



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY  
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

*Sergey V. Baigushev, Evgeny A. Khvalkov, Alena Kuznetsova,  
Feliks E. Levin, Nikita Malinovskiy, Gleb Paramonov,  
Adrian A. Selin, Aleksandra D. Shisterova,  
Yulia Zakrzhevskaya, Daria Zubkova*

**THE ISSUES OF CULTURAL  
HIERARCHIES IN EARLY  
MODERN ETHNOGRAPHY  
BASED ON THE ACCOUNTS BY  
PETRUS PETREJUS, PAUL  
RYCAUT, FYNES MORYSON, AND  
JOHN DAVIES**

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM  
WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: HUMANITIES  
WP BRP 197/HUM/2020

*Sergey V. Baigushev<sup>1</sup>, Evgeny A. Khvalkov<sup>2</sup>, Alena Kuznetsova<sup>3</sup>, Feliks E. Levin<sup>4</sup>, Nikita Malinovskiy<sup>5</sup>, Gleb Paramonov<sup>6</sup>, Adrian A. Selin<sup>7</sup>, Aleksandra D. Shisterova<sup>8</sup>, Yulia Zakrzhevskaya<sup>9</sup>, Daria Zubkova<sup>10</sup>*

## **THE ISSUES OF CULTURAL HIERARCHIES IN EARLY MODERN ETHNOGRAPHY BASED ON THE ACCOUNTS BY PETRUS PETREJUS, PAUL RYCAUT, FYNES MORYSON, AND JOHN DAVIES<sup>11</sup>**

This paper is focused on the issues of cultural hierarchies in early modern European imperial discourses in all-European discourse about Muscovy and Ottoman Empire and English discourse about Ireland, which have not been previously compared, in the narratives by Petrus Petreus, Paul Rycaut, Fynes Moryson and John Davies. The authors of the article have analyzed mechanisms of building the cultural hierarchies and compares different traditions of ethnographical descriptions with each other.

The authors under consideration not only create cultural hierarchies, but also instrumentalize the image of the Other to some extent. They focus on government, laws, religion and manners. The choice of these aspects aims to highlight problems important not for (or not only for) the Other, but for authors' societies themselves. The fact that most accounts describe relative barbarians rather than absolute also can be a consequence of such instrumentalization, because comparison between "us" and the Other becomes important.

Key words: Early Modern Period, XVIth – XVIIth centuries, the Other, discourse, description strategies, Europe, periphery, Ireland, the Tsardom of Moscow, the Ottoman Empire, early modern ethnography.

JEL Classification: Z19

---

<sup>1</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics (Saint Petersburg). E-mail: svbaygushev@edu.hse.ru

<sup>2</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics (Saint Petersburg). Department of History. Associate Professor. E-mail: ekhvalkov@hse.ru

<sup>3</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics (Saint Petersburg). E-mail: adkuznetsova\_5@edu.hse.ru

<sup>4</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics (Saint Petersburg). Department of History. Senior Lecturer. E-mail: flevin@hse.ru

<sup>5</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics (Saint Petersburg). E-mail: namalinovskiy@edu.hse.ru

<sup>6</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics (Saint Petersburg). E-mail: gaparamonov@edu.hse.ru

<sup>7</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics (Saint Petersburg). Department of History. Professor. E-mail: aselin@hse.ru

<sup>8</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics (Saint Petersburg). E-mail: adshisterova@edu.hse.ru

<sup>9</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics (Saint Petersburg). E-mail: yupzakrzhevskaya@edu.hse.ru

<sup>10</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics (Saint Petersburg). E-mail: dazubkova\_1@edu.hse.ru

<sup>11</sup> The article was prepared within the framework of the Academic Fund Program at HSE University in 2020 (grant № 20-04-032 "Languages for describing the Other in early modern Europe: social contexts and repertoires of interpretation").

## Introduction

In the present research project the authors contextualize ethnographic narratives of the early Modern period; moreover, we try to identify and understand universal mechanisms of construction and repertoires of interpretations of the Other within the framework of the seemingly emerging cultural relativity. The present ethnographic texts were never interpreted and analyzed in a similar perspective; hopefully, this will allow a fresh new glance at some problems of early modern ethnography.

