Visual images accompanying sixteenth- and seventeenth-century European travel accounts of the Ottomans are among the subjects least utilized by art historians. Yet these images are important, for they give us some sense not only of technological changes in printing and book production of the time, but also of the complex cultural and aesthetic background into which they are set. Although they were meant to complement the text, the difficulty and the cost of production limited the number of illustrations in any given book. Consequently, frontispieces acquired a special importance, not unlike heraldic or emblematic imagery, as they were often the only visual statement of the content of the book. They frequently employed elaborate iconography which allowed authors, with the help of their engravers, to transform their written accounts into symbolic codification.

A characteristic example is the early-seventeenth-century frontispiece to George Sandys’s travel account, *A Relation of a Journey begun An: Dom: 1610. Foure Bookes Containing a description of the Turkish Empire, of Egypt, of the Holy Land, of the Remote parts of Italy, and Islands adjoining*, 1st edition (London, 1615). The frontispiece (fig. 1) depicts a classical temple adorned with figurative images. To the left on the plinth of the temple stands a male figure in Oriental dress. He is identified with an inscription just above his head as *Achmet, Sive Tyrannus*, that is, the reigning Ottoman Sultan Ahmed I (1603–17). Accompanying him on the right stands a female figure personifying the Egyptian goddess Isis. They are separated by the text, "A Relation of a Journey Begun . . .," which fills the center of the temple and above which are seated two other figures personifying *Veritas* and *Constantia*, "the guardian angels of Christian humanism." The figures, joined in the middle by an ornamental oval cartouche containing an image of the ascending Christ, viewed together form an illusionary pediment. At the bottom of the frontispiece, on the left and right, two oval medals depict a lamenting Virgin with the motto *Virta Iacet*, and a bull identified as *Apis Sive Osyris*. A large medallion, framed with strapwork portraying the Virgilian Sibylla Cumea, placed in the recess of the plinth between the medals completes the overall design.

In terms of design, Sandys’s frontispiece is similar

![Fig. 1. Frontispiece to George Sandys’s travel account, *A Relation of a Journey begun An: Dom: 1610*. (Photo: courtesy of the Syndics of the Cambridge University Library)]
to earlier frontispieces to books such as Jean-Jacques Boissard’s *Vitae et Icones Sultanorum Turcicorum*, a compilation of biographical information and portraits of the Ottoman sultans, Persian shahs, and other nobilities, published in 1596 in Frankfurt (fig. 2), and Richard Knolles’s *Generall History of the Turkes, from the First Beginning of that Nation to the Rise of the Ottoman Familie...*, published in 1603 in London (fig. 3).² Boissard’s frontispiece depicts the Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand on the left and the reigning sultan Mehemd III on the right. Both rulers are treated equally: they are the same height and have the same thrust forward; though facing each other, neither makes eye contact. Their gaze is directed towards the action in the battle scene below the title frame. As if to emphasize their position as onlookers only, the compartmentalization of the individual images stresses the distance between the rulers and their willingness to lead a war, which is quite accurate considering that it was not until the end of 1596 that both rulers were forced to take action in the Great Hungarian war, also known as the “Long War” between the Habsburgs and Ottomans (1593-1606).

Knolles’s frontispiece is also a further exploration of the theme of conflict between the Ottoman Empire and European powers, which is expressed through scenes of battles and warriors within an architectural setting entirely in keeping with its location: Byzantine-looking marble columns, for example, relate to the Ottoman lands and the drapery between the columns conveys an exotic character.³ Both these frontispieces deal with the subject of Europe’s military
achieved, and particularly with the victory at the battle of Lepanto in 1571, when the combined forces of Spain and Venice defeated the Turkish fleet. If put in context, however, the allusion to the victory at Lepanto seems to act as moralizing propaganda for the ongoing Great Hungarian war, which began in 1593 and lasted for thirteen years, to convey an equality of power between the Ottomans and themselves. The distinctive feature of Sandys’s frontispiece is, however, the shift from such images of equality of power to Christian supremacy over the Ottomans. This is represented in the idiosyncratic style of the frontispiece—pairing of male with female, human with divine, real with imaginary, the present with the past. Furthermore, Ahmed is paired with the mythological figure of Isis and not with a monarch as, for example, in the case of Boissard’s frontispiece. This incongruity alone suggests Sandys’s attempt to eliminate the Ottomans from the European political frame and to undermine their legitimacy as the portrayal of Ahmed as a tyrant would suggest.

Although on the surface the frontispiece could be read as an allegorical representation of the places visited by Sandys during his travels to the East, the portrayal of an Ottoman sultan as a tyrant stands out as a landmark in the visual propaganda disseminated against the Ottomans in Europe, as we shall see. Therefore its impact and intricacy must be addressed in detail. The nature of and the reasons for this type of visual propaganda against the Ottomans, however, cannot be understood without an inquiry into the construction of European political identity vis-à-vis the Ottomans during the first half of the sixteenth century.

The frontispiece takes its theme from the contemporary prophesies of the imminent collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the return of Christianity to the Holy Land. The image serves to strengthen the argument put forward by Lucette Valensi in Venice et la Sublime Porte: la naissance du despote, in which she identifies a turning point in the history of European perception and description of the Ottoman Empire by analyzing the vocabulary used by the Venetian bailos. “At the twilight of the sixteenth century,” she writes, “the [verbal] image that the Venetian ambassadors give of the Ottoman Empire clouds over, the sovereign’s portrait takes on a grimace, and cracks begin to appear in every part of the imperial edifice.”4 Focusing on the appearance of the word “despot” in the accounts of the bailos, Valensi identifies a crucial moment in the process of Ottoman alienation in European political discourse.5 One of the reasons why a new label had to be invented for the political conduct of the Ottomans, she argues, was that conventional words such as “tyranny” had become problematic, partly because the word had been used predominantly to describe the political systems of ancient Greece and Rome; but mainly because it had become part of the international political criticism exchanged among the European powers.6 Nicolo Morin, the Venetian ambassador to the court of James I, reported the “government’s tyrannical beginnings and described the King as being the absolute master in all things.”7 But most important, labeling the Ottomans as “despots” was indicative of the increasing preoccupation with defining national identities by drawing a distinct line of demarcation between different cultures—placing the Ottoman Empire, as it were, at the boundary between legitimate and illegitimate government made the Ottomans not only the object of ridicule and contempt, but also a source of political and religious speculation in general.

If Valensi’s argument is supplemented with visual evidence, we come closer to understanding the role played by the Ottomans in the formation of the different national identities in Europe in relation to the Ottoman Empire. Sandys’s frontispiece, for example, can be seen as a significant political strategy employed to disentangle the notion of tyranny within the European political discourse through the use of extensive but controlled visual symbolism. England’s struggle to define its political and religious identity vis-à-vis other European powers during the reign of the Stuart King James I can determine how the frontispiece as a whole is to be understood. The English Renaissance historian Jonathan Haynes argues that “Sandys and his book stand squarely at the conjunction of two great historical events: the consolidation of humanist culture in England and the foundation of the British Empire.”8 The allegorical frontispiece on which the content of the book is carefully staged reflects this new sense of English identity.9 Sandys was born into an aristocratic family. At Oxford, he was educated in the humanist tradition, and in his later years he became an ardent believer in the political causes of James I and later Charles I, and held an important government position as the chief adviser to the governor of Virginia,10 as well as being a Gentleman of the Chamber, which afforded him a specific mode of engagement with the Otto-
His portrayal of Ahmed as a tyrant seems geared to demonstrate attributes that could never belong to a European ruler and in particular to James I, an effort no doubt prompted by the fact that James had acquired the reputation of being a tyrant when immediately after his succession to the English throne in 1603, he made his claim to divine authority by attributing his accession to the particular intervention of God, a claim inspired by the union of the crowns of Scotland and England.

