europe defined itself along the lines of Christendom, especially beginning with the conquests of Spain and Sicily by the Arabs in the eighth and the ninth centuries. As a consequence of the rapid Ottoman conquests in Eastern Europe from the mid-fifteenth century onwards, what was in the European mind thinking of Islam were the Ottoman Turks. While the image of Islam as well as that of the "Turk" served to define "Europeanness" as opposed to the "other", this image gradually started to change towards the end of the seventeenth century with Ottoman military failures.

Since the fall of Constantinople the Italians as well as the general European public opinion identified the Turks as the anti-thesis of Europe and everything that European civilisation represented. The identification of Islam as the anti-thesis of Christendom and European civilisation was already present before the Fall of Constantinople thanks to the rapid expansion of the Muslims within a century of the birth of the last Abrahamic religion. The Arabs had conquered by the eighth century Spain, North Africa and the Middle East, which were Christian lands until a century before. Coincidentally, in 1071 when the Seljukides opened the gates of Anatolia to the Turks by the victory at the battle of Manzikert against the Byzantine Empire, the following year the Normans had conquered Palermo from the Arabs, the last bastion of Muslim Sicily. Therefore, the Normans ended two hundred years of Muslim rule in Sicily, which had started by the landing of the Arabs on Mazara del Vallo in 827, followed by the fall of the fortress of Siracusa in 878 and accomplished by the fall of the last Byzantine fortress of Rometta in 965. Although it took a few centuries more for Christians in 1492 to completely cast away the Muslim Arab presence in Europe with the *reconquista* of Spain. With the final passage of the banners of Islam from the hands of the Arabs to the Turks in 1453, the fall of the last Christian imperial capital in the Levant and the fall of the millennium-old Eastern Roman Empire, the Muslim presence in Europe was to remain until the present day as an inseparable part of European reality.

It is within this historical perspective that the crucial role of the Ottomans, as a continuation of their Seljukide brethren should be seen. The Italian sources perhaps better than most of its contemporaries reflect the worries and fears caused by this new alien presence in Europe. The Ottomans, who managed to conquer almost the entirety of the Balkans by mid-fifteenth century, not only were threatening and diminishing the

Venetian commercial presence in Eastern Mediterranean, but were also posing a threat to the Italian peninsula with naval incursions of pirates under the Ottoman flag. These were followed by the incursions of the Ottoman raiders well into the Venetian *terraferma* in Friuli in the last decades of the fifteenth century and the fall of Otranto in southern Italy off the coast of Ottoman Albania in Puglia in 1480. It is not surprising that there is an abundance of literature of official as well as popular nature on the Turks starting with the second half of the fifteenth century, only to increase to vast quantities by the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries with the increasing might of the Ottomans reaching their apex under Süleyman the Magnificent (1520-1566). Although the Ottomans did not make significant additional conquests in the seventeenth century in Europe, their consolidated military presence was sufficient to perpetuate the *Turkish terror* to make plans of crusades projected by Italians under the encouragement of the Holy See well into the later seventeenth century.

The genealogy of image creation about Islam in Europe had three elements. The first one was the military one. The conquests undertaken by the Arabs first, in the Middle East, North Africa, Spain and Sicily between the seventh and the ninth centuries, in these lands which were considered to be the natural territories of Christendom. Following these conquests, with the shrinking of Christendom to Europe, came the conquests of the Ottomans in Eastern Europe starting in the fourteenth century. The second element was the theological problems arising with the arrival of Islam, the last religion of the Abrahamic lineage, which claimed to revise and replace Christianity as a universal religion. The third one was the general lack of political unity in Christendom - which was now Europe - which coincided with the apex of the Ottoman Empire. As Bernard Lewis points out the oddity of talking about "Europe and Islam" - one of which is a *geographical* entity and the other a *religious* one - states that Europe came to represent the antithesis of Islam. This was a result of the concept of Europe transformed into a post-medieval secular re-definition of what was once called Christendom. Under these circumstances Islam, and later the Turks provided the general European mind with the perfect example of the "other". The later half of the fifteenth century marks not only the peak of the Renaissance in Italy and the apex of the humanist movement, but also the fall of Constantinople in 1453 and that of Trebisond in 1461, the last house of Byzantine royalty in Anatolia.

One of the most important writings of the Middle Ages about the Turks is the *Codex Cumanicus* in Venice. This book, which has been composed towards the end of the thirteenth century, is an invaluable source which gives information on the culture, language and customs of the northern branch of Turks, namely the Kumans (Kipchaks). The manuscript of the *Codex Cumanicus* in the St. Mark's Library of Venice is composed of two parts: The first part contains a dictionary of the Kuman language. The second part is composed of religious, linguistic and folkloristic writings. The fact that it contains Latin and Eastern *Mittelhochdeutsch* translations makes one presume that it was composed by various individuals over a period of time. Most probably, there have been later additions