A big part of modern scholarship is based on the postcolonial issues and thus focused on the Other outside European space practically<sup>12</sup>. The tendency to study the Other outside the European space leads to a division between the territorial extent of European states and 'external expansion' of European maritime empires. This is the reason for separation between the histories of states and empires. This distinction provokes the neglect of the fact that European history of the Middle Ages and early modern times was the product of colonization characterized by discourses of "Other"<sup>13</sup>. The discourses have their own strategies of "othering". They constructed the distinctions between the centre and periphery, becoming the reason for the emergence of cultural hierarchies, which were designed to establish control over the territories and transform them.

Thus, the present study addresses the problem of mechanisms used for constructing cultural hierarchies in the writings of several early modern authors, who flourished in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and left accounts about the European peripheries. Geographically, our authors describe Ireland (Fynes Moryson and John Davies), the Tsardom of Moscow (Petrus Petrejus and Johan Gabriel Sparwenfeld), and the Ottoman Empire with its vassals and satellites (Paul Rycaut). As for the last area, we perceive the Ottoman Empire as a European power<sup>14</sup>. Speaking about peripheries we mean parts of geographical Europe perceived as 'barbaric'. The differences in development of various peoples were perceived by the authors of those writings through the discourse of civilization and barbarity, in some

---

<sup>12</sup> For example, Stephanie Leitch, *Mapping Ethnography in Early Modern Germany: New Worlds in Print Culture* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); Carina L. Johnson, *Cultural Hierarchy in Sixteenth-Century Europe: The Ottomans and Mexicans* (Cambridge, 2011); Shankar Raman, *Renaissance Literature and Postcolonial Studies* (Edinburgh, 2011); *Inventing Americans in the Age of Discovery: Narratives of Encounter*, ed. Michael Householder (Burlington, 2011); *Practices of Coexistence Constructions of the Other in Early Modern Perceptions*, eds. Marianna D. Birnbaum, Marcell Sebok (Budapest, 2017); Elizabeth Horodowich, *The Venetian Discovery of America: Geographic Imagination in the Age of Encounters* (Cambridge, 2018).

<sup>13</sup> Armitage D. The Ideological Origins of the British Empire. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. P. 13-14; Barbara Fuchs, 'Imperium Studies: Theorizing Early Modern Expansion' in *Postcolonial Moves*, 71-92; Michael Hechter, 'Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development', 2nd ed. (New Brunswick, 1999).

<sup>14</sup> Hasan Çolak, 'The Nature and Limits of Toleration in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire,' *Historisch Tijdschrift Groniek*, 217: 377-388. Mesut Uyar 'The Ottoman Empire and the Early Modern World,' *Early Modern History* 50/4 (2015): 22-28.

cases implying stadial development through civilizing and even kind of some premodern concept of progress.

By researching the image of the Other in the Old World this work maintains ‘integrated’ history of early modern ethnographic discourses. It pays attention to the question about the instrumentality of the image of the Other in European both internal and overseas expansion and examines early modern ethnography as a system of knowledge in an attempt to identify universal mechanisms and patterns of describing the Other and repertoires of interpretation of otherness which were deployed in particular contexts. We assume the similarity of the description and construction of the image of the Other in sources that were not directly related to each other, but had common intellectual roots<sup>15</sup>.

Our research group would like to use the approach of critical discourse analysis unlike traditional works with wide comparative perspectives<sup>16</sup>. We will examine conceptual and linguistic strategies of representation of the Other in connection with social context. By this we will answer not only the question of *what* the image of the Other meant but also *how* it was constructed<sup>17</sup>. What are the most common themes through which our authors express inequalities in development, backwardness, cultural hierarchies, and how do they construct these hierarchies? Moreover, what type of a barbarian, absolute or relative, emerges through these descriptive practices?

---

<sup>15</sup> The Bible and the works of religious authorities, Classic works, which were known in that time, medieval and early modern political thought and medieval and early modern collections of manners and customs. See: Colin K. British Identities before Nationalism. Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600-1800, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999. P. 9-33; eadem, *The Forging of Races : Race and Scripture in the Protestant Atlantic world, 1600-2000* (Cambridge, 2006); Margaret T. Hodgen, *Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1964), 17–48; Peter Mason, ‘Classical Ethnography and its Influence on the European Perception of the Peoples of the New World’, in *The Classical Tradition and the Americas: European Images of the Americas and the Classical Tradition*, ed. Wolfgang Hasse and Meyer Reinhold (Berlin, 1994), 135–72.; Marshall T. Poe, *A People Born to Slavery" : Russia in Early Modern European Ethnography, 1476-1748* (Ithaca, 2002), 150-167.; Johann Boemus’s *Omnium Gentium Mores, Leges et Ritus*. which, according to Margaret Hogen, initiated literary and ethnological genre. Hodgen, *Early Anthropology*, 131-143.