Sandys's commitment to the divine-right principle of the English monarch under James I sets the general tone of the program for the frontispiece. His use of the label "tyrant" for Ahmed can be considered part of the larger political strategy to control the image of the English monarchy as well as to reflect the changing context of political relations between the Porte and Stuart England in contrast to the lenient policies of Elizabeth's reign.

Images of the Ottoman sultans had circulated throughout Europe since the capture of Constantinople in 1453. The portrait of Mehmed the Conqueror (1480), under a triumphal arch decorated with the images of earthly paradise, by Gentile Bellini (fig. 4), and the engraving of Süleyman the Magnificent with the fantastic imperial headgear (1535) by Agostino Veneziano (fig. 5), as well as the full portrait engraving of the same sultan celebrating the inauguration of the Süleymaniye Mosque in 1557 by Melchior Lorich (1559) (fig. 6) are among the best known examples. Several engravings depicting the Ottoman sultans also appeared in the works of European chroniclers of the Ottoman Empire, in albums, and in travelers' accounts, but until the late sixteenth century they
were all celebratory images not unlike those of European rulers.

One of the first images to depart from this trend is the frontispiece of a pamphlet entitled Pianto, et Lamento de Selin, which depicts the reigning sultan Selim II (fig. 7) in the year of his defeat at Lepanto (1571). The woodcut depicts the sultan standing, turned three-quarters to the right, wearing a traditional three-layered costume and holding a scepter with a crescent on top. Gülru Necipoğlu has identified this image from the evidence of earlier portraits as a relatively accurate portrait of the sultan.

The frontispiece is remarkable for its alteration of the image of an Ottoman sultan when compared with, say, Lorich’s depiction of Süleyman the Magnificent in 1559. In the latter engraving, a narrative of magnificence surrounds the figure of the sultan, within which the figure is magnified to represent monarchical power. In the woodcut figure, on the other hand, Selim II is divorced from his natural setting: the palace, the capital, or the battlefield; one sees him alone, captured within a frame standing on bare ground. Although he is shown holding the royal scepter, it is no longer held aloft as a symbol of power; instead it seems to rest on the shoulder of the sultan as if to signify resignation, not unlike the position of a rifle held by a defeated soldier. The effect may be partly the result of perspectival distortion, but another frontispiece, this one belonging to Lamento et Ultima Disperatione di Selim Gran Turco, shows him beating his chest, tempted into a suicidal state by the demon sneaking up from behind (fig. 8).

Although both images portray a weakened sultan, phrases such as Gran Turco and Imperador de Turchi accompanying the frontispiece reinstate his power. These images were part of the immediate reaction to
the victory at Lepanto that lasted for a brief time because of continuing Ottoman pressure. This realization led to a very different kind of image of victory in frontispieces during the reign of subsequent sultans.

The frontispiece to the 1612 French edition by Thomas Artus (first published in 1577) of the late-fifteenth-century Greek historian Laonikos Chalkokondyles's *L'histoire de la decadence de l'empire grec, et establissement de celuy des Turcs*, provides one of the earliest manifestation of this change (fig. 9). This two-volume work has two engravings depicting the reigning sultan Ahmed I. One is portrait bust at the end of the second volume (fig. 10): the other is a sultan on horseback in an allegorical frontispiece. Far less enigmatic than the frontispiece to Sandys's work, this frontispiece could also be perceived as an homage to the Christian victory at Lepanto, as the scenes flanking the title of the book suggest. Combining text with images, the frontispiece is divided into three sections. The first and the largest of the sections displays the power of the Ottomans by depicting the sultan riding an elaborately caparisoned horse accompanied by soldiers and a group of prostrating slaves. Despite the charged scene, the surrounding texts and images convey a very different idea of that power. It is both undermined and elevated at the same time, for the Latin inscription, *Quid Superbis Deus Irdebit Prostratus Tandem Solideo Servies* ("Whatever you are proud of God will mock; prostrate at last you will serve the only God"), mocks their power and proclaims Christian prophecies of Ottoman destruction. In this sense, the image of the Ottoman magnificence is merely a device for expressing a certain kind of
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To go back to the treatment of Ottoman sultan portraits, both the frontispiece and the single portrait of Ahmed at the end of the second volume easily fit into the established norms for portraying Ottoman sultans as legitimate rulers. They contain the usual attributes of rulers such as the crescent, scepter, aigrettes, and plumes decorating the sultan's turban, and a richly caparisoned horse, all of which were considered emblematic of the Ottomans. Sandys's frontispiece, which appeared three years after the translation of Chalkokondyles's history in 1615, presents a dramatic contrast by denouncing any attributes of royalty, including the scepter and the crescent. If the earlier frontispiece left Ahmed's identity ambiguous, the inscription declaring him "Achmet sive Tyrannus" in Sandys's frontispiece leaves no doubt. And whereas Chalkokondyles's frontispiece still promotes the sovereign as a man of action, mounted on a royal horse in the company of his soldiers, Sandys's portrayal of Ahmed rejects such a notion by presenting him immobile in front of a classical temple. Although solemn and monumental in posture, the grandeur of Ahmed is clearly undermined by the long unremarkable robe he wears, which seems deliberately designed to look dull and inelegant. His bulky turban has been stripped of its imperial ornaments; he is depicted with a scruffy beard and melancholy eyes. His gaze is directed away from his surroundings, and his narrow shoulders, emphasized by the exaggerated lower belly, make him look somewhat deformed. With such an image, Sandys seems to set out to portray a different idea of an Ottoman ruler, which aimed at distancing Ahmed from the previous Ottoman sultans and from the very idea of a legitimate ruler.

Sandys's engraver Francis Delaram was probably guided by the written description of Ahmed for this portrait. It is worth quoting the relevant passage from the Relation of a Journey:

He [Ahmed I] is, in this yeare 1610, about the age of three and twenty, strongly lim'd, & of a just stature, yet greatly inclining to be fat: insomuch as sometimes he is ready to choke as he feeds, and some do purposely attend to free him from that danger. His face is full and

confidence in Europe confirming the reader's understanding of the recent shift in power. This subversion, i.e., the contrasting messages of the word and image, is clearly a necessary device for forging a new idea of the Ottomans that is capable of generating a new image of a stronger Christendom. Clearly, the stronger the opponent the worthier the achievement. The final message of the frontispiece appears in the right-hand corner where a cross replaces a crescent at the summit of a classical temple (fig. 11), which is clearly a reference to Christian hopes for recapturing the city of Constantinople and reconverting Hagia Sophia back to a church, as the Latin inscription Verso Vice Resurgam et Iterum ("Turned around I will rise again and once again") declares. However, when the same image reappeared in 1633 in the frontispiece to Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq's letters from Istanbul (fig. 12), the crescent remaining at the summit of the temple suggests that once the memory of the victory at Lepanto had faded, so had the hopes for recapturing Istanbul.

