Christine Isom-Verhaaren received her Ph.D in 1997 in Ottoman history from the University of Chicago where she was a student of Halil Inalcik. She has been teaching Middle East history at Benedictine University in Lisle, Illinois since 2001. She is the author of “Royal French Women in the Ottoman Sultans’ Harem: The Political Uses of Fabricated Accounts from the Sixteenth to the Twenty-first Centuries,” *Journal of World History* (2006): 159–96 and “Süleyman and Mihrimah: The Favorite’s Daughter,” *Journal of Persianate Studies* (special issue on fathers and daughters in Islam) (2011).
ALLIES WITH THE INFIDEL

The Ottoman and French Alliance in the Sixteenth Century

CHRISTINE ISOM-VERHAAREN

I.B. TAURIS
LONDON • NEW YORK
For Bruce, Catharine, Christopher, and Nathaniel
# CONTENTS

*List of Illustrations*  
ix

*Acknowledgements*  
xi

*Note on Transliteration, Pronunciation and Names*  
xiv

1. Introduction: Webs of Diplomacy and Historiographical Images  
1

2. Ottoman Involvement in European Alliances, Diplomacy and the Balance of Power, 1453–1600  
23

3. Multiple Identities: Foreign State Servants in France and the Ottoman Empire  
49

4. Sultan Cem: A Fifteenth-Century Ottoman View of Relations with the Infidels  
82

5. Allies with the Infidel: Joint Ottoman-French Naval Operations  
114

6. Views of Infidel Allies: Records of Negotiating, Fighting and Traveling  
141

Conclusion  
180

*Appendix A*  
186

*Appendix B*  
190
ILLUSTRATIONS

Tables

1.1 Diplomatic Alignments 32
5.1 Individuals Mentioned in Accounts of the Ottoman and French Naval Expedition, 1543–44: Ottomans 150
5.2 Individuals Mentioned in Accounts of the Ottoman and French Naval Expedition, 1543–44: French and their Supporters 152
5.3 Individuals Mentioned in Accounts of the Ottoman and French Naval Expedition, 1543–44: Habsburgs and their Supporters 153
5.4 French Travelers in the Ottoman Empire and their Accounts of their Travels 168

Map

The Mediterranean in the Sixteenth Century xiii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A project that has taken as long as this one to bring to completion necessarily leads to expressing gratitude to many individuals who have helped me in various ways in this process.

First, I thank the members of my dissertation committee at the University of Chicago who each provided crucial direction in completing the original dissertation: Halil Inalcik, Cornell Fleischer, John Woods, and Colin Lucas. I am also grateful to the staff at Regenstein Library for obtaining copies of manuscripts that I needed for my research.

I also thank the staffs at the archives and libraries in Istanbul that I used extensively: Başbakanlık Archives, Topkapı Sarayı Museum Archives and Library, Archaeology Museum Library, and the Süleymaniye Library.

I acknowledge assistance provided in a variety of ways by my colleagues at Benedictine University: Fannie Rushing, Vince Gaddis, Rita George-Tvrtkovic, and Beth Vinkler.

I would like to thank the editors I have worked with at I.B.Taurus, Jenna Steventon and Lester Crook.

The greatest debt I owe in terms of help in revising the manuscript at various times is to Linda Darling, whose willingness to be a mentor is truly remarkable.

Finally, I have benefitted from the support of my family, both from my siblings, but more especially from my husband, Bruce, and my children, Catharine, Christopher, and Nathaniel. Bruce provided the reason, archaeological excavation, for my first trip to Turkey, which led me to explore an interest in the Ottoman Empire. Most recently, he
helped me produce the map for this book. Catharine accompanied me on a research trip to Turkey 1992–93, during which we shared many experiences. In 2010, she used her professional expertise as an editor to copyedit the manuscript. Christopher and Nathaniel have provided less tangible assistance, but to all my family I express gratitude for love and support.
NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION, PRONUNCIATION AND NAMES

In this book, Ottoman Turkish words have been transliterated according to modern Turkish orthography for the most part. Words such as sultan, pasha, and vizier are rendered as they commonly appear in English.

Since modern Turkish uses a modified Latin script, I include a list of characters that are different from those in English.