made to the codex by German Franciscan missionaries, which were originally compiled by Genoese and Venetian merchants who were trading in the area between the Black Sea and the Mongol state founded by Juchi in Central Asia. The curiosity about the Seljukide State and later on Ottoman culture was a result of the presence of Genoese and Venetian colonies on the Black Sea and Eastern Mediterranean. On the other hand, the passage of colonial supremacy in the Eastern Mediterranean from the Genoese hands to Venice in the fifteenth century, followed by the continual Ottoman conquests of Venetian territories such as Thessalonica, the Morea, Eubea and Corfu caused a certain shift in the Venetian politics. From then on, Venice started to pursue a policy not based solely on the consolidation of the Eastern Mediterranean colonies, but rather on the consolidation of the balance of power on the *terraferma* vis-à-vis the other Italian states, in a continual shifting of alliances, which also invited foreign invasions of the Italian peninsula as in the case of the French invasion. Concerning the Genoese-Ottoman relations, Genoa used first the Byzantines and later the Ottoman State as an ally against the Venetians throughout the fourteenth century. However, following the Ottoman conquests of the Genoese Eastern Mediterranean colonies, especially after the fall of the Crimean colony of Caffa (Theodosia) to the Ottomans during the reign of Mehmed II, and the migration of the Catholic subjects to Istanbul by the latter, Genoa realised that the Ottomans could no longer be used as a leverage against the Venetians and she lost her supremacy in the region to Venice for good.

One of the most curious facts that exist about the sources which gave information on the Turks to the general Italian public is that as it was the custom of those days, many of the books on the Turks were copied from one another without citing their sources of information. The curiosity about the Turks was so high in this period, that preoccupation with fame as well as money produced an immense quantity of books, manuscripts, pamphlets and travel accounts on the Turks. The *relazioni* of the Venetian ambassadors or of envoys of other Italian states must be considered separately from the aforementioned works. The *relazioni* were written for political, espionage or simply for pragmatic information purposes to bolster political or commercial aims. The former were read merely for satisfying the curiosity of the intellectuals of the time. A third category of literature on the Ottomans is the literary and folk literature works, which will not be examined in the present book. A good example of books written for the general audience of the time is *Costumi et modi particolari della vita de' Turchi* of Luigi Bassano published in Rome in 1545. Almost an identical text of this book with some later additions was published a hundred years later in Venice in 1654, edited by Count Maiolino Bisaccioni under the title, *Historia universale dell'origine, guerre et imperio de Turchi* as a re-edition of another sixteenth century Venetian writer, Francesco Sansovino. This indicates the demand on information on the Turks, since a century later almost an identical book was published. It also indicates to the fact that information about the Ottoman Empire which circulated in the intellectual milieu was not always updated and usually not of first-hand information. This was certainly not the case for the Venetian ambassadorial dispatches which came at least once a month from the Ottoman capital, in addition to the detailed

relazione of each *bailo* upon his return to Venice to be presented to the Senate. Although the reports which the Holy See received were of different content, usually concerned with the missionary activities, their source were the missionaries. As the documents after the beginning of the seventeenth century in the historical archive of *Congregazione per l'Evangelizzazione dei Popoli* or *Archivio de Propaganda Fide* show, Rome was also not badly informed about the state of affairs in the Ottoman Empire. As the "most favoured nation" among the Italian states for the Ottomans, the Venetians usually provided also the other European states with information on the Ottoman Empire, as the considerable quantity of Venetian *relazioni* found in the Vatican library, and the indelible presence of the Venetian envoys to Rome suggest. As Lucette Valensi writes about the political career of the Venetian patricians: "Embassies – ordinary as well as extraordinary – were part of the *cursus honorum*, among which the position of *bailo* in Istanbul was the most prestigious and most important that a patrician could hope for" and adds that "Copies of these [*relazioni*] circulated in the city [Venice] and were acquired by collectors both in Venice and in other cities as far away as Rome and Oxford". This is one of the reasons why the *relazioni* not only of the Venetian ambassadors, but also those reports of Italians written in the *relazione* style, had considerable influence from 1550 to the end of the eighteenth century, in providing information on the Ottoman Empire in Europe outside of Italy as well. In the 1500s there were the famous works of European envoys to the Ottomans like Augerius Busbequius and his *Turkish Letters*, however, concerning the quantity and the detail of information they contained, the sheer number and regularity of the *relazioni* made them far more influential in their times. Due to the number and accuracy of the *relazioni*, but also thanks to the influx of Byzantine expatriates and the literature they produced, Venice served as the "press office" and the opinion creator of Europe on the Turks between the sixteenth and the eighteenth centuries.

As a result of the curiosity nurtured towards the Turks in Europe and the aforementioned aspects of the Italian socio-political conjuncture, the Italian states also pioneered the early stages of orientalism. Following the fifteenth century, in almost all European countries, particularly France, Germany and Britain, the Italian literary works were read and interpreted within the scope of historiography, literature, as well as for the purposes of espionage and intelligence. Furthermore, they were directly translated to the other European languages, in accordance with the common practice of the continent until the eighteenth century. Other than the more detailed *relazioni*, the first examples of the dominant role of Italy on information about the Ottoman Empire were the dispatches conserved in the Venetian archives. In the fires which erupted in the Venetian archives in the years 1479, 1483 and 1577, many documents about the Ottomans concerning the second half of the fifteenth century were unfortunately burnt. Although the correspondences during the reign of Mehmed II with Venice were written in Turkish, Greek and Latin, the Ottoman bureaucracy which had gradually lost the impact of the old Byzantine chancery, in addition to the newly acquired status as the Caliph, started to correspond with Venice almost exclusively in Ottoman Turkish from the reign of Selim I onwards. In 1419, Mehmed I signed a trade agreement with Venice. The earliest state

treaty pertaining to the reign of Mehmed II was the Ottoman-Venetian trade agreement signed in 1446, a copy of which was composed in the Greek language. Taking into consideration this treaty documented by Franz Babinger and the Byzantine watermark on the paper of the treaty, it can be asserted that the diplomatic institutions of Byzantium had a great impact on the Ottoman State.