<sup>16</sup> Hodgen, *Early Anthropology*; Peter Hulme, *Colonial encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492–1797* (London, 1986); Jonathan Locke Hart, *Comparing empires: European colonialism from Portuguese expansion to the Spanish-American war* (New York, 2003); Anthony Pagden, *Lords of all the world: ideologies of empire in Spain, Britain and France c.1500-c.1800* (New Haven, 2005).

<sup>17</sup> What makes this type of discourse analysis suitable for our research objectives is that it is the most text-oriented and focused on dominance relations. Teun A. van Dijk, ‘Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis’, *Discourse and Society* 42, no. 2 (1993), 249-283; Norman Fairclough, ‘Analysing Discourse : Textual Analysis for Social Research’ (London, 2003), eadem, *Discourse and social change* (Cambridge, 2016).

### Critical source overview

One of the two accounts about the Ottoman Empire is Rycaut's *The History of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire*.<sup>18</sup> Paul Rycaut, born in 1629, was a son of a French merchant who immigrated to England. He graduated from Trinity College, Cambridge, and served for some time at the court of Charles II during his exile in France. After the Restoration Rycaut became a private secretary to Heneage Finch, 3rd Earl of Winchilsea, ambassador to the Ottoman Empire and at the same time he served as a secretary of the Levant Company in Istanbul. He was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1666 and was a British Consul at Smyrna from 1667 until 1678. *The Present State* was first published in 1666 as a result of five years which Rycaut had spent in the Ottoman Empire as a secretary of English ambassador. The text was divided into three parts concerned with Turkish government, religion and army and soon after the publication became a bestseller in several languages.

One of the Irish sources for this study is written by John Davies, who was born in 1569. He had rather good legal education from Winchester College, Queen's College and the Middle Temple and has held fairly high positions throughout his life. His story of working in Ireland began in 1603 and in 1606 he achieved the status of the Attorney-General<sup>19</sup>. Davies's social circle consisted mainly of lawyers and antique dealers, and James I himself was his patron. For the analysis in this research we took his work, which was published in 1612: *A Discovery of the true causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued nor brought under obedience of the Crown of England until the Beginning of His Majesty's happy Reign (...) 1612 in Ireland under Elizabeth and James the First*<sup>20</sup>. It was one of the most popular texts about Ireland during the first half of XVII century<sup>21</sup>. Here Davies observed the history of Ireland and tried to explain the reasons for previous failures of British in attempts to conquer Ireland. His text represents the classic sample of the program works on Ireland in recent decades<sup>22</sup>. Davies shows the way of control and reformation of Ireland by the English rule and English laws.

---

<sup>18</sup> Paul Rycaut, "The History of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire"

<sup>19</sup> Hans S. Pawlisch, *Sir John Davies and the conquest of Ireland : a study in legal imperialism* (Cambridge, 1985), 15-22, 30

<sup>20</sup> Henry Morley, ed., *Sir John Davies A Discovery of the true causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued nor brought under obedience of the Crown of England until the Beginning of His Majesty's happy Reign (...) 1612 in Ireland under Elizabeth and James the First* (London, 1890). (Henceforward — A Discovery of true causes).

<sup>21</sup> Lenihan P. *Consolidating conquest: Ireland 1603-1727*. London: Routledge, 2014. 42.

<sup>22</sup> The program of the colonial project. The most famous example: Edmund Spenser. Nicholas Canny, 'Edmund Spenser and the development of an Anglo-Irish Identity', *The Yearbook of English Studies* 13 (1983), 15; Clare Carroll, *Circe's cup: cultural transformations in early modern writing about Ireland* (Cork, 2001), 13-14.