C, c = j as in jump
Ç, ç = ch as in church (Note that this is different from the French usage of ç which produces an “s” sound. In French words ç has its usual French pronunciation.)
Ğ, ğ = soft g. This is usually pronounced as a lengthening of the preceding vowel.
İ, ı = unrounded back vowel, as in “bird”
İ, į = as in “bit”
Ö, ö = as in French peu
Ş, ş = sh as in “shoe”
Ü, ü = as in French “tu”

Ottoman names cause great difficulty. The order of elements in names is fluid. The spelling is variable. I have identified individuals as their names most commonly appear in English language publications.
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INTRODUCTION:
WEBS OF DIPLOMACY AND
HISTORIOGRAPHICAL IMAGES

I believe that I have clearly shown and confirmed by reasonable and accurate arguments two main points: first, that the king [François I] has accepted the forces that were sent to him by the Ottoman Sultan [Süleyman] without harm to his title and honor of 'Most Christian;' second, that this aid was more helpful than harmful to Christendom. And I will add a third...: which is that the king did this not because of an ambition to dominate, not to avenge injuries he has received... not to justly recover that which has been usurped from him, but merely he has retained this succor for defense. I mean, Illustrious Lords [of Venice], to defend his kingdom, which the Emperor [Charles V] always has tried to ruin by means of violent overtures,... with treason, against all reason and justice.

Jean de Monluc's speech to the Venetians in 1544 as reported by his brother Blaise de Monluc in his Commentaires.¹

When passion reigns, respect for the divine and the human is lost; the passion that took hold of Francisco [François I] was so powerful that, even though he was a celebrated Christian prince, he sought the friendship of the Turk. He took up arms and brought them to bear against innocent Christians in order to avenge himself against his enemy [Charles V].
Notorious are the deeds that were done, for the costs were very dear, for he gave more to the Turks because of his stubbornness, than the worth of Milan, and even Naples. He joined with Barbarossa, a powerful pirate captain and enemy of the Christians, with a fleet and men loyal to the Great Turk [Süleyman], and gave him protection and welcomed him into his kingdom. And when he [François I] finally wanted to cast him out, he could not; he found himself so poor, dishonored, and cursed that the sorrowful Christian captives themselves had to do it. And then that same Turk, Barbarossa, stayed in the harbor, cutlass in hand, and mocked him.

Prudencio de Sandoval recounting events of 1543 in ‘Barbarossa comes to France with the Turkish fleet’ in his Historia del Emperador Carlos V, Rey de España.²

The Ottoman sultan, Süleyman known to his western European contemporaries as the Magnificent, formed an alliance with François I of France against Charles V, king of Spain and Holy Roman Emperor. Charles V and his supporters condemned François I’s diplomacy as exceeding the limits of accepted diplomatic practice by which a ruler could seek to find support against his enemies, by forming an alliance with a ruler who practiced a different religion. The Habsburg Charles V’s view of the alliance has dominated the western historiography of the ensuing events. At the time, however, the alliance generated a much wider spectrum of views regarding its appropriateness, but this diversity has disappeared from the historical record. This book offers an alternative view of relations between the Christian West and the Islamic East as it analyzes contemporary French and Ottoman participants’ and chroniclers’ perceptions of an alliance between Muslim Ottomans and Christian French in the sixteenth century. Moving beyond describing these perceptions, it proposes answers to why few of these views were incorporated into the western historiographical tradition, despite the existence of abundant sources produced by Ottoman and French participants. An understanding of the process by which certain views of an event become dominant is a critical element in writing and evaluating history. Thus, discovering the contemporary Ottoman and French
perception of their alliance, with the aim of tracing its impact on the historiographical record, has wider implications than describing one famous alliance in its sixteenth-century context. The Habsburgs and their supporters projected a view of alliances with ‘infidels’ that has dominated western historiography to the exclusion of both the Ottoman and the French perspectives. An example of the pervasiveness of the view of events originating in Habsburg sources is found in a biography of François I. The following quotation reflects the view found in sixteenth-century Habsburg sources, but not that found in sixteenth-century French ones.