For centuries, from the very beginnings of interactions between the Muslims and Christians, the Ottomans represented for the European the "other" *par excellence*. For the Protestants, they were used as an analogy of the evilness of the Catholics; for the Catholics, they were a deviation of the Christian faith like the Protestants; and for the Renaissance humanists, the Turks were identified with the Persians as enemies of the Greek civilisation. For the Catholic Church in Rome, they were the arch-enemies of Christendom against whom one had to wage war at all costs; and for Venice, an inseparable "infidel" commercial partner, with whom amicable relations were of vital importance for her very existence.

Luther was of the conviction that the Catholics and Turks (Muslims) were similar. According to him, they both thought that God gave help only to the pious, and that like the Pope the Turks were also not going to ascend to the Father through Christ, for the Turks did not recognise Christ's divine nature and because the Pope had betrayed Him. Ironically enough, for another Protestant and an opponent of the Pope like Elisabeth I of England, the Turks and Protestants were quite similar. In 1583, Elisabeth I sent her ambassador William Harborne to Sultan Murad III (1574-1595), described as a "totally lost Calvinist" by the Venetian *bailo* in Constantinople Gianfrancesco Morosini, for the aim of promoting England's trade interests in the Orient. The letter which she gave to Harborne contained the affirmation that friendship between Turkey and England was natural. Since France and Spain and especially the Pope were idol worshippers, and England abhorred sacred images as much as the Muslims, and that their religion was greatly similar to the Turkish one as much as a Christian confession could be.

The era of counter-Reformation for the Catholic Church was an era of increasing intolerance towards the Protestants as well as the Orthodox. The separation of a considerable part of Europe from the Catholic Church (Catholic literally means "universal") coupled with the Thirty Years War and its political, ideological and material destruction, obliged Rome to take a number of measures. On the theological front, The Council of Trent (13th December, 1545 - 4th December, 1563) resulted in a further mutual alienation of the Catholic and the Protestant worlds. In a way, these measures destroyed the ecumenical structure of the medieval church at least in theory if not in practice. "[...] Protestantism and Catholicism were in solution in medieval thought. What so dramatically happened during the age of Reformation is that they crystallised into two distinct and opposed systems..."¹

¹ Eugene F. Rice Jr. and Anthony Graton, *The Foundations of Early Modern Europe. 1460-1559*, (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. , 1994), p.173.

On the political as well as the ideological level, the Counter-Reformation era for the Catholic Church shifted the importance of the crusades from sole religious rhetoric to the political level. By the beginning of the seventeenth century, the Turks for Rome were the only target of a fully legitimate possible crusade, which would have enabled Rome to bring once again *pax christiana* to Europe under apostolic auspices, regaining the authority that it had enjoyed between the aftermath of the Fall of Constantinople and before Reformation. Since according to the ongoing mentality of the Holy See during the Middle Ages, the Catholic Church of Rome, with all its hierarchy and institutions, claimed to be the sole inheritor of the ancient Roman state structure and magnificence. Thus, similar to the Romans who had systematically ruled the world through the *pax romana*, the Church intended to rule the entire Christian world through *pax christiana*. However, the claim of being the inheritor of ancient Rome did not only belong to the Roman Church. Sultan Mehmed II (1444-46 and 1451-81), the most powerful sovereign of his time, took the title of *Kayser-i Rum*, Roman Emperor as well as his grandfather Bayezid I (1389-1402) who definitely aspired to be one. Mehmed's successors also adopted the title Caesar later, especially in treaties with the Habsburgs throughout the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries. In the peace treaty concluded with the Habsburgs in 1547 between Süleyman the Magnificent and Carl V, the Holy Roman Emperor and Ferdinand I, the Archduke of Austria, the treaty refers to them as "King of Spain" and "King of Germany" (*Nemche Krali*) respectively.² Whereas, in the treaty of Zsitvatorok in 1606, Ahmed I (1603-1617) insisted on referring to Emperor Rudolph II as "King". However, the treaty ended up referring to Rudolph II as "Emperor" and to Ahmed as "Caesar".³ During much of the sixteenth century the Ottoman Empire was the closest in reminiscence to the glory of ancient Rome and Byzantium in terms of its political, institutional and military structure.⁴ The famous architect of St. Mark's Library, Jacopo Sansovino's son, Francesco Sansovino, a famous Venetian historian who wrote an important history book on the Ottomans in the sixteenth century, two years after the Ottoman defeat at Lepanto, still claimed the greatness of the Romans for the Ottomans.⁵

² Anton C. Schaendlinger and Claudia Römer, *Die Schreiben Süleyman des Prächtigen an Karl V, Ferdinand I und Maximilien II*, (Wien: 1983), pp. 11-18.