Fig. 10. Portrait bust of Ahmed I in Laonikos Chalkokondyles's L'histoire de la decadence de l'empire grec, et establissement de celuy des Turcs. (Photo: courtesy of the Syndics of the Cambridge University Library)
duely proportioned: ... onely his eyes are extraordinary great, by them esteemed an excellency in beauty. Fline hath the predominancy in his complexion. He hath a little haire on his upper lip, but lesse on his chin, of a darksome colour. His aspect is haughty as haughty as his Empire is large, He beginneth already to abstain from exercise; yet are there pillars with inscriptions in his Serraglio, between which he threw a great iron mace, that memorise both his strength, and activity. . . . His Turbant is like in a shape to a pumpcion, but thrice as great. His under and upper garments are lightly of white sattin, or cloth of silver tisued with an eye of green, and wrought in great branches.24

Although this description of him as a gluttonous, indolent, and vain person may well have been one of the sources used for the visual rendering of the sultan25 the set of objects accompanying Ahmed’s portrait suggests that Delaram’s image should be read as complementing the written descriptions rather than simply deriving from them. Ahmed is rendered with an orb in one hand and a yoke in the other, with books under his feet and a broken scale on the floor. The composition seems to be self-explanatory—an orb signifies the world that Ahmed is aspiring to dominate; a yoke is a symbol of servitude indicating his power to enslave; broken scales symbolize injustice; and the books under his feet his denunciation of Truth, i.e., Christianity.

But where did these symbolic associations come from? Historians such as Corbett and Lightbown have argued that frontispieces were designed so that the readers “are confronted with conceits of the author, represented at the front of his book in visual symbols that he himself had chosen and designed as its most fitting emblems.”26 Much of the allegorical imagery in early-seventeenth-century frontispieces were derived from sixteenth-century emblem books, which were widely used for title pages and frontispieces for printed books in general.27 Sandys and his engraver no doubt also made use of them; Francis Delaram trained under renowned engravers such as Renold Elstrack, Crispijn, and Willem and Simon de Passe, all of whom had an interest in emblematic images.28 The emblems used with the word Tyrannus can be a case in point.

The first emblem of tyranny appeared in an early book of emblems compiled by the Flemish humanist
Johannes Sambucus in 1564. It seems to illustrate the sixteenth-century popular notion of tyranny (fig. 13). It shows an ancient Greek ruler pointing a sheathed sword at prisoners who have been brought to his presence by a soldier, while a hungry lion roars in the background. The accompanying epigram characterizes the two distinct animating faculties of the tyrant as being animal instinct and irrationality, which are manifested in the concluding maxim of the epigram, “His will is his law.” By using the word tyrannus, Sandys might have tried to invoke a similar sentiment regarding Ahmed, but the absence of any discernible Ottoman motifs in Sambucus’s emblem suggests no particular reference to an Ottoman ruler. By the same token, the presence of objects such as a crown, a sword, and wild beasts—the visual attributes of a tyrant—are missing from Sandys’s personification.

Another source available to Sandys may have been the collection of emblems entitled Iconologia. Ovvero descrizione di diverse imagini cavate dall’antichità, e di propria inventione by the Italian Cesare Ripa, first published in Rome in 1593 without illustrations and then again in 1603 with over 400 images. Although the work was not translated into English until 1630 and even then remained in manuscript form until 1709, Sandys could have known the 1603 Italian edition. However, neither in this nor later editions—with the exception of the French translation of 1644 (fig. 14)—was the emblem of tyranny illustrated. Sandys’s debt to Ripa’s epigram is nonetheless evident in both the verbal and the visual depiction of Ahmed. For Ripa, like Sambucus, emphasizes “haughtiness” as necessary for a tyrant:

An armed woman, somewhat pale, haughty, and cruel in appearance, and standing in armor with a purple sash, a crown of iron on her head, in her right hand is a drawn sword at prisoners who have been brought to her presence by a soldier, while a hungry lion roars in the background.
sword, and with her left she trails a yoke. She is depicted armed and on her feet in order to demonstrate the vigilance, which is necessary to the tyrant, to conserve the greatness of her violent state, which stands always with her spirit and forces dedicated to her own defense, and to the offence of others. She is pale because of continuous fear and anxiety, which perpetually molest and afflict her. She displays cruelty and haughtiness in her face because one of these plagues leads to unjust greatness, and the other preserves it. She is dressed in purple, and a crown of iron, to demonstrate her lordship, which, however, is barbarous and cruel. Instead of a scepter, a symbol of greatness and of legitimate government, she holds a drawn sword. As one who obtains the obedience of the subjects with terror, shepherding them not for their good, as does the good shepherd, but to subdue them under a plough, and to fleece them, as does a boorish cattle thief. Having as a goal only one’s own benefit she holds a yoke in her hand.35

Sandys’s remark that Ahmed’s “aspect is as haughty as his empire is large” is in keeping with this theme of “haughtiness.”34 Furthermore, Ripa’s tyrant is depicted “on her feet,”35 like Sandys’s Ahmed, “in order to demonstrate vigilance, which is necessary to the tyrant.”36 But the most striking link between Ripa’s tyrant and Ahmed is the presence of a “yoke.” According to Ripa, it signifies “one who obtains the obedience of the subjects with terror.” This and many other aspects of Ripa’s epigram can easily be observed in Sandys’s account of Turkish policy and the ruler of the empire:

But the barbarous policie whereby this tyrannie is sustained, doth differ from all other: guided by the heads, and strengthened by the hands of his slaves, who thinke it as great an honour to be so, as they do with us that serve in the Courts of Princes: the naturall Turke (to be so called a reproach) being rarely employed in command or service: amongst whom there is no nobility of blood, no knowne parentage, kindred, nor hereditary possessions: but are as it were of the Sultans creation, depending upon him onely for their sustenance and preferments. Who disposeth, as well of their lives as their fortunes, by no other rule than that of his will.37 Ripa’s emblem, then, has an iconography similar to that presented both in the figure of Ahmed holding a yoke and in Sandys’s literary descriptions. Yet the absence of Ottoman motifs in Ripa’s emblem also demonstrates—though less explicitly than that of Sambucus—that the notion of tyranny was associated primarily with the ancients and that contemporary Ottoman rulers still remained outside the collective notion, as an emblem tries to convey, until the beginning of the seventeenth century. This interpretation is also confirmed by Valensi’s reading of the diplomatic reports produced by the Venetian bailos, who continued to discuss the Ottoman political system within the norms of legitimate governments until the middle of the seventeenth century.38 But that is not to say that there had never been an occasion when the word tyranny was equated with the Ottomans. On the contrary, the emblem of Fortuna, which we also find in Sambucus, has a clear reference to “Turkish tyranny,” and unlike the emblems of tyranny, makes explicit use of Ottoman motifs (fig. 15).39

Fortuna is represented as a female figure with her attributes of swirling scarf and hair blowing in the wind and with a globe under her feet. She is holding high above a flame a Turkish imperial turban, denoted by a long plume of feathers, which has been
pierced with a sword held by an arm emerging from the clouds. In the middle burns a fire surrounded by wild animals, reminiscent of the emblem of tyranny. The emblem is dedicated to “the glorious King Maximilian of Bohemia” and is “about the Turkish tyranny”; it continues:

Too much swollen and intoxicated by the temptation of fortune, he will madly rush to wherever his desire takes him. Everything that he undertakes he undertakes by force and deceit, Breaking alliances, treaties and promises in his faithless manner! And so you recognize the tyrant even better in all respects. He rages without God’s fear also against his own people. To the same extent the deceitful ruins his own friends by his cunning, and like a wild animal he devours everything that is around him. Neither duty nor yellow gold changes his mind, and the cruel ridicules and detests law, justice and equality. With him you will try in vain peace and everything else. It requires the sword because he only loves those whom he fears.