The sight of Christians fighting Christians with the help of Infidels was shocking enough to many people at the time, but there was worse to come. ... Toulon consequently became a Turkish colony for eight months, ... The transformation of a Christian town into a Moslem one, complete with mosque and slave market, did not fail to amaze those who witnessed it.

He [François] also began to find the Turkish presence on French soil embarrassing, since it earned him universal opprobrium and many complaints from his Provencal subjects.3

Far from being embarrassing or destructive, the Ottoman presence in Provence was viewed as useful by both French and Ottomans; a view that was countered by Habsburg propaganda and that is still ignored by historians who accept this propaganda as an accurate portrayal of these events. This book redresses this imbalance by reconstructing the history of the alliance with its fifteenth-century background as well as by discussing its historiographical implications.

Historians who have analyzed historiography are as diverse in terms of subject and period as J. R. Walsh in the twentieth century reviewing Ottoman-Safavid relations of the sixteenth century and Henri Voisin de la Popelinière in the sixteenth century discussing ancient Greek and Roman historians, but they share an understanding of the bias that afflicts historians when writing about an earlier period. Awareness of the issue does not prevent historians from experiencing the influence of their own time when they write about past events. This becomes
evident in the following brief overview of the historiography of the Ottoman-French alliance.\textsuperscript{4}

The Ottoman-French alliance in the sixteenth century, in which a Christian king allied with a Muslim sultan against another Christian ruler, has been regarded as a sensational aberration from the norms of Renaissance Diplomacy. It is argued here that this perception is both Eurocentric and anachronistic, as it projects a nineteenth- or twentieth-century worldview onto the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. This alliance was neither an aberration, nor regarded as sensational in the sixteenth century by those who dealt in political realities rather than crusade rhetoric. The Ottomans were not outsiders but an integral part of the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century European Mediterranean world, despite their distinct political and cultural system. The Ottomans and the French viewed their allies from multiple perspectives, not solely as adherents of different religions, and their religious differences did not prevent them from pursuing joint military action against their mutual enemies.

The Ottomans and their contemporaries in Europe were joined through a ‘pattern of alliances’ that evolved from informal, ad hoc relations formed as mandated by events in the fifteenth century to a formal alliance between two powerful rulers of the sixteenth century, the Ottoman sultan Süleyman and François I of France.\textsuperscript{5} In the fifteenth century diplomatic initiatives were sporadic and frequently unreciprocated depending on the individual ruler and his priorities at the time. In the sixteenth century, Süleyman and François entered into a formal alliance. Although François wavered in his commitment to the agreement, he never abandoned it since he realized that his only effective means of combating the power of his rival Christian ruler, Charles V, was to request Ottoman assistance. From this somewhat tenuous beginning, whose roots lay both in French diplomacy with the Ottomans as well as in the diplomacy of Italian states of the fifteenth century with them, emerged the Ottoman-French alliance that endured through the seventeenth century and still continued with minor modifications into the eighteenth century. Despite these extensive earlier roots and the continual renewal of the alliance in later centuries, the alliance and the events in the sixteenth century
associated with it continue to be viewed as an aberration from normal diplomatic patterns.

Historiography, which is influenced by its time, in its turn has an impact on future historical writings. The bias that a given time and place imprints on the historical literature produced in that milieu is often accepted uncritically by later scholars because it has become part of the historiographical tradition. In Europe and America, the study of the Middle East became an academic discipline during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, a time of western imperial domination of the region. Therefore, the works that form the foundations of Middle Eastern studies reflect this imperialist heritage. Although at present some of these past assumptions appear obviously outdated, recent events such as September 11, 2001, and US wars in Afghanistan and Iraq have provided impetus to popular views of a 'clash of civilizations' as formulated most famously in the writings of Samuel P. Huntington. While scholars who specialize in the history of the Middle East are reexamining earlier assumptions, it is difficult to change a pervasive and entrenched tradition. Often scholars of neighboring regions who wish to examine the role of the Middle East in the history of their own areas of specialization continue to use the older historical literature uncritically. For example, a book on the 'idea of Europe' incorporates views of the Ottoman Empire found in an earlier study on the Ottomans that most specialists in the field today would consider obsolete.