³ Markus Köhbach, 'Çasar oder Imperator? Zur Titulatur der römischen Kaiser durch die Osmanen nach dem Vertrag von Zsitva-Torok', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 82 (1992), pp. 223-224 in Colin Imber, *The Ottoman Empire, 1300-1650*, (Basingstoke [etc.]: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), p. 125.

⁴ Halil Inalcık, "The Problem of Relationship Between Byzantine and Ottoman Taxation", pp. 237-242; "The Policy of Mehmed II Toward the Greek Population of Istanbul and the Byzantine Buildings of the City", pp. 231-249 in *The Ottoman Empire: Conquest, Organization and Economy*, (London: Variorum Reprints, 1978); Inalcık, "The Question of the Emergence of the Ottoman State", pp. 71-79 in *The Ottoman Empire: Conquest, Organization and Economy*, (London: Variorum Reprints, 1985). See also H. Inalcık, *Doğu Batı Makaleler*, (Ankara: Doğu Batı, 2005).

⁵ Francesco Sansovino, *Gli Annali Turcheschi overo Vite de'Principi della Casa Othomana*, (Venetia, 1573), preface.

From the point of view of the Holy See, there was no novelty in the policy towards the Turks and the "heretic" Greeks, as it could not always decide which one was worse. On the other hand, for Venice, it was a matter of trade. For the *Serenissima* it was necessary to avoid the war so long as the commercial relations went well. The Ottomans were to be gotten along diplomatically and not confronted militarily as much as possible. Venetians had the maxim: "*siamo veneziani prima , poi cristiani*" (first of all we are Venetian, and then Christian).

The originality of the Ottoman civilisation was not its intellectual achievements, but rather the extremely efficient administrative and military organisation embedded in a profound state tradition which had its origins in the Turkish-Islamic as well as the Byzantine ones. The empire was a genuine melting-pot of various nations and religions. It had not only incorporated many Islamic and oriental political and cultural concepts into its state tradition and organisation, but had also improved them and brought them to perfection in their classical age. An example in architecture which reflected the self-perception of the Ottomans is the evolution from the Pantheon in Rome to the majesty of Hagia Sophia which was perfected in the graceful architectural masterpieces of Architect Sinan with their domed structure that was the symbol of Muslim-Roman architecture. From this point of view the Ottomans were the rightful inheritors of many Roman traditions in addition to their Islamic heritage. All of the Italian documents presented in the present book give a picture of the Ottoman Empire in different periods and different historical instances from different perspectives. These pictures vary from the unstoppable might of the Empire until the time when it found itself on the eve of an irrevocably changing world in the eighteenth century. On the eve of Enlightenment, while the Europeans were starting to see the Ottoman world with new eyes affected by the secular ideals after years of religious polemic and political rhetoric, the Ottomans were just starting to discover a Europe which had remained a distant neighbour next door. In a way, the Turkish Republic is recently starting to discover Europe in the same way that Europe started to re-interpret the Orient in the eighteenth century.

Various conclusions could be drawn based on the documents presented in this book. The first one is concerned with the perception of the Ottoman Empire during the period when the Ottomans were strong enough to pose a military threat to Europe between the fall of Constantinople and the second siege of Vienna. This perception was a continuation of the thereto existing antagonism between the Christian and the Islamic civilisations. On the theme of political disunity in which Renaissance Italy found itself, which occupied the minds of many humanists including Machiavelli, the Ottomans were the feared enemies as well as the infidels from whom much concerning how to run a mighty empire could be learned.

The period between 1453 and 1517 until Luther's rebellion against the Roman Catholic Church, marks the period where the Turks kept their already existing image, not only as the enemy of Christianity, but from 1453 onwards also as the imminent and greatest threat to Christendom. The efforts of bringing unity to Europe under the auspices of the

Roman Church and the restoration of *pax christiana* gained unprecedented importance after 1453. As the manuscripts of Marchesi and Petricca demonstrate, the ideological arm of the Counter Reformation considered it an excellent opportunity to use "war against the Turk" as a means of diverting attention from the ongoing religious and political divisions and wars in Europe. Oddly enough, the same Roman Church considered the Protestant heretics as well as the infidel Turks, as targets of a possible "crusade". In this way, the diminishing importance of the Roman Catholic Church forced it to make use of the traditional Turkish enemy image as an attempt to regain control in a Europe. The consequences of the Thirty Years War are clear proofs of this religious and political fragmentation in Europe. On the other hand Marchesi was concerned with finding a remedy against the Ottomans and in his far-sighted treatise on military strategy, he was predicting the further military revolution of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that had already begun during the Long War, which brought the downfall of the Ottoman Empire on the battle front. Most of the writings of Italians until the end of the seventeenth century present the historian with almost a totally negative view of the Ottomans, with the exceptions of pragmatic Venetians and a few travellers who went to the Ottoman Empire, and witnessed its reality personally. The tone of the famous Venetian historian Francesco Sansovino is in stark contrast to the war cries of the Holy See:

I have always retained [...] that the greatness and power of the Turkish nation deserves much consideration. As a result of seeing their ancient military institution and the order of their civil government, one must conclude – as it is evident – that they are men of valour, and not at all rough [people]. As to the military, I do not see any other people among ours, which has better order, and more reminiscent of the Roman order, than the Turkish one. Considering that they - almost as successors of the aforementioned Romans - are abstinent in war, resistant to fatigue and obedient to their superiors [...]⁶

However, the Ottoman Empire, which was reminiscent of the glories of the Roman Empire from a military and a political point of view, in the eye of the same humanists was also the heir to the barbarian Persian heritage, which represented the antithesis to the Hellenic civilisation and therefore to their own, with its tyranny and lack of civilisation.