This emblem represents the events of the time of its appearance; it celebrates the coronation of Maximilian II as Holy Roman Emperor in 1564, the year in which the book was published, and anticipates the Turkish threats facing the new rule. It might also be taken as a warning to the Ottomans that their good fortune may not last forever: the discarded arms, a whip, and a Turkish sword in the foreground depict fortune as a worldly possession with a fleeting presence signified by the globe under her feet and the blowing wind. The emblem could also be read as moralizing propaganda encouraging Maximilian to wage war against Suleyman the Magnificent and thereby also encouraging conscription into the armies at war throughout Europe. Considering that both Catholics and Protestants rejected war as barbaric, this iconography can be viewed as an appropriate instrument for the justification of wars in general. The Turkish sultan as tyrant in this case may represent Christian sentiments about war during the religious conflict in Europe. Although Europeans were also occupied with combatting the threat of Turkish expansion into Europe, it was conflict over territories and religion in Europe that divided them. Some religious and political thinkers of the time, including Erasmus in the Netherlands and Thomas More in England, argued that the real enemy was not the “Turk on the outside but the Turk inside.”

A reworking of Sambucus’s emblem of Fortuna by the English artist Francis Hyckes in a 1611 tapestry decorating the walls of Hatfield House (fig. 16) also demonstrates that even he did not find it appropriate to identify the Ottomans with the notion of tyranny. Hyckes substitutes for the turban a jar pouring water on a fire burning below, but repeats the last line from Sambucus’s emblem of Fortuna as a motto, *Tyrannus nullum nisi que[m] timet amat* (“the tyrant loves no one but him whom he fears”).

The preceding discussion suggests that Sandys’s labeling of an Ottoman sultan as *tyrannus* and showing him with specific objects and expressions falls outside the conventional forms of representing the Ottomans in the early seventeenth century. It seems that the purpose of the motto was to promote the idea that Ahmed shared the characteristics of a tyrant prescribed in the emblems of tyranny and therefore should be considered to be one. By conveying this idea, Sandys’s frontispiece not only introduces the theme of tyranny into the prevailing perception of the Ottoman ruler, but also modifies the notion of tyranny in accordance with these perceptions. Norman Bryson, in his seminal work, *Word and Image*, tells us that there are two aspects to an image that emerge simultaneously: “... the image must recall and reinforce the family of representations of the scene already encountered, like a memorandum; and ... is subordinated to a proleptic place within
future memory.” Sandys’s image of Ahmed, and the frontispiece generally, does precisely that.

Sandys, like most Europeans, was fascinated with the unlimited power of the sultan, a power that could claim to dominate the world, that could enrich the state revenues beyond imagination, and, most important, that could enslave Christians and other nations. Throughout his discussion of the Ottoman army and treasury, Sandys conforms to the late-sixteenth-century perception of the supreme power of the sultan, tying his strength and wealth, as did earlier observers, to the voluntary submission of his subjects. In the frontispiece to the Relation of a Journey, Ahmed’s power is signified, not by the marching army and prostrate slaves evident in Chalkokondyles’s frontispiece, but by the presence of a golden globe which Ahmed holds high in his left hand.

Sandys’s frontispiece is a provocative image more concerned with transposing existing cultural symbols and notions into an unfamiliar context than with producing a literal portrait of an Ottoman sultan symbolizing the country he visited. For example, the symbolism of an orb is predominantly European; as Salomon Schweigger, the contemporary traveler to Turkey, remarked: “Golden chains, royal crowns, scepters, orbs, clocks and similar Imperial regalia are unknown there [in Turkey] and not in use.” There are numerous early-seventeenth-century images of Queen Elizabeth I showing her with a globe in her hand—including images by the tutors of Delaram (fig. 17; compare with fig. 1). By placing a globe in Ahmed’s hand, Sandys’s engraver both confirms Ahmed’s status as a monarch and simultaneously denies his legitimacy by showing him usurping an European icon. The message is therefore also about the stability of monarchical legitimacy that suffers at
the hands of the Ottomans, as the juxtaposition of the globe with the yoke that Ahmed holds with equal vigor suggests.

By the end of the sixteenth century, the Ottoman administration of justice had become the target of attacks by Europeans, who argued that it was based solely on the will of the sultan and not on written law and therefore could not guarantee justice, but the sultan himself did not become the object of such criticism until the middle of the seventeenth century. The notion of injustice became a leitmotif in European perceptions of the Ottoman Empire, representing a stark contrast to the sultan's perception of himself as the spearhead of justice.\(^48\)

Accordingly, the readers of Ripa's *Iconologia* would have encountered the characteristics of the Ottoman Empire, not in the emblems of tyranny, but in the emblems of injustice. Injustice offers a profound cultural synthesis of the overall sentiment about the Ottomans prevailing in Italy at the time, and is also acutely expressive of certain aspects of the observations of the Venetian bailos and ambassadors that Valensi discusses. In the first illustrated edition of the *Iconologia* there are two separate entries for the emblem of Injustice, only one of which is illustrated (fig. 18).\(^49\) Both epigrams remark on the despicable and monstrous character of a person who is blinded by greed, signified by a toad in one epigram and a rich golden cup in the other, which she secures only through cruelty and denunciation of the laws:

The personification of Injustice is a tall woman of commanding appearance, wearing a turban and a rich robe. Her white cloak is spattered with blood, and she holds a blood-stained scimitar in one hand. At her feet lie torn scrolls, parts of a broken pair of scales, broken tablets of the Decalogue, and a fragment of an obelisk. On her shoulder sits a toad. Her spotted white robe represents purity corrupted by injustice. Her turban and robe suggest the barbarous lands where injustice is common. The curving scimitar symbolizes twisted justice, while the broken scales, tablets, and scrolls represent broken faith in justice. The toad is a symbol for greed, upon which much injustice is founded.\(^50\)

And the next one:

A deformed woman dressed in white sprinkled with blood, with a turban on her head, in the fashion of the Barbarians. She holds in her left hand a big golden cup, towards which she keeps her eyes turned, in her right [hand] she holds a scimitar, and on the floor are the broken scales. She is depicted deformed, because injustice, where the universal troubles of people, and the civil wars often derive, is considered very ugly. The scimitar signifies distorted justice; and the Barbarian clothing cruelty, the blood stained white shirt signifies the corrupted purity of justice. And to this corruption belongs also the golden cup, having his eyes, that is his will and his thoughts, the unjust Judge turns towards avarice, to the charm of gold only. Because he can not hold at the same time the scales, and the reason, they fall, where they come to be trampled upon as if they are things of minor value.\(^51\)

Although Injustice is represented by a female figure, the contemporaries of Ripa would have had little difficulty in assuming the real identity of this figure to be an Ottoman sultan in disguise, even though the engraver has omitted the turban and substituted a European sword for a scimitar. Sandys's direct adoption of this emblem is observable in the broken scales and books thrown on the ground under Ahmed's feet. Another subtle influence is discernible in Ahmed's garment. Since it is an important aspect of the symbolism in Ripa's emblem, as the epigram would suggest, it is fair to assume that it also received attention in Sandys's depiction. Unlike Ripa, Sandys makes
Fig. 19. Emblem of Injustice from the English translation of Ripa’s *Iconologia or Moral Emblems*, 1709. (Photo: courtesy of the Syndics of the Cambridge University Library)

no reference to blood stains, but instead ingeniously sprinkles the dress with small dark spots, thereby giving at once the illusion of a traditional Turkish costume and the “purity corrupted by injustice” referred to in the first epigram. By the same token, the 1633 English translation (published in 1709) of the emblem of Injustice makes no reference to bloodstains, but to “a white garment full of spots,” which according to the author, “denotes Injustice.” This may have been the result of Sandys’s modifications of Ripa’s emblem.