The second source about Ireland and other countries belongs to Fynes Moryson<sup>23</sup> who was an English noble who once served in Ireland in the position of personal secretary of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland in time when Elizabeth and James reigned. He was educated in Cambridge and for a long time traveled around the world, including countries such as Germany, Italy, France, Turkey, Ireland and others. Based on his experience, he compiled itinerary, which he later published. We planned to explore fragments of his itinerary, dedicated to the description of Ireland.

Petrus Petrejus<sup>24</sup> was a scholar, who compiled a historical and political description of the Tsardom of Moscow for the political purposes of the Swedish royal court; he visited Novgorod and some other towns of Northwest Russia and published his work in Swedish and German.

Johan Sparwenfeld was a representative of the early Swedish Enlightenment. Being a hereditary nobleman (by his mother; his father received a title of nobility for merits during military service), he received legal education at Uppsala's university, combining it with the study of history and linguistics. After a series of trips abroad to Western and Southern Europe, which had had mainly educational and antiquarian purposes, in 1684 Sparwenfeld got the opportunity to become a part of K. Yullenshern's embassy to Muscovy and stayed in Moscow afterwards, having received financial support from the king for his "ethnographic" and "region" studies. During this period, he was writing a travel diary, which is used as a source here. Sparwenfeld had acquaintances and communicated with diplomats and officials from Sweden, Russia, Denmark, the Holy Roman Empire and Poland as well as with well-known scientists from Western and Southern Europe (personally and through correspondence) and representatives of the Russian clergy and nobility along the route of the Swedish embassy and directly on the spot in Moscow). Regarding the reading horizon of this Swedish "ethnographer", he was closely familiar with European archival documents and manuscripts, a wide range of scientific literature, notes by authors who visited Muscovy before.

In addition to these key accounts we also used to a limited extent several travelogues of other well-known authors, which serve here as a background rather than are used as a main source.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup>Kew, Graham David. n.d. *Shakespeare's Europe revisited: the unpublished Itinerary of Fynes Moryson (1566-1630)*. Thesis / Dissertation ETD. University of Birmingham. 1995. Vol. 1-4. .

<sup>24</sup> Stora oredans Ryssland. Petrus Petrejus ögonvittnesskildring från 1608. Stockholm, 1997. P. 7-10.

<sup>25</sup> Giosafat Barbaro (1413–1494), who wrote *A Journey to Tana* reflecting the events of 1430s, and Ambrogio Contarini (1420–1480), who also visited Tana and left his accounts. Giorgio Interiano was a Genoese traveler and writer, known for

## Historiography

The work of Paul Rycaut became an authoritative text on the Ottoman Empire soon after its publication, and in this status attracted the attention of modern historians. Researchers analyze the image of Turks in Rycaut's text and its possible instrumentalization. For example, Linda Darling argues that a highly negative image of Turkish tyranny in *The Present State* was a warning to England, where after the Restoration of the Stuart monarchy there was a possibility of absolutism.<sup>26</sup> However, historians often concentrate on the notion of tyranny,<sup>27</sup> leaving aside other aspects on which cultural hierarchies may be based. Our research also aims to fill this gap.

The text of Petrus Petrejus has been used for a long time as a source on the history of the Tsardom of Moscow in the Time of Troubles; however, only recently historians presented the origins and the scholarly nature of the work of Petrejus as an independent object of research. The formation of P. Petrejus as a representative of early modern Swedish science was largely based on his field experience in the Tsardom of Moscow; the nature of Petrejus's research in the field of political geography and "ethnography" of Muscovy; his analysis of how exactly the images of the past (the Varangian legend, etc.) were used to solve political problems in the early XVII century are still to be thoroughly investigated<sup>28</sup>. Several researchers, for instance A. Tolstikov, provided textual criticism of Petrejus's works. Both, the "Relation" and the "History" had more than one version. The analysis revealed significant differences in texts, which is important for future studies<sup>29</sup>. Some cultural and historical contexts are given in the publication of the "Relation"<sup>30</sup>.

Like Bacon, Davies represents the pro-royal discourse of the conquest of Ireland, which is not surprising as the customer and sponsor of the work was James I<sup>31</sup>. Davies's ideas fit well into the existing theory of the 'New English' period of settlement, which began in the 1560s. However, he was not a pioneer in this direction and followed an already given

---

his description of Circassia, which was very original and based on personal observations, but was influenced by the traditions of ancient Ethnography.