This negative identification slowly gave way to the more tolerant and realistic perception of the Ottomans in the hands of the Venetians towards the end of the seventeenth century after Ottoman military and political loss of power mostly due to reasons inherent to the Ottoman Empire. The pioneers heralding the changing Turkish image towards the

⁶ Francesco Sansovino, *Gli Annali Turcheschi overo Vite de' Principi della Casa Othomana*, (Venetia: 1573.), preface.

end of the seventeenth century are the Venetians Donà⁷ and Businello⁸, both members of the Venetian bureaucratic class of prominent families. Perhaps the most radical change took place in the *Letteratura Turchesca* of Toderini who was also a clergyman. Toderini attempted at eradicating the prejudices against the Turks in his *Letteratura Turchesca* of the new Enlightenment age in the following words:

Before entering into the study of Turkish Literature, I should remove a great popular error, still rooted in the minds of many erudite Europeans, who firmly feel and write about Muhammed, that he closed every way of science with severe precept, fearing that harm would [come] to his doctrine if sciences were cultivated; making ignorance of his people, almost the base, upon which to found the extravagant Muslim religion. However, Muhammed was equally concerned, as it would become clear from his own words of the false prophet: "It is legitimate" he says "for the Muslims to possess all the sciences". And in another saying of his [he says]: "Seek science, even if it were in China". The sentence written on the library of the conqueror of Constantinople is famous: "The study of sciences is a divine precept upon the real believers" Therefore, it is clearly seen, how far from the truth is, to think that Muhammed wanted to prohibit his people science and keep them buried in ignorance [.....] The intelligence and the happy climate of the Turks, especially the abundance of the Arabic books, the translations of the Greeks, original and perfect masters of all knowledge, honour and solemn advantages, give the Ottomans the fruits of letters. And finally the academies and the course of well-systemised and laudable studies make them have a doctrine in many sciences and cultivated in pleasant literature. As Galand wrote, in sciences and in fine letters, the Turks are not beaten neither by the Arabs, nor by the Persians, which have been cultivated by them since the beginning of the Ottoman Empire.⁹

Toderini asserted that the Turks have also compensated for the delay in their lack of knowledge of foreign languages to follow the sciences and letters:

There is no person of any doctrine and culture there who does not know the Arabic and the Persian languages together, which are both necessary to penetrate the sciences and to write in the Turkish tongue with elegance. Moreover, as the erudite Reviczky declares, that a Turk would not be able to read inscriptions in his own mother tongue, without knowing those of the Arabs

⁷ Giovanni Battista Donado, *Della Letteratura de' Turchi*, (Venetia, Per Andrea Poletti, 1688)

⁸ Pietro Businello, *Lettere informative delle cose de Turchi riguardo alla religione et al governo civile, militare, politico, et economico. Scritto dal Sig. Pietro Businello segretario del Senato Veneto*, (Padova: manoscritti, Biblioteca Universitaria di Padova)

⁹ Giambattista Toderini, *Letteratura Turchesca*, (Venezia: 1787.), pp. 1-4.

[at least] in a mediocre way. [.....] However, in our present day, they have softened a lot their ferocious literature, and tempered their barbarous superstition. I know two Turks who are men of letters and gentlemen, who write and read Italian, and many others who are most willing to speak it. I was asked by an eminent French engineer, to provide him with some treatise of algebra in our language for an Ottoman, who knew it sufficiently. A mature young Turk, asked me with much warmth, the logarithmic tables of sinus of tangents and cotangents, and another one enquired about the astronomical ephemerides of the then-present year 1785, and other times about unusual and strange things. I have not taken here the trouble of confuting Baron de Tott, [Toderini's note: Mémoires du Baron de Tott sur les Turcs, & les Tartares. Première Partie, Préf. page xv, xxiv,xxv. Mémoires, page 10, 11. A' Amsterdam, 1784.] who denies the Turks any letters, as he has not researched , nor read on this subject. It would be futile that I bothered – as it has been fought with valour – and won by the erudite Peyssonel. [Toderini's note: Lettre de Mr. Peyssonel sur les Mémoires du Baron de Tott. A' Amsterdam, 1785] Finally, this book of mine will show – still not willingly – how much Tott, Savary and many others are ignorant of Turkish literature, [Toderini's note: Lettres sur l'Egypte par M. Savary a Paris, 1785. Lett. prem. page 17. Les Barbares! (parla de' Turchi) ils ont étouffé dans leur vaste Empire les arts, les sciences.]¹⁰ although since sixty years, the initial splendour has declined, as the sincere Turkish scholars confirmed to me.¹¹

Another importance of Italy concerning Ottoman history arises out of the fact that not only numerous works written in Italy between the fifteenth and the end of seventeenth century were copied in other parts of Europe, but also in the eighteenth century the famous works of Italians like the aforementioned books of Soranzo, Toderini and the manuscript of Businello, *Lettere informative*¹² and numerous others enjoyed a wider number of readers than only the Italians. This shows the central role of Italy as late as the later eighteenth century in diffusing the Turkish image in Europe. Another conclusion is the obvious role that the Roman Church played in the creation of Turkish image, to say the least in Catholic Europe as its spiritual head through the well-calculated process of ideological and political strife that went on through using the hostility directed towards the Turks.