The English version not only eliminates the reference to blood but also transforms the female figure of Injustice into a male figure (fig. 19). He stands in front of what seems to be a classical temple with two of its columns visible, against a view of open country. The male figure of Injustice wears a turban and holds a Turkish sword, identified by its slight curve, corresponding to the epigram rather than to the illustration. Although Ripa gives particular iconographic importance to the bent sword—namely “distorted justice”—in his illustration, the figure holds an ordinary sword with a straight blade (compare fig. 18 and fig. 19). Appearing only in the English edition, the significance of the change from female to male figure and from a straight to bent blade points to European attempts to establish a more concrete defining characteristic of Ottoman sultans as initiated by Sandys’s image. The accompanying epigram mentions nothing of the turban or the bent sword, leaving the image to speak for itself:

A Man in a white Garment full of Spots; a Sword in one Hand, and a Goblet in the other; the Tables of the Law all broken to pieces, on the Ground; blind of the right Eye, and tramples on the Balance. His Garment denotes Injustice to be the Corruption and Stain of the Mind. The Laws broken, the Non-observance of them, being despis’d by Malefactors; and the due weighing of Matters neglected, intimated by the Balance. The blind Eye shews that he sees only with the left; that is his own interest.

Sandys’s frontispiece replaces a female personification with a portrait of Ahmed using two devices—word and image: *tyrannus* and all the visual attributes of injustice. The intention is clearly to draw on the already existing modes that the readers would use to characterize the Ottomans and to modify these stock notions in order to suit the contemporary context and the rapidly changing relations between Europe and the Ottoman Empire. In the frontispiece and as well as in his book, it seems that Sandys’s mission was to place Ahmed and James I, or for that matter other rulers in Europe, on opposite sides of the political spectrum.

Labeling Ahmed a tyrant gave Sandys the opportunity to rescue the reputation of James I as a tyrannical king by highlighting the attributes of a tyrant, notably belligerence and inevitable downfall. Erasmus, in the *Education of the Christian Prince*, advises the prince not to wage war unless it is impossible to avoid, for he claims that wars are barbaric and therefore the greatest threat to humanity. Over a century later, in the same tradition of advice to princes, the anonymous author of *A Briefe Discourse upon Tyrants and Tyranny* also denounces wars and identifies them as a tyrannical practice:

So then Tyranny cannot agree with the joyful tidings of the Gospel, which desires the unity of spirit in the bond of peace. Now where Law, Religion, and the Love of People are, it makes a threefold cord, not easily broken, which draws on plenty, peace, and prosperity. And
James I's well-known maxim "peace at home and peace abroad" immediately sets him on the opposite side of a tyrant.\textsuperscript{56}

The importance of the motto, \textit{Tyrrannus}, lies also in its contribution to the allegory of constancy.\textsuperscript{57} For the seventeenth-century audience, the notion of tyranny involved the inevitable destruction and ruin of empires, as is evident from the same anonymous author:

Tyrrannie is most commonly taken for the irregularity of him that governs in chiefe, who only rules according to will; for in subordinate instruments it is called oppression: And under this title it caused the ruine of the first world, as it doth now of all corporations where it is suffered too much to abound.\textsuperscript{58}

This allegory was well recognized and captured in Sandys's rendering of the success of the Ottoman Empire as a self-consuming process:

And surely it is to be hoped that their greatness is not only at the height, but near an extreme precipitation: the body being grown too monstrous for the head; the Sultan's unwarlikee and never accompanying their armes in person; the Soldier corrupted with ease and liberty; drowned in prohibited wine, enfeebled with the continuall converse of women; and generally lapsed from their former austerity of life, and simplicity of manners. Their valours now meeting on all sides with opposition; having of late given no increase to their dominions; and Empire so got, when it ceasseth to increase, doth begin to diminish. Lastly, in that it hath exceeded the observed period of a Tyrannie, for such is their Empire.\textsuperscript{59}

Sandys's pairing of Ahmed with the long forgotten mythological figure of the pagan goddess Isis adds to this metaphorical inhuman characterization of Ahmed and his empire. Adorned with her attributes of \textit{sistrum} and \textit{hydreion}, Isis is depicted as a young woman.\textsuperscript{60} Yet her humanity is as illusory as Ahmed's; the protruding horns, slightly disguised by her crown of olive leaves, demonize her as much as the label \textit{tyrannus} denies Ahmed both humanity and legitimacy. The horns also assimilate Isis with Osirus, who is appropriately placed just below her in the image of a bull whose ambiguous identity—man or animal, brother or husband—serves to enhance one of the many subtle aspects of the frontispiece. This juxtaposition might be meant to emphasize the pagan origins of Islam to which Sandys pays so much attention in his discussion of Turkish religion and the life of the Prophet Muhammad in the \textit{Relation of a Journey}: "Their Morall and Ecclesiasticall lawes, the Turkes do receive from \textit{Mahomet}, the Saracen law-giver: a man of obscure parentage, born in a yeere 551. His father a Pagan, his mother a Jew both by birth and religion."\textsuperscript{61} The presence of Isis might also be read as a reference to religions that are long past or condemned to be surpassed by the revealing truth of Christianity, as well as a celebration of the purity of ancient civilizations, highlighting the contrast between her and Ahmed.

For Sandys, whose ultimate goal was to diminish the legitimacy of the Ottoman Empire, the impurities of Muhammad's background could only have represented tyranny. He claimed that Turkish civilization, culture, and religion is a conglomeration of different languages and civilizations that lacked the coherence of an ancient civilization. He wrote:

The \textit{Turkish} tongue is lofty in sound, but poore of itself in substance: for being originally the \textit{Tartarian}, who were needy ignorant pastors, they were constrained to borrow their termes of State, and office from the \textit{Persian}, (upon whose ruins they erected their greatness) of Religion (being formerly Pagans) from the \textit{Arabians}; as they did of maritime names (together with the skill) from the \textit{Greeks} and \textit{Italians}.\textsuperscript{62}

If we look carefully, we can see that the immediacy of Ahmed and Isis is ultimately denied, as they seem to be blind to each other's presence. The prevailing capacity of emblematic images for the most part remains opaque. But what is discernible is that Sandys attempts to reformulate a notion of "the other" by drawing clear lines of demarcation between the three religions: Christianity, Islam, and paganism.\textsuperscript{63} One cannot overestimate the religious overtones of this frontispiece. In contrast to the long-gone paganism and soon to be diminished Islam, Sandys hails Christianity as the religion that will prevail. The inscription, \textit{Magnae estis et praecalebitis} ("You will be great and you will prevail") on the architrave, together with the ascending figure of Jesus Christ, along with a motto, \textit{Sic redibit} ("Thus he will return"),\textsuperscript{64} conveys the most obvious message of the frontispiece that one day Christianity will return to the Holy Land.