This book on the Ottoman-French alliance of the sixteenth century differs from most studies of this episode in that it examines contemporary Ottoman and French sources, whose perspectives have been ignored. The neglect, even by French historians, of contemporary French sources in preference to the Habsburg perspective is connected to the weakening of Ottoman power, when, by the nineteenth century, it became difficult to acknowledge that the French had ever sought Ottoman aid in their struggle for power in Europe with their Habsburg rivals. In addition, historical writing in France during the seventeenth century was dominated by historians who favored polished prose over historical research, and it was not until the nineteenth century that the two traditions were combined in French historiography.
Portraying the Past: The Methodological Issues

The past becomes more difficult to portray accurately as it becomes increasingly different from the present, and various historical trends obscure our understanding of it. This book investigates some fifteenth- and sixteenth-century conjunctures, which differ markedly from those of the twentieth-first century. The methodological problem is how to discover and interpret sixteenth-century views of ‘the other.’ Historians have employed various methods for recovering the voices of individuals from the past and interpreting them in their own context.

Many historians have explored the many ways in which the present can misunderstand the past. While scholars such as Norbert Elias, Lucien Febvre, and Fernand Braudel have produced works that point out the dangers of assuming that past practices and beliefs were the same as those at present, John Francis Guilmartin in his study of Mediterranean warfare in the sixteenth century approaches the subject of this book more closely when he discusses anachronistic tendencies that prevent an understanding of a period in its own terms:

the traditional historiography of armed conflict at sea has been based upon a number of implicit assumptions which do not apply to the sixteenth-century Mediterranean. Almost without realizing it, modern historians of maritime affairs have used as their analytical framework the series of relationships which existed in the eighteenth century between maritime trade, naval forces, and the nations supporting them.

Traditional historiography has also assumed an anachronistic state of relations between the sixteenth-century states that engaged in diplomacy.

European views of the Islamic ‘other’ have varied over both time and place. Many studies of the impact of Orientalism on historiography, such as Edward Said’s Orientalism, emphasize the nineteenth and twentieth centuries neglecting the important transitional Early Modern period. Writings from this period about Muslims and Islamic
lands were less dominated than the writings of the medieval or modern periods by either medieval polemic against Islam or modern imperialism and colonialism. This study examines a crucial period in the history of relations between western Europeans and inhabitants of the Middle East that has been neglected.\textsuperscript{11}

Finally, some scholars have demonstrated that not only do views vary in relation to time and place, but also that at the same time and in the same place they may differ depending on the identity and social position of the individuals expressing them. Carlo Ginzburg demonstrates that the views of the lower classes are often unlike those of the contemporary elite and that historical events could influence the various layers of society differently.\textsuperscript{12} R. W. Southern's \textit{Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages} illustrates the danger of relying on the views of one group, who had a perspective particular to their role in society, to judge the opinions of an entire civilization concerning another one. The 'Western Views' discussed by Southern are solely those of churchmen, ignoring those of merchants and travelers whose first hand experiences often produced different perspectives on Islamic lands. Moreover, Southern's study only considered the genre of polemic, ignoring other religious writings such as the pilgrimage itinerary or commentaries on the Qu'ran.\textsuperscript{13}

Analyzing contemporary Ottoman and French sources demonstrates that sixteenth-century individuals held views different from those of twenty-first century individuals, but more importantly, this analysis reveals that the widely differing views held during the sixteenth century have been unevenly incorporated into the modern western historical literature. Understanding how events were perceived by various people in the past necessitates recovering the views of individuals whose perspectives do not reflect the dominant tradition today and then considering them in the context of the sixteenth century. While it is impossible to ever know what views were held by \textit{everyone} (evidence is generally available only for those who were literate), a range of opinions concerning allying with non-fellow believers is accessible. These views were not static but altered over time in relation to circumstances, demonstrating the complexity of the process of the formation of views of 'others.'\textsuperscript{14}
Views of the Ottomans and Ottoman Views

The most common image of the Ottomans in the early modern period, as presented in modern historical studies written by western scholars, is one of fearsome adversaries whose presence in Europe was terrifying, but whose impact aside from terror was marginal. This image is frequently encountered in western historical literature. Moreover some historians claim that this was the ‘common feeling of Europe.’ Other modern historians have described another image of the Ottomans current in the early modern period, but their work has had little impact on the historiographical tradition. Clarence Dana Rouillard in *The Turk in French History, Thought, and Literature (1520–1660)* evaluates the views of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century French travel writers.