The Treaty of Passarowitz in 1718 marks a period where the Ottoman Empire and Venice as well as the Papacy as determinant political actors in Europe started to decline. With the Treaty of Passarowitz, Venice concluded its last war against the Ottomans and lost the Morea to its old rival, which it had managed to capture two decades ago with the Treaty of Carlowitz in 1699. In 1797 Venice lost its independence to Austria and was

¹⁰ Barbarians! (speaking of Turks) They have drowned the arts and sciences in their vast empire.

¹¹ Giambattista Toderini, op. cit., pp.7-9.

¹² Pietro Businello, op. cit.

permanently out of the European political scene as an independent actor. In the eighteenth century, the Ottomans were perceived in Italy as well as in Europe in general within the Enlightenment vision of the "exotic Turk" and not anymore the seen as the fierce enemies of the past centuries.

Lastly, the archival and primary sources of pontifical and Venetian sources in the present book not only present the reader with a picture of how the Ottomans were perceived, but also how these two states perceived themselves within the Italian and the European historical context by posing the Ottomans as the ultimate "other".

The model of the Italian perceptions for the Ottomans can be used as a model for all of the Middle Eastern cultures in general as well as early modern perceptions of the Indian subcontinent. The above text highlights the main points of conflict and relations between the European powers and the Ottomans and covers the period from the 15th to the 18th centuries.

Textbooks:

Brentjes, Sonja, *Travellers from Europe in the Ottoman and Safavid Empires, 16th-17th Centuries*. Variorum Collected Studies Series: CS961. Farnham and Burlington: Ashgate Variorum, 2010. (introduction; part I: "The interests of the Republic of Letters in the Middle East, 1550-1700", part II: "On the relation between the Ottoman Empire and the West European Republic of Letters", part VI: "Pride and prejudice: the invention of a "historiography of science" in the Ottoman and Safavid empires by European travellers and writers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries")

Soykut, Mustafa, *Italian Perceptions of the Ottomans. Conflict and Politics through Pontifical and Venetian Sources*, Peter Lang, 2011. (the entire book)

Tolan, John Victor, *Saracens. Islam in the Medieval European Imagination*, Columbia University Press, 2002. (the entire book)

Readings:

Harper, James G. ed., *The Turk and Islam in the Western Eye: Visual Imagery Before Orientalism*. Transculturalisms, 1400-1700. Farnham and Burlington: Ashgate Press, 2011. (the entire book)

Inalcik, Halil, *The Ottoman Empire: Conquest, Organization and Economy*, Variorum Reprints, 1978.

Kalmar, Ivan, *Early Orientalism. Imagined Islam and the notion of sublime power*, Routledge, 2012.

MacLean, Gerald M., *The Rise of Oriental Travel. English Visitors to the Ottoman Empire, 1580-1720*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Martin, John and Romano, Dennis, eds, *Venice Reconsidered. The History and Civilization of an Italian City-State, 1297-1797*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.

Schwoebel, R., *The Shadow of the Crescent: The Renaissance Image of the Turk (1453-1517)*, Nieuwkoop: n.p., 1967.

Şengel, Deniz, "Sources and Context of the Renaissance Historiography Concerning the Origin of Turks" in *Historical Image of the Turk in Europe from the Fifteenth Century to the Present: Political and Civilisational Aspects*, ed. Mustafa Soykut, Istanbul: The Isis Press, 2003

Setton, Kenneth M., *The Papacy and the Levant (1204-1571). Vol.II.*, The Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1978.

Setton, Kenneth M., *Venice, Austria and the Turks in the Seventeenth Century*, Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1991.

Setton, Kenneth M., *Western Hostility to Islam and Prophecies of Turkish Doom*, American Philosophical Society, 1992.

Turnbull, Stephen, *The Ottoman Empire. 1326-1699*, Osprey Publishing, 2003.

Unit IV: Europe, its neighbourhood, the world at large and the Enlightenment

The 18th century is not only marked by ever increasing expansion of the European powers to the American, Asian and African continents, but also by a fundamental milestone in shaping our modern day called the Enlightenment. As explained above in the Renaissance unit, the relations between humanism and the Church remained accommodating. After the antagonism of the medieval church towards the philosophy and the world-view of the antiquity, the Renaissance was rather a convenient reconciliation between the ideals of the ancient Graeco-Romans and the Christian world-view. The Enlightenment spirit was substantially independent from the Graeco-Romans ideals and principally completely antagonistic to the Church. The motto of the day was "rationalism". Therefore, the birth of modern science is due to Enlightenment ideas. Of course calling one age the enlightened age implies that the precedent one was a dark one! Naturally, sciences were not born in Europe in the 18th century. In fact, sciences were the monopoly to a great extent in the middle ages of the clergy and the first universities founded in the 11th century had professors of clerical origin who taught to the laity. In fact the difference between secular and religious sciences was rather blurred. The difference in the age of Enlightenment was that now those aspects of sciences which contradicted with the holy scriptures were also professed as legitimate albeit without the approval of the church.