By dedicating the \textit{Relation of a Journey} to Prince Charles, the heir to the throne, and not to James I, Sandys not only affirms his support of the Stuarts but also conjures up a vision of dynastic continuity from father to son, without the threat of usurpation char-
characteristic of tyranny. Sandys predicts the success of the reign of Charles I and sanctions it by showing Sibylla Cumae (the Cumaean Sybil), sitting inside a cave with her prophecies communicated through the inscription, *Folisque notas et nomina mandata* ("She commits notes and names on the leaves of her book"). His confidence in this continuity and in the union of the crowns is staged like an entablature by the presence of the pillars of Christian doctrines personified by figures of *Veritas* (Truth) i.e., Christianity, and *Constantia* (Constancy), i.e., Eternity, lest we forget that no tyrannies are eternal.

Why was Ahmed singled out as the object of this shift in the European perceptions of the Ottoman sultans? According to Valensi, Ahmed, "who was a poet and a pious man," fell victim to political disorder in Europe, at the time when the rhetoric of tyranny was part of the discourse of politics. To suppose that Ahmed had no role in this shift, however, would be wrong. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, the European and Ottoman struggle to redefine their relationship entailed a subtle manipulation of political, social, and aesthetic modes on both sides.

Ahmed's great grandfather Süleyman the Magnificent was the last of the sultans to have the power to control European perceptions of his empire—the next two sultans lacked his sophistication—until Ahmed decided to take control of these perceptions by following in his footsteps. Not surprisingly, it was during his reign and for this reason that there was a visual and verbal shift in the European perception of the Ottoman Empire.

Growing up in a court still resonating with the landscape of court administrators. In this struggle for control, Ahmed's debt to his great-grandfather Süleyman is evident in both his public and private deeds. According to Thomas Arthus, who had brought Chalkokondyles's history up to date, Ahmed promised his people an empire more flourishing than ever before by "imitating the virtues of his predecessor Süleyman" ("Qu'il [Ahmed] a donné au commencement une grande espérance aux siens de voir leur Empire plus florissant que jamais, et qu'il serait imitateur des vertus de son ayeul Soly-
man, qu’à son avènement à l’Empire il fit plusieurs
dons, et congiaires à la milice pour luy gaigner le
coeur de plus en plus72).

Four years later another author in a letter from
Istanbul to a Jesuit brother remarked on Ahmed’s
desire to become the next Suleyman the Magnificent.73
In his history of the Ottoman dynasty, Bostanzade
Yahya Efendi, the accomplished theologian and his-
torian, also described Ahmed as having, like Suley-
man, a high position in the heavens with the features
of an angel and the nature of a dervish.74 This con-
nection between Ahmed and Suleyman has never been
made before, but it was significant for Ahmed’s es-
tablishment of his own political legitimacy in order
to gain the confidence of his court.

To mark the beginning of his reign, Ahmed paid
homage to Suleyman by going to the Suleymaniye
Mosque for Friday prayer rather than following the
tradition of visiting Hagia Sophia.75 Determined to
follow in Suleyman’s footsteps, Ahmed composed his
own law code, or Kanunname. In doing so he not only
recalled one of the most important deeds of Suley-
man (it earned him the title Lawgiver [Kanunisi]), but
he also revived some of the lapsed practices of the
empire that Suleyman had initiated. In contrast to
Sandys’s image of a tyrant, Ahmed was remembered
as one who “révisa et codifia la législation antérieure
dans un kanunname qui subsiste encore.”76 A nine-
teenth-century French historian called Ahmed’s Kanunname
“as monumental as his mosque,” which had also been
inspired by the mosque of Suleyman.77

Political circumstances also helped Ahmed’s quest
for public attention as the second Suleyman the
Magnificent. The crowning of Stephen Bocskai, the
prince of Transylvania as the king of Hungary and
Transylvania78 with an impressive golden crown dec-
inated with rubies, emeralds, turquoises and pearls,
sent from Istanbul (fig. 20), gave Ahmed the oppor-
tunity to adopt Suleyman’s well-known appellation “the
distributor of crowns,” thus recalling the memories
of Suleyman’s conquest of the regions and his crown-
ing of a Christian king, John Zapolya, with the holy
crown of Saint Stephen.79 Even Ahmed’s grand vi-
zier, Lala Mehmed Pasha, was compared to Suleyman’s
vizier Ibrahim Pasha, when he overcame “most of the
troubles with Bocskay and managed to sign the Zsit-
va-T6rok treaty in 1606” which concluded the “Long
War” between the Habsburgs and Ottomans.80 Accord-
ing to Pecevi, Lala Mehmed Pasha made a point of
following the same strategies used by Suleyman to
convince Bocskai to accept his title from Sultan Ahmed
and to make peace with the Hapsburg emperor. In
retrospect, Ahmed’s act may not have carried the same
political weight as Suleyman’s, but symbolically it must
have boosted his confidence. The treaty ended the
fluctuation of the Ottoman Empire’s western borders
for half a century and fueled the hostilities between
the European kings and princes to the advantage of
the Ottomans.

Another major military event which helped Ahmed
to present himself triumphantly in the manner of
Suleyman was the suppression of the “uprising of
provincial administrators and the irregular soldiers”
known as the Celali revolts of 1609 in Anatolia, one
of the most important domestic crises he had to face.81
Ahmed used this victory over the rebels as an excuse
to build a new royal mosque bearing his name. The
announcement caused extreme discontent among the
conservative ulema, because Ahmed had never been
to war and had no intention of doing so. According
to Ottoman tradition, the erection of public works
on such a scale was only legitimate for rulers who had gained victory over the infidels or conquered new territories. Perhaps Ahmed considered this victory over the rebels as a legitimate excuse, though the question of whether it was legitimate or not may not have been the real issue for a sultan whose eagerness to emulate Süleyman was part of a grand scheme of re-creating Süleyman’s “golden age,” in which the commission of works of art and architecture was paramount. Through his emulation of Süleyman, Ahmed had rediscovered that image was just as important as the deed itself. He spared no expense, labor, or time in its construction, and it is still today considered to be one of the most magnificent mosques in Istanbul. A contemporary observer describes it as follows:

The most beautiful of all the mosques that the Ottoman Princes have had built is the one of Sultan Achmat, the eighteenth emperor of the Turks: it is ordinarily called the new Mosque: but lawyers [the ulema] call it the unbeliever’s mosque, because, notwithstanding what they could mean to Sultan Achmat, he insisted on building it. It is expressly forbidden by their law to found neither a mosque nor a hospital, if it is not out of a wealth that one has legitimately acquired. For they say that God may not be pleased that one offers something to him that one doesn’t own. They hold that wealth is legitimately acquired when it comes by succession: and even more so when one earns it by serving the prince against infidels to the law. But for the Ottoman princes, before being able to perform any foundation, they must have conquered some land over the infidels and they must have personally assisted in these conquests. This is why the mufti and all the lawyers [ulema] tried so hard to convince him not to build this mosque because he had never been to war.82