<sup>26</sup> Darling L. T. Ottoman Politics through British Eyes: Paul Rycaut's "The Present State of the Ottoman Empire", *Journal of World History*. 1994. Vol. 5, No. 1. P. 71-97

<sup>27</sup> Çirakman A. From Tyranny to Despotism: The Enlightenment's Unenlightened Image of the Turks // *International Journal of Middle East Studies*. 2001. Vol. 33, No. 1. P. 49-68.

<sup>28</sup> Tolstikov A. "Shvedskost'" i "gotskost'": shvedskii goticism XV-XVII vv. // *Sushchnost' i metamorfozy shvedskoi identichnosti*. Moskva: RGGU, 2008. S. 59-76.

<sup>29</sup> Tolstikov A. Zachem perevodit' "Regni Muschovitici Sciographia" Petra Petreia so shvedskogo iazyka // *Srednie veka*. Moskva: IVI RAN, 2011. T. 72, No. 3-4. S. 175-186.

<sup>30</sup> Stora oredans Ryssland. Petrus Petrejus ögonvittnesskildring från 1608. Stockholm: Carlsson, 1997.

<sup>31</sup> Davies J. A Discovery of the true causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued (...). CELT: Corpus of Electronic Texts: a Department of History Project at University College, Cork College Road, Cork, Ireland: <http://www.ucc.ie/celt>. P. 330.

narrative; therefore he was not studied closely. For this time, his opponent Edward Spenser is more widely known<sup>32</sup>.

Moryson's work did not initially receive a particularly good response. He was quickly forgotten and remembered only in the Victorian era to justify the claims of England to her colonies. It was then that positive comments poured onto Moryson's work, praising him for his scrupulousness and careful approach to the material, but criticized him for the dryness of the presentation. This situation happened because, at the time of publication, Moryson's work was already outdated. Therefore, it was interesting precisely from the historical side, and not from the side of reproduction of current events<sup>33</sup>.

Thus, there are lacunae in studying cultural hierarchies expressed in our sources. To fill the gap, we have chosen four main themes which are commonly used by our authors while writing about the Other, namely, the discourse of past and present, political regime and law, religion and, last but not least, some aspects of morality and culture. These topics are important in showing the difference between author`s society and the Other and, what is more, in creating the cultural hierarchies between them.

## Past and present

Discourse of past and present is connected to the notion of civility, as the latter implies the process of social development and historical change. Civilized peoples went through several historical stages, whereas those who were considered barbarians remained close to the original state of mankind.<sup>34</sup>

Rycaut highlights that the Turks remained the same since they exited from Scythia; they still live in a condition of endless war.<sup>35</sup> As Keith Thomas shows, there was a link between warlike habits and the condition close to the original state of mankind. For some English intellectuals, one of the first steps from barbarity to civility were nomads and pastoralists, who were “perpetually involved in plunder and warfare”.<sup>36</sup> These intellectuals also recalled the accounts of ancient Greek and Latin historians about Scythians, mainly Herodotus and Tacitus.

---

<sup>32</sup> Canny N. Edmund Spenser and the Development of an Anglo-Irish Identity // *The Yearbook of English Studies*. 1983. Vol. 13. P. 1-2.

<sup>33</sup> Kew, Graham David. n.d. *Shakespeare's Europe revisited: the unpublished Itinerary of Fynes Moryson (1566-1630)*. Thesis / Dissertation ETD..University of Birmingham. 1995.. Vol. 1 pp.99-103

<sup>34</sup> Thomas K. In Pursuit of civility. P. 180.

<sup>35</sup> Paul Rycaut, “The History of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire”, P. 5.

<sup>36</sup> Thomas K. In Pursuit of civility. P. 183.

However, during their conquests they engaged with Christians; thus, Treaties and other contacts with not so barbarous peoples influenced the Turks and their manners. They become not so rude and, as Rycout writes, “it will not be strange for us to find amongst them men whom Education hath made civil, polished in all points of vertuous deppartment”.<sup>37</sup> (What is also crucial is the role of education, because for Rycout it can help to civilize a man.)