The constant admiration in travel writings, not only of Turkish civil and military discipline but of fine moral qualities underlying it, could not fail to lead intelligent readers to some readjustment of values, especially when such admiration frequently evolved into sharp criticism of French or Christian institutions or practices. Even that last bulwark of complacency, the superiority of the Christian over the Infidel, was shaken by revelations of a superior zeal in prayer, reverence, fasting, and charity among the Turks.

Rouillard found that the views of these travelers generally had little impact on popular traditions of the ‘Cruel Turk’ and the ‘Amorous Turk’ in seventeenth-century French fiction, but in contrast they had a major impact on sixteenth-century authors of political theory such as Bodin and Montaigne. Rouillard’s study also has had minimal impact on Ottoman historiography. His comment, ‘We must not underestimate the tremendous force of inertia in the long-standing tradition that the Turks were evil and ignorant Barbarians and Infidels,...’ still applies. This study presents additional evidence that there was no ‘universal’ view in Europe of the Ottomans as an alien, terrible enemy, by showing a contrasting view of the Ottomans,
as they appear in contemporary French sources, that of a fascinating ally.

More crucially, contemporary Ottoman views of the French, which have hardly been surveyed yet, need examination more urgently to recover a larger range of views of the Ottoman-French alliance and then to understand the development of its historiography. Consequently, this book relies on contemporary Ottoman sources to reveal how Ottomans viewed the French, and their alliance with them. Once again, the opinion commonly accepted by modern western historians is that only one attitude existed, namely that the Ottomans perceived all Europeans as ‘despised infidels,’18 but this book argues that the Ottomans did not dismiss all Europeans as barbarian infidels. Ottoman opinions concerning a particular people, for example the Spanish subjects of Charles V, varied depending on the history of that groups’ relations with Muslims, the current diplomatic relations with the Ottomans, and the extent and nature of contact between them and the Empire.

By examining both French views of the Ottomans and Ottoman views of the French, this book shows that on both sides the image of ‘the other’ during this period was not based solely on religion.

The Ottoman-French encounter in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries culminated in an alliance between the Ottoman Empire and France, which was a crucial part of both Ottoman and French foreign policy against their mutual enemy, the Habsburgs. On the level of Ottoman and French diplomatic history, this study describes aspects of the alliance in detail and demonstrates the alliance’s importance for Ottoman and French foreign relations. Moreover, it shows that the Ottomans were accepted as diplomatic partners by the French and others, including the pope, as the need arose during the sixteenth century. Finally, this book explores how both the Ottomans and the French understood their own alliances with infidels.

The Ottoman Empire was one of the greatest powers of the sixteenth century, having a considerable impact on the emerging states of western Europe and influencing the unfolding of sixteenth-century European history. This is rarely reflected in the western historical literature on early modern Europe, where the Ottoman Empire is included as a marginal factor, if it is discussed at all.19 In contrast,
contemporary sources confirm that Ottoman power and interests were closely intertwined with the wars in Italy and the Valois-Habsburg rivalry.

The rivalry of the Ottoman, the Habsburg, and the Valois dynasties in Italy involved two related concepts, balance of power and universal monarchy. As Italy became the battleground and the prize for which the great powers of the time fought, any state that was threatened would turn to a greater power for protection. This policy led to the French invasion of Italy in 1494, which began the era of the Italian wars. When in the early sixteenth century Charles, the Habsburg heir, became the ruler of Castile, Aragon, Burgundy, Austria, and the Holy Roman Empire, with possessions in Italy and the Americas, he was accused by the kings of France of wanting to usurp the monarchy of Christendom. His chief rival in the west, François I, employed the usual policy of enlisting a more powerful ally when he sent an envoy to the Ottoman sultan. The threat of one power growing too great led to alliances between other states, in order to balance the threatening power or if possible to overcome it in any ensuing struggle. This is the political and diplomatic context for the views that will be analyzed. While this context is not the principal subject of this study, understanding the context, that the alliance conformed to diplomatic trends in Italy that had become standard practice, strengthens the argument supported by the evidence produced by sixteenth-century observers.