In stylistic terms, Ahmed’s mosque was in many respects a tribute to the artistic canons established by Süleyman and his architect Sinan (fig. 21).83 The plan was drawn up by Mehmed Aga, one of Sinan’s apprentices, who devoted a great deal of attention to dramatic effects.84 Several historians have noted that its overall design lends itself to a series of analogies with the mosques of Süleymaniye (1550–57) and Sehzade (1543–48), both of which were built by Sinan for Süleyman.85 While the interior of Ahmed’s mosque echoes that of the Sehzade in its form and the richness of its decoration, its austere exterior establishes a direct dialogue with the Süleymaniye. Stylistically situated somewhere between the two, the iconography of Ahmed’s mosque was part of the program for recovery of the golden age and the statement of Ahmed’s superiority as the reigning sultan. This capacity to embody both programs might also explain the significance of its location near the Hippodrome: punctuating the point where the axis radiating from the earthly paradise, the Topkapi Palace, on the north side meets the heavenly temple of Solomon, the Süleymaniye, on the west.86 A poem called the Baha-riyye also emphasizes the association between the sultans and their mosques and describes it as the icon of Ahmed’s achievement: “That holy place proclaims all the sultans / Is it any wonder that it is the commander of the army of mosques”87

Ahmed’s emulation of Süleyman eventually reached such proportions that it could be found in every aspect of his life. He built gardens in the place where Süleyman had once owned his.88 Imitating his great-grandfather’s piety, he ordered restoration work at the Ka’ba; he redesigned his imperial seal according to the norms established by Süleyman by reintroducing the word shah,89 he even tried to revive the literary corpus Süleyman initiated by ordering a new edition and translation of the works commissioned by him.90

Respect for Süleyman could certainly be observed in earlier generations of sultans, but, as Kafadar points out, Süleyman was “not always the favourite.”91 Before Ahmed, Selim II, Murad III, and Mehmed III also revered Süleyman, but none seems to have singled him out as a role model in their cultural, political, or military achievements. During Ahmed’s reign, on the other hand, we see both in Ottoman and foreign sources a more exclusive reverence, not only for the reign of Süleyman but also for Süleyman himself. Individual works such as the Selimiye Mosque in Edirne, commissioned by Selim II, and the scientific-technical achievements during the reign of Murad III, may be more worthy of comparison with some of Süleyman’s accomplishments, but the systematic adherence to examples set by Süleyman seemed to reach its peak during Ahmed’s reign. Ahmed’s emulation of Süleyman, unlike that of his predecessors, has more to do with his struggle for identity than with a straightforward reverence. As a result, Ahmed’s vision of success and the modes of representation appropriate for reconciling his vision with the contemporary context largely depended on producing a complicated interplay between the memories of Süleyman’s cultural innovations and his own desire to surpass him.
This struggle for identity must have made more of an impact on the Europeans than on the Ottomans, who were somewhat critical of his disruptive cultural activities, especially the construction of his mosque. European nations, some of whose borders were determined by Süleyman's conquests, even after the victory at Lepanto must have been particularly receptive to Ahmed's pretensions as the new Süleyman. It is tempting to consider the two early-seventeenth-century German engravings of the equestrian Ottoman sultan identified as "Sultan Achmet Chan Turcarum Tyrannus," as a subtle response to Ahmed's pretensions (fig. 22). Although the inscription identifies the sultan as Ahmed, the upper part of the image belongs to an earlier profile portrait of Süleyman wearing the Venetian helmet-crown (see fig. 5) discussed by Necipoğlu, who suggests that the caption is a misidentification of the sultan, but the number of contemporary European descriptions of Ahmed's ceremonial parade through Istanbul suggest that the engraving might have been intended to portray him, rather than Süleyman.

For example, the French visitor Canillac was impressed by the amount of attention given to decorating his horse with jewel-encrusted trappings for one of these occasions:

"... upon the Saddle of an Arabian Horse out of the Grand Vizirs stable; Others fasten a Bitt of Gold to Reines of rich red Leather of Russia; some doe fit stirrop Leathers to stirrops of Gold, enricht with a Great number of Turksches of the olde Rocke: Others fasten upon a large Crouper a great number of the Diamonds wherewith it is enricht make it inestimable: The Bitt and stirropes of Gold covered with Diamonds, the Tassels of Pearles which are at the Reines, and at the Trappers of the Crouper, and the other beauties of this royall Harnesse, ravish the eyes of such as looke of it with admiration of their wonders, and some silently persuade themselves that Fortune adorned with these precious things which depend on her, meanes to goe in triumph through Constantinople, to let the Turkes see that she dwels amongst them."

A passage in *L'histoire de la decadence de l'empire grec*,
also gives a brief description of a ceremonial procession that the sultan led from the gate of the Topkapi to the Hippodrome. It devotes particular attention to the jewelry worn by both the sultan and his horse: "And then comes the king, riding his horse which is royally reined, the king is ordinarily dressed in white wearing three black and white aigrettes in his turban, one or two looking sideways, shining with pearls and stones as the rest of his horses reins." An equestrian portrait of Ahmed in the frontispiece of the same book matching this description might well have been the model for the later engravings (see fig. 8).

The portrait thus involves more than a simple confusion of identities; it is possibly a deliberate cross-reference contributing to European visual propaganda undermining Ottoman power, much like Sandys's frontispiece. The verse accompanying the engraving of the equestrian sultan declares, "Make a show with robbed crowns, you cursed World Tyrant," which serves as a metaphorical reference to Ahmed's pretensions as Süleyman and as a direct reference to Süleyman's usurpation of a papal crown. Having accused the sultan of being a "world tyrant," it also mocks the once magnificent emperor Süleyman, so as to deprive the empire of any legitimacy past or present. Images like this one and Sandys's portrayal of Ahmed as Tyrannus seem to be geared not only to undermine Ahmed as a ruler but also to proclaim his empire as illegitimate and past its prime.

The complexity of thought that lies behind not only the frontispiece to Sandys's Relation of a Journey but also the differing European and Ottoman discourses about the self and the other can be seen in several contrasting attitudes—Europeans vs. Europeans; Europeans vs. Ottomans; past vs. present. Within these contexts, I have argued that Sandys's frontispiece should be seen as an allegorical and emblematic display of his nationalistic tendencies. Even though the Relation of a Journey was an important means of establishing Sandys's own identity, as a poet/traveler, among his contemporaries, a travel account—one which embodies the "other" as much as the "self"—should be considered more than a mere staging of a public persona. In other words, since the book and its frontispiece deal with the Ottomans collectively, the counterpart is not Sandys as an individual but the idea of his nation as a whole. In effect, the process of forging a national identity is not unlike the process of forging an individual identity. In either case, as Stephen Greenblatt has argued, "the power to impose a shape upon oneself [or the "other" for that matter] is an aspect of the more general power to control identity." Sandys's frontispiece was instrumental in contributing to the incipient processes of European self-fashioning at the time—at the expense of Ottoman alienation from the European political discourse. In Sandys's case the possibility of achieving this was clearly built into the increasingly hierarchical distinction between Europe and the Ottoman Empire.