Moryson also traced link of Irish with the Scythians, but it was connected with their lifestyle in peace, not war. He wrote, that “the wemen weare many yeardes of linnen vpontheir heades, as the wemen doe in Turkey”, whose ancient times were perceived precisely as Scythia<sup>38</sup>. However, apart from this mention, Moryson does not provide the development of the theme of heredity and the origin of the barbarism of the Irish. The author simply points to them as absolute barbarians, referring to Julius Caesar's notes about the Germanic tribes. However, the description that Moryson gives and prescribes to Caesar (That may well be said of the Irish which Caesar in his Commentaries writes of the old Germans; like beasts they doe all things by force and Armes, after a slauish manner<sup>39</sup>) actually belongs to Gerald of Wales<sup>40</sup> who lived in XII and XIII centuries, whose description of the local population was a template for explorers of Ireland during the Elizabethan period<sup>41</sup>. Therefore, we can say that the Irish, as they were barbarians from those years and earlier, so they remained, as they are, according to Moryson.

Not only the Turks and Irish have not changed since ancient times, but the same can be said about Tatars. Rycout does not clearly express it, but, while describing them, he refers to Tacitus and his account of Sarmatians. Sarmatians for Rycout is the former name of the Tatars, and what Tacitus wrote about this ancient tribe – that they fight only sitting on a horse back, no foot-service – Rycout transfers to the Tatars.<sup>42</sup> But we also cannot say that they remain completely the same. In their towns and villages usually there are no houses, only huts, but Rycout writes that the Tatars of his time became rich due to their raids in Europe, and some of them spent their money on building houses.<sup>43</sup>

Unlike Rycout and Moryson, della Valle in his descriptions of Turks does not speculate on their alleged ancestry. The question whether the Turks descended from Scythians or

---

<sup>37</sup> Paul Rycout, “The History of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire”, P. 317.

<sup>38</sup> Kew, Graham David. n.d. *Shakespeare's Europe revisited...* Vol 1.p.198

<sup>39</sup> Kew, Graham David. n.d. *Shakespeare's Europe revisited: the unpublished Itinerary of Fynes Moryson (1566-1630)*. Thesis / Dissertation ETD..University of Birmingham. 1995 Vol. 3. p. 680.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.; Giraldus Canbrensis. *The topography of Ireland* // Translated by T.Forester. Revised and Edited with additional notes by T.Wright/ Medieval Latin Series. Ontario, 2000. pp. 68-70.

<sup>41</sup> Kew, Graham David. n.d. *Shakespeare's Europe revisited:...* Volume 3. p.652

<sup>42</sup> Paul Rycout, “The History of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire”, P. 108.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid. P. 110.

Trojans, which often can be found in the texts concerning the Ottomans and their history, does not seem to be important for him. Still the consideration of relations between past and present could be found in his narrative. But, unlike many authors, including Rycout, who attempted to prove Turks' barbarism by demonstrating the continuity of customs and manners with those of old, della Valle compares Turks with previous owners of the lands he visited, who were, first of all, Christians. In this vein della Valle argues for Turks' cultural inferiority when he recounts the story of the famous golden chain which sealed the sea gate of Constantinople in the days of thriving of the Byzantine Empire. In his interpretation, there is no such chain anymore, because Turks are simply unable to repeat and maintain such sophisticated technology of old<sup>44</sup>. Although the juxtaposition of past and present manifests itself in the cited fragment quite clearly, it does not only compare old and new. It also expresses the opposition between European culture and that of Turks. Despite the ambiguous status of Byzantine Empire in this case, it definitely is portrayed as a part of Europe in comparison with the Turkish state.

Petreyus's work was an account of Muscovy's history from its earliest times. He tried to outline the history of Muscovy from various positions. Petreyus considered geography, peoples, religion, and politics, sometimes referred to ancient authors, to create a certain vision of the Muscovites and neighboring peoples by the XVII century. Petreyus considered superficially vast parts of Moscow's history from legendary Oleg to Vasily III, dwelling in detail only on Rurik's and Ivan the Terrible's reign. Petreyus wrote that the Russians were rude and cruel by nature, which was explained by their history<sup>45</sup>. Since ancient times, they were inventing various cruel reprisals, sharing, and boasting about them<sup>46</sup>. He often repeated the same descriptive fragments, mentioning different events, thereby linking the image of the Russians into a single modern representation. For example, Petreyus claimed that the Muscovites got their name partly from the connection with Meshech. They did not change since the time of Meshech and remained agile and good with a bow<sup>47</sup>. Petreyus drew a direct link between the cruel ancient people and their descendants with the Grand Duke. Describing the Time of Troubles (or Smuta), Petreyus appealed to this barbaric image, which he formed throughout previous parts.