The expansion of Europe to the world at large, not only established the foundations of colonialism and the dominance of the so-called "inferior" civilisations by the West, but there was not also more open-minded approach to regard these cultures within their own civilisational aspects. One of these civilisations considered by Western Europe to be extraneous to Europe was the Russian one. Although its Tsars (means simply Caesar in Russian) claimed the title "Caesar" already in the 16th century, Russia's entry into the European system as a major actor happened only at the beginning of the 18th century with the reforms of Peter the Great. Over the global seas, as the 16th century belonged to Spain, the 18th century belonged to Britain with her overseas colonies in all continents, the most important of all was India. However, the difference of the British Empire from the other continental empires of Europe, such as the Holy Roman Empire and the Ottoman Empire, was that it was based on trade initially and later on colonialism and

exploitation. The rest of the Western European states such as France, Holland and Belgium followed with their own colonies starting in the 18th century based on the Spanish and Portuguese model of the 16th century.

Textbook:

Fitzpatrick, Martin; Jones, Peter; Knellwolf, Christa; McCalman, Ian eds., *The Enlightenment World*, Routledge, 2004. (Parts I, II, III, pp.1-249)

Readings:

Almond, Ian, *History of Islam in German Thought. From Leibniz to Nietzsche*, Routledge, 2010.

Birmingham, David, *Trade and Empire in the Atlantic, 1400 -1600*, Routledge, 2000.

Gleason, Abbott, ed., *A Companion to Russian History*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2009.

Harrington, Jack, *Sir John Malcolm and the Creation of British India*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Hillemann, Ulrike, *Asian Empire and British Knowledge. China and the Networks of British Imperial Expansion*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Kotilaine, Jarmo and Poe, Marshall eds., *Modernizing Muscovy. Reform and social change in seventeenth-century Russia*, Routledge Curzon, 2004.

Lamb, Alastair, *British India and Tibet. 1766-1910*, Routledge, 1986.

Morgan, Philip D. and Hawkins, Sean, eds., *Black Experience and the Empire*, Oxford University Press, 2004.

Newitt, Malyn, *A History of Portuguese Overseas Expansion, 1400-1668*, Routledge, 2005.

Riddick, John F., *The History of British India: A Chronology*, Praeger, 2006.

Whelan, Frederick G., *Enlightenment Political Thought and non-Western Societies. Sultans and Savages*, Routledge, 2009.

Wynne, A., *A General History of the British Empire in America. Volume I*, London, 1770. (Available online at books.google.com)

Syllabus

Learning Outcomes:

By the end of this course, students should be able to do the following:

1. Discuss the major developments and texts found in the subject of the course.
2. Identify unique theoretical underpinnings and influential thinkers in the course topic.
3. Analyze the relationship between historical texts and the particular social, cultural, and biographical contexts of their production.
4. Research and critically evaluate historical, social, cultural, or biographical criticism relevant to the analysis of specific events.
5. Use secondary sources and close reading skills to produce a substantive critical essay relating a one or more specific historical texts to the economic, social, cultural, or biographical contexts of its production.
6. Demonstrate a balanced perspective and a deepened understanding of the cultures, times, people, and situations that produce these works.
7. Write coherent historical arguments that explore the relationships of various concepts and texts, and which provide a clear synthesis.

Course Goals:

1. To provide students with a broad perspective of approaches to world history and an understanding of the various ways in which they manifest themselves and to assess students' ability to express their perspectives through exams and essays.
2. To provide students with a deeper understanding of diverse historical and interdisciplinary traditions the course focus and to express this deepened understanding in written tests and a critical essay.
3. To provide an overview of historical analysis and interpretation methods and help students apply these skills in writing essay examinations and a critical essay.
4. To read widely and critically in a variety of historiographic and historical texts and to demonstrate the depth and breadth of this reading in essay examinations and a critical essay.
5. To do library research on a particular trend, event, concept, an individual theorist, or an issue in the area of history studies and to write a critical essay which incorporates this research.

Course Content:

1. Historical events and texts that have been designated as being produced within the category of the course topic.
2. Discussion of the theoretical, social, cultural and biographical contexts in which those works were produced.
3. Historical movements in various periods.
4. Discussion of the historical issues and questions related to theoretical, social, cultural, and biographical approaches to the study of the course topic.
5. Key ideas about how to evaluate and interpret historical events, texts, and approaches.
6. Criticism and reflection upon political and economic systems as reflected in literature.
7. Discussion of the relevance of course readings to the understanding of contemporary global issues.
8. Critical analysis and interpretation of history.
9. Conducting scholarly research on and off-line.

Course Outline:

For the detailed course outline, please see the study guide.

Course Readings:

The course readings for this course will be available through the Online Library, which will provide students access to selected journal articles, book chapters, and reference materials.

Course Preparedness:

This course is a history course which requires analysis, research, and writing. It assumes the mastery of prerequisite college-level skills in spelling, grammar, punctuation, paragraphing, and essay writing. It also assumes the ability to read and analyze literary texts. This course provides instruction in history and does not address remedial writing issues at the sentence, paragraph, or essay level. The California Department of Education "English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools" offers context for understanding the standard for writing at the college level. Students who do not meet the standards outlined in the "English-Language Arts Content Standards" will not pass this course.