The study of the frontispiece also provides a window onto some of the important aspects of Ottoman changing self-perceptions in the early seventeenth century. The dynamics between past and present Ottoman sultans and its contribution to the question of the "golden age" in Ottoman historiography is a
subject which has hitherto been neglected. As Kafadar has pointed out, the Ottoman "golden age," like any other, never really existed in the ways in which its proponents envisaged it. But for the Ottoman sultan Ahmed I not only the consideration of the reign of Suleyman as the age of glory and order but also the emulation of Suleyman himself helped him to create a language of political power that was necessary for the legitimacy of his kingship and the control of his empire, however it might have been perceived from the outside.
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3. Just to add that the link between Knolles and Boissard is also significant. Knolles had not only owned a copy and made extensive use of it in his book, he even had copied the battle scene from its frontispiece.
5. Ibid., pp. 92-93.
6. "The word tyranny continued to be used occasionally in discussions of the Ottoman system, though mostly referring to the 'abuses of the system rather than the system itself,' until the word 'despot' entered into the Italian, French, and finally English lexicon in the 1640s," ibid., pp. 72-77.
7. Ibid., p. 90.
9. None of Sandys's contemporaries who can be compared with him as travelers to the East—Thomas Coryat (1611); Sir Anthony Sherley (1611); William Lithgow (1632), and Sir Henry Blount (1636)—use allegorical or emblematic frontispieces. Sandys's interest in emblematic images becomes more apparent in his subsequent book, Ovid's Metamorphosis Enlighed, Mythologised and Represented in Figures (London, 1632), where the allegorical frontispiece was also accompanied by an explanatory poem entitled "The Minde of the Frontispiece, and Argument of this Worke" on the page facing the frontispiece.
10. "Even more important is his [Sandys'] role in laying colonial foundations, for he was director of industry, collector of revenue, chief advisor to the governor, model farmer, and military raider in a crucial period in Virginian and English colonial history" (Richard Beale Davis, George Sandys: Post-Adventurer. A Study in Anglo-American Culture in the Seventeenth Century (London, 1955), p. 16.
11. Ibid., p. 284.
13. Throughout James's reign and even after his death, the terrors of union were invoked to give him "an aura of divinity" as exemplified in the ceiling decoration of the Banqueting House in Whitehall known as the Apotheosis of James. The sacred symbolism of the elaborate decoration by Rubens was based on the allegory of Unity, conflating images of the divine revelation with the hopes of English supremacy over Christendom. Stephen Orgel, ed., The Renaissance Imagination. Essays and Lectures by D.J. Gordon (Berkeley, 1975), p. 168.
15. Anonymous, Pianto, e lamento de Selim Drian Imperado de Turchi: Nella rotta, & de struttion della so Armada Con un'Esor- tation fatta a Occhiali (Venice, 1571).
16. I am grateful to Professor Necipoğlu for allowing me to see the unpubished catalogue entry, "Selim II (r. 1586-74)," for the "Ottoman Portraits" project, p. 19.
17. I am greatful to Professor Necipoğlu for bringing this image to my attention.
18. Laonikos Chalkokondyles, L'histoire de la decadence de l'empire greck, et establissement de celuy des Turcs, par Chalcondile, grec, et establissement de celuy des Turcs, par Chalcondile, trans. B. de Vigenere (Paris, 1612-20). I am grateful to Gîlû Necipoğlu for bringing this frontispiece to my attention. The book contains a portrait of each of the sultans at the beginning of the section dealing with his reign.
19. Memories of the victory at Lepanto were frequently invoked in the designs of early-seventeenth-century frontispieces. See, for example, the frontispiece to Boissardo's Vitae et Icones Sultanorum Turcicorum (1596), which includes a scene from the battle. Nine years later, in 1603, Richard Knolles, in Generall Historie of the Turks, reuses the exact same image, although this time with a different perception of the outcome of the battle.
20. There are many aspects of this frontispiece which need to be addressed but are beyond the scope of this paper.
21. L. Batavorum, ed., Gislenis Busbepuiu amnisa quae extant. Cum Privilegio, 7th ed. (Frankfurt, 1638). The earlier editions of Busbecq's letters had different frontispieces, decorated with printers' devices. It seems that there was a conscious effort for expression in the early-seventeenth-century frontispieces.
22. For detailed discussions of Ottoman imperial symbols, see...


24. George Sandys, A Relation of a Journey Begun An. Dom. 1610..., containing a Description of the Turkish Empire, of Egypt, of the Holy Land, of the Remote Parts of Italy, and Islands adjoyning, 1st ed. (London, 1610), pp. 75.

25. There is a parallel between Sandys’s description of Ahmed and the earlier European accounts of his grandfather Selim II, which might have been known to Sandys. But whereas Selim’s characterization was based on factual evidence, Sandys’s characterization of Ahmed seems to have been purely rhetorical.


29. Johannes Sambucus, Emblemata cum aliquot nummis antiqui operis (Antwerp, 1564).

30. Ibid. The emblem reads in English: “Who holds the royal sceptre alone as a tyrant, you have to obey whatever his misguided greed commands. Failing to do so, he will force the issue and raising his right hand threateningly, he de- stroys the disobedient by cruel murder. Just as the lion roars and digs his claws into the prey, so your hands, cruel ruler, are stained with blood. Just as the insatiable catfish takes everything that is in his way, so little mildness is in the mind of terrible kings. He suppresses and conquers everything with his gesture, he reaches for the stars and turns happiness into groans. Whatever takes his fancy is allowed: his will is his law. When I am the judge, the pale orcus shall consume his pestilence." I owe this translation to Kenneth Lapatin.


33. Ripa, Iconologia, p. 487.

34. Sandys, Relation of a Journey, p. 57.

35. Emblems were normally depicted as males or females ac- cording to the gender of the main word in the motto. The word tyrant in Italian is feminine and therefore here de- picted as a female.


37. Sandys, Relation of a Journey, p. 47.


39. Eastern or Ottoman-looking figures have appeared in the design of certain emblems. Some of the particular details that symbolized the Ottomans were turbans, crescents, and a cityscape with crescent-crowned buildings. Some of these emblems can be found in Arthur Henkel and Albrecht Schöne, eds., Emblemata: Handbuch zur Sinnbildkunst des XVI. und XVII. Jahrhunderts (Stuttgart, 1967).

40. Ibid., pp. 1504–5. Original is in Sambucus, Emblemata, p. 200. I am grateful to Kenneth Lapatin for this translation.


43. Peter Daly, ed., The Index of Emblem Art Symposium (New York, 1990), pp. 144–45.


46. For images of Queen Elizabeth, see Roy C. Strong, Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I (Oxford, 1963); see also the exhibition catalogue, The Print in Stuart Britain, 1603–1689, 8 May–20 September 1998 (London: British Museum Press, 1998), by Antony Griffiths. By the middle of the seventeenth century most eastern rulers, including the Ottomans, experimented with the symbolism of the globe. Mughal images of Shah Jahan holding a globe or standing on a globe are well known examples, but Sandys’s image predates all of these.

47. We could recall the iconographic significance of Süleyman’s possession of a papal crown in the 1530’s as discussed by Nechoğlu in “Süleyman the Magnificent and the Represen- tation of Power.”


50. Ibid., p. 230. I am grateful to Marina Belozerskaya for this translation.

51. Ibid., pp. 231–32. I am grateful to Marina Belozerskaya for this translation.

52. Cesare Ripa, Iconologia, or Moral Emblems (London, 1709), pp. 41–42.

53. Ibid.
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