Analyzing western views of ‘the other’ during this period reveals that this was a transitional period between the religious polemic of the Middle Ages and the condescension of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, when the Ottoman Empire was described as ‘a pawn on the European chess-board.’ This era is distinct from both the preceding and the following periods, although it contains elements of each. Portraying the relationships that then existed between Christian states in Europe and the Ottoman Empire as solely those of conflict is overly simplistic; in reality there were many inter-European conflicts during which confrontations were between Christian states that were allied with the Ottomans. Alliances were fluid and changing; one year’s ally was often the next year’s enemy. Anti-Ottoman rhetoric should
not be confused with the pragmatism of diplomacy in the sixteenth century. In addition, many contemporary European portrayals of the Ottomans were positive. Scholars who claim that the political confrontation between predominantly Muslim and Christian powers during this period was central to the formation of a European identity do not incorporate this more complex picture. Nevertheless, this view of the construction of a European identity has shaped the discourse about ‘the other’ evident in the works of western historians.

Modern western historiography includes several works on historical relations between Muslims and Christians. Norman Daniel in *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image* studied Christian views of Islam in the period 1100–1350, confining his subject to religion and polemical religious texts. He claims that western Christians preferred an inaccurate image of Islam in this period, although they could have obtained a more accurate one, and then explores why this inaccurate image was created and preserved. When Daniel briefly discusses the image of Islam in the early modern period, he states: ‘Travelers always seem to show independent judgment most when they are speaking of actual encounters, and least when they discuss theory, dogma, or the life of Muhammad. They easily confused what they saw, what they were told, and what they had long ago read in books.’ He emphasizes the persistence of long standing traditions despite evidence to the contrary. A similar trend exists in modern western historiography on the Ottoman-French alliance, as Ottoman and French sources have been neglected in writing on this subject, resulting in an account that forgets their perspective. This book investigates why this biased view of the alliance has become standard.

R. W. Southern in *Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages* examines the views of theologians who were struggling with ‘the existence of Islam [which] was the most far-reaching problem in medieval Christendom.’ Southern emphasizes the differences between ‘Western Christendom and Islam’ claiming that ‘they were societies extraordinarily unlike from almost every point of view.’ While reviewing western Christian theologians’ misconceptions of Islam in the medieval period, he also depicts relations between Muslims and Christians as one of a menacing Islam threatening western Europe.
Southern analyzed the views of four fifteenth-century bishops, including Jean Germain, who he claims ‘was only interested in Christendom and in attempting to rally it to a sense of its own identity: above all, he hated those Christians—merchants and others, in increasing numbers—who traveled in Islam and came back with scruples and criticisms of the Christian faith.’ Although his sample is limited to the opinions of four bishops, Southern implies that their views were representative of all people living in western Europe throughout the Middle Ages. Southern concludes by claiming that the views of these four bishops concerning Islam from 1450 to 1460 were ‘larger, clearer, and more lifelike than at any previous moment, or any later one for several centuries at least.’ Southern did not include in this work the views of merchants and other travelers who visited the Levant for reasons that had little or nothing to do with religion. They produced an extensive and rich literature about the region that in the sixteenth century often showed an interest in, appreciation for, and admiration of the lands ruled by Muslims, which they knew as eyewitnesses.

Bernard Lewis’s *The Muslim Discovery of Europe* is a contrast to most works on relations between Muslims and Christians because it explores the ‘discovery’ of Europe by Muslims, that is, the growth of Muslim knowledge of the west. In contrast to Daniel and Southern, Lewis does not limit his study temporally or geographically, but includes information concerning Muslims from the seventh to the nineteenth century from India to North Africa. Lewis emphasizes the adversarial nature of relations between Muslims and Christians: ‘dealing with familiar events from an unfamiliar angle—that of the adversary.’ Lewis describes relations between the Ottoman Empire and Europe in adversarial terms, as the advance of the Ottoman Empire ‘seemed to pose a mortal threat to Christendom.’ He describes Ottoman views of Europe similarly: ‘For the advancing Ottomans, Frankish Europe was no longer the remote and mysterious wilderness that it had been for the Arabs and Persians of medieval times. It was their immediate neighbor and rival, replacing the defunct Byzantine Empire as the emblem of Christendom, the millennial and archetypal adversary of the House of Islam.’ This emphasis on adversarial relations between the Ottomans and western Christians ignores Ottoman alliances with
many Italian states as well as France during the fifteenth and six-
teenth centuries. In chapter 1, these alliances are described, providing
evidence for both the quantity of alliances that the Ottomans formed
with ‘Frankish Europe’ and the wide variety of rulers and states that
sought alliances with them.