---

<sup>44</sup> della Valle P. *Viaggi di Pietro della Valle, il pellegrino : descritti da lui medesimo in lettere familiari all'erudito suo amico Mario Schipano, divisi in tre parti cioè : La Truchia, La Persia, e l'India, colla vita dell'autore.* Brighton: G. Gancia, 1843. P. 25.

<sup>45</sup> O nachale vojn i smut v Moskovii / Isaak Massa. Petr Petrej. Moscow: Fond Sergeya Dubova. Rita-Print, 1997. P. 418-438.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid. P. 216.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid. P. 213-216.

A common practice of Early Modern states was to gain a higher position in the political hierarchy by using myths of origin. Petrejus combined these legends in a quite tricky way. First of all, he referred to Gothicism, the main historical myths for Sweden in the XVI<sup>th</sup>-XVII<sup>th</sup> centuries. According to this theory, Swedes were the descendants of Goths who conquered half of the ancient world. The story was widespread at the Swedish court<sup>48</sup>. Being familiar with the concept of Gothicism, Petrejus also used it in his works.

Petrus Petrejus found the roots of the Muscovites in biblical themes and said that Moscow and, hence, the Muscovites descended from Meshech, the son of Japheth<sup>49</sup>. It could be explained by the development of Gothic expansionism, which was based on biblical themes. Gothic expansionism was the characteristic feature of Swedish imperialism in the XVII century.<sup>50</sup> The central part of this imperialism was devoted to the *"identification of noble Swedes as descendants of Noah's eldest son, Japhet, through Magog, and his son Gotar, the father of the Goths"*.<sup>51</sup> Although Meshech was also the direct descendant of Noah, Petrejus focused on the rigidity of Meshech and referred to the words of David, who said: "Hei mihi, quod exulo in Meseck" after visiting Meshech. The words "Muscovite" and "Meshech" were synonymous for him.<sup>52</sup> Thus, Petrejus perhaps tried to show that despite the common biblical origin, the Muscovites were historically cruel and rude in contrast to the Swedes (although Petrejus did not mention anything about the Swedes in the biblical context, perhaps he still implies it).

Meanwhile, he was arguing with another famous legend, which was actively used by the Russian tsars in their diplomacy. The Great Princes of Moscow traditionally claimed Prus, the brother of Emperor Augustus, as their ancestor. Thus, they brought themselves to the level of the Holy Roman Emperor and justified territorial claims in Eastern Europe. This legend was repeatedly challenged in the XVI<sup>th</sup> century by foreign diplomats<sup>53</sup>. Petrejus also

---

<sup>48</sup> To learn more about Gothicism see: Neville K. Gothicism and Early Modern Historical Ethnography // Journal of the History of Ideas, 2009. Vol. 70. No. 2. P. 213-234.; Neville K. The land of the Goths and Vandals: the visual representation of Gothicism at the Swedish court, 1550-1700 // Renaissance Studies, 2013. Vol. 26. No. 3. P. 435-459.; Tolstikov A. "Shvedskost'" i "gotskost'": shvedskii goticism XV-XVII vv. // Sushchnost' i metamorfozy shvedskoi identichnosti. S. 59-76.

<sup>49</sup> O nachale vojn i smut v Moskovii / Isaak Massa. Petr Petrej. P. 213-216.

<sup>50</sup> Colin K. British Identities before Nationalism. Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600-1800, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999. P. 29.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid. P. 29.

<sup>52</sup> O nachale vojn i smut v Moskovii / Isaak Massa. Petr Petrej. P. 215.

<sup>53</sup> Erusalimskii K. Istoriiia na posolskoi sluzhbe: diplomatiia i pamiat' v Rossii XVI veka // Istoriiia i pamiat': istoricheskaia kultura Evropy do nachala Novogo vremeni. Moskva, 2006. P. 664-732.

rejected this legend and revealed that Russian tsars were never able to convincingly verify it<sup>54</sup>.