In short, this course assumes that students already "write with a command of standard English conventions, write coherent and focused texts that convey a well-defined perspective and tightly reasoned argument, and use clear research questions and creative and critical research strategies" (California Standards, Grades Nine and Ten). This course focuses on texts and analysis and requires college-level writing skills that exceed those required at the secondary level.

Course Workload:

In accordance with accreditation standards, requires approximately two hours of outside work for every contact hour. For a 3-hour course, there are 48 contact hours, plus a minimum of 96 hours outside work. For a sixteen-week course, students can expect to devote a minimum of 6 hours of independent study per week in order to complete the coursework.

Grading Factors:

Discussion Board (20%)

The Discussion Board provides the learner a place to respond to questions on the topic and to exchange ideas, reactions and analyses of the texts. Discussion questions concentrate on ideas, themes, and characters in literary works. There will be one question per week. Discussion Board questions will be responded to by all learners in the course and will be evaluated by the instructor. The Discussion Board is not available for OCW courses.

Journal (20%)

Your journal consists of your responses to questions in the Study Guide. These questions require you to reflect on the material and to write a one to two-paragraph response. At the end of the course, you will gather together all of your Study Guide responses and will turn them in as a final portfolio.

Essay (20%)

You will write an essay on one of the topics provided to you by your instructor in which

you apply a critical paradigm from theorists or issues raised by the Study Guide questions. You should start your paper with a succinct thesis statement, describe the critical paradigm and the text(s) being analyzed. Be sure to cite critical passages to demonstrate support for your argument.

Length: 1,000—1,500 words. Essay topics will be assigned by the instructor and will reflect material covered in the Study Guide and the readings.

Exam (40%)

Students must complete the assignments, submit them, and take the proctored exam.

Definition of Grades:

Graduate Courses

- A** Outstanding Achievement
- B** Commendable Achievement
- C** Marginal Achievement
- D** Unsatisfactory *
- F** Failing *

* Students receiving this grade in a course that is required for his/her degree program must repeat the course.

- I Incomplete** A grade given at the discretion of the instructor when a student who has completed **at least two-thirds of the course class sessions** and is unable to complete the requirements of the course because of uncontrollable and unforeseen circumstances. The student must convey these circumstances (preferably in writing) to the instructor prior to the final day of the course. If an instructor decides that an "Incomplete" is warranted, the instructor must convey the conditions for removal of the "Incomplete" to the student in writing. A copy must also be placed on file with the Office of the Registrar until the "Incomplete" is removed or the time limit for removal has passed. An "Incomplete" is not assigned when the only way the student could make up the work would be to attend a major portion of the class when next offered.

An "I" that is not removed within the stipulated time becomes an "F." No grade points are assigned. The "F" is calculated in the grade point average.

- W Withdrawal** Signifies that a student has withdrawn from a course after beginning the third class session. **Students who wish to withdraw must notify their admissions advisor before the beginning of the sixth class session in the case of graduate courses, or before the seventh class session in the case of undergraduate courses.** Instructors are not authorized to issue a "W" grade.

Plagiarism:

Plagiarism is the presentation of someone else's ideas or work as one's own. Students must give credit for any information that is not either the result of original research or common knowledge. If a student borrows ideas or information from another author, he/she must acknowledge the author in the body of the text and on the reference page. Students found plagiarizing are subject to the penalties outlined in the Policies and Procedures section of the Catalog, which may include a failing grade for the work in question or for the entire course. The following is one of many websites that provide

helpful information concerning plagiarism for both students and faculty:
<http://www.indiana.edu/~wts/pamphlets/plagiarism.shtml>

Ethics:

Ethical behavior in the classroom is required of every student. The course will identify ethical policies and practices relevant to course topics.

Technology:

Students are expected to be competent in using current technology appropriate for this discipline. Such technology may include word processing, spreadsheet, and presentation software. Use of the internet and e-mail may also be required.

Diversity:

Learning to work with and value diversity is essential in every class. Students are expected to exhibit an appreciation for multinational and gender diversity in the classroom.

Civility:

As a diverse community of learners, students must strive to work together in a setting of civility, tolerance, and respect for each other and for the instructor. Rules of classroom behavior (which apply to online as well as onsite courses) include but are not limited to the following:

- Conflicting opinions among members of a class are to be respected and responded to in a professional manner.
- Side conversations or other distracting behaviors are not to be engaged in during lectures, class discussions or presentations
- There are to be no offensive comments, language, or gestures

Students with Disabilities:

Students seeking special accommodations due to a disability must submit an application with supporting documentation, as explained under this subject heading in the General Catalog. Instructors are required to provide such accommodations if they receive written notification from the University.

Writing Across the Curriculum:

Students are expected to demonstrate writing skills in describing, analyzing and evaluating ideas and experiences. Written reports and research papers must follow specific standards regarding citations of an author's work within the text and references at the end of the paper. Students are encouraged to use the services of the University's Writing Center when preparing materials.

The following website provides information on APA, MLA, and other writing and citation styles that may be required for term papers.

Online Library:

Our Online Library supports academic rigor and student academic success by providing access to scholarly books and journals electronically.