It is also inaccurate to view the medieval period as one in which
Muslims and Christians viewed each other solely as religious enemies.
Diplomatic relations were common between Muslims and Christians
during the crusades in Medieval Spain and fourteenth-century
Anatolia. The French remembered these earlier alliances and used
them to support their arguments in favor of their decision to ally with
the Ottomans in the sixteenth century.

Contemporary Sources: Ottoman Eyewitnesses

Eyewitness reports of Ottomans and Frenchmen about their alliance
provide the basis for formulating an alternative view of both the alli-
ance and the views of ‘the other’ included in the accounts. Additional
evidence representing other viewpoints is valuable, but for the pur-
poses of eliciting Ottoman and French views, eyewitnesses, both
French and Ottoman, are of primary importance. Chapter 5 provides
an in depth analysis of the sources of these views, but a brief discussion
here identifies those sources that are crucial in preserving evidence of
these views.

Uncertain attempts at diplomatic relations between the Ottomans
and the French began in the fifteenth century when in the 1480s the
Knights of Rhodes held an Ottoman prince, Cem Sultan, captive in
France until papal diplomacy led to his transfer to Rome. An eyewit-
ness account by one of Cem’s companions in captivity, the Vakı‘at-ı
Sultan Cem, presents the Ottoman view of Cem’s experiences. This epi-
sode exemplifies many aspects of Italian diplomacy with and concern-
ing the Ottomans, as well as showing how Italian practices spread to
other areas of Europe, notably France.

Approximately fifty years later, the French king, François I,
requested Ottoman military aid against the Habsburgs. The Ottoman
sultan sent his fleet in 1543 to assist the French as they attacked the
Habsburgs. Hayreddin Pasha, the Ottoman admiral, led the expedition with the French ambassador, the Baron de la Garde, informing Hayreddin of French objectives for the campaign. The Ottoman fleet agreed to spend the winter in the French port of Toulon because the French also hoped to use the fleet in campaigns in 1544. Ottoman views of this expedition are found in two narrative accounts that include the perspectives of eyewitnesses. One of these, a section of the *Gazavat-ı Hayreddin Paşa*, is attributed to Muradi (a companion of Hayreddin Pasha on many of his campaigns) and focuses on the exploits of Hayreddin Barbarossa in 1543–44. Another account of this naval expedition, *Tarih-i Feth-i Şikloş Estergon ve İstunibelgrad*, was written and illustrated by Nasuh Matråç, a probable participant in the sea campaign. The manuscript’s paintings of Toulon, Marseilles, Nice, and Genoa accurately represent these cities as they appeared in 1543. These two accounts are essential for exploring the Ottoman view of the events of 1543–44.

These two episodes, when Ottomans and Frenchmen encountered each other directly in France, produced these unusual examples of Ottoman views of the French that reflect Ottoman experiences in French territory. Not only were relatively large numbers of Ottomans present on French soil, interacting with Frenchmen in a variety of situations for fairly extended periods of time, but Ottoman authors, who were either directly involved or who could interview those who were, wrote about this interaction in ways that indicate that they appreciated how unusual these circumstances were. They wished to explore various aspects of this encounter and then articulate their own perceptions of it. These sources express how Ottomans, with personal experience in encountering the French, viewed their western Christian ‘other’ in relation to specific events. Their views modify the perspective created by studying this interaction solely from the viewpoint of western sources, which do not consider Ottoman aims or constraints in their alliances with their western neighbors. The difficulty of using Ottoman sources written in Ottoman Turkish, which few western historians were able to read, few of which were published or even well cataloged, may partially explain why these sources have not been used extensively. Since the same difficulties did not apply to French sources,