Peter Petrejus carefully combined knowledge of the Christian canon, antique and Scandinavian history. References to Antiquity can be found in a form of a rhetorical tool aimed to strengthen the impression of an event, to give it an assessment or to use it as a moral lesson. A perfect example contains the text of the "Relation". Petrejus compared the tyranny of Ivan the Terrible to three different stories: the end of the united Kingdom of Israel after Solomon's death, the fall of Tarquinius Superbus after the crimes of his son and the overthrow of Christian II in Sweden after the Stockholm Bloodbath<sup>55</sup>. Thus, Peter Petrejus demonstrated that tyranny, like the rule of Ivan the Terrible, always ended in dreadful events and the fall of the ruling dynasty. Moreover, it did not depend on whether the people are Christian or pagan. Everyone was in the same position.

It also could be said that after the publication of Herberstein's "Rerum moscoviticarum commentarii", the presence of tyranny was a reason for contrasting the opposition between tyranny states and modern European states. Since the XVIth century, a new historiographical trend was in shaping – Russia as an opponent of the West<sup>56</sup>. Petrejus was familiar with Herberstein's works and often referred to him. Herberstein also had a story about the origin of the Muscovites from Japheth<sup>57</sup>, which is reproduced by Petrejus. It could be said that Petrejus followed the tradition of describing Muscovy.

A different picture is presented in Davies's text. Although Davies builds his text around an analysis of the past, he divides his discourse of the past into only two parts.

The most common is an analysis of the past failures of the British conquest of Ireland. Davies both describes the events from the sources available to him and explains the reasons for the failure of Ireland's mismanagement.

However, Davies has very few references to Irish antiquity. Unlike, for example, Rycout and Petrejus, Davies is not trying to trace the Irish to a specific origin myth. But he seeks to prove that they are not barbarians by origin. Irish in Davies's text had more precious ancestry with strong poetry and music traditions: "for though the Irishry be a nation of great

---

<sup>54</sup> O nachale vojn i smut v Moskovii / Isaak Massa. Petr Petrej. P. 219.

<sup>55</sup> Stora oredans Ryssland. Petrus Petrejus ögonvittnesskildring från 1608. S.96.

<sup>56</sup> Akopyan O. Europe or Not? Early Sixteenth-Century European Descriptions of Muscovy and the Russian Responses // Contesting Europe: Comparative Perspectives on Early Modern Discourses of Europe (15th–18th Century), ed. Isabella Walser-Bürgler, Nicolas Deteringand Clementina Marsico. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2019. P. 256-257.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid. P. 253-254.

antiquity...they had received the Christian faith above twelve hundred years since, and were lovers of music, poetry, and all kind of learning, and possessed a land abounding with all things necessary for the civil life of man”<sup>58</sup>. This is some kind of the idea of a precious past, which is irrevocably gone.

This cultural past ended when new Irish customs appeared. Davies through the part reinforces his argument about the roots of barbarism in certain laws and customs<sup>59</sup>. Nevertheless, they were barbarous in most of their history and the way out from barbarism for them is English crown.

## Political regime and laws

Early modern time is the period of emergence and development of new political theories and views. With the extension of expansion, the development of methods for describing political characteristics was also required<sup>60</sup>. This is reflected in the description of the Other. The authors draw attention to the governance of Others and governance-related laws. The discourse of rights was used to justify subjection of the people to authority<sup>61</sup>. The description of someone else's control could sometimes be justified in order to establish the country of the author of the text.

For example, Davies wrote his work by order of James I and placed laws and governance as the centre theme. He had three levels of hierarchy based on the laws and customs. First, the English, who are the most developed by this view and the second are the Irish with their barbarian law and customs: “...if we consider the nature of the Irish customs, we shall find that the people which doth use them must of necessity be rebels to all good government, destroy the commonwealth wherein they live, and bring barbarism and desolation upon the richest and most fruitful land of the world. For, whereas by the just and honorable law of England, and by the laws of all other well-governed kingdoms and commonweals, murder, manslaughter, rape, robbery, and theft are punished with death, by

---

<sup>58</sup> Davies J. A Discovery of the true causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued (...). CELT: Corpus of Electronic Texts: a Department of History Project at University College, Cork College Road, Cork, Ireland—<http://www.ucc.ie/celt>. P. 292.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid. P. 291 - 292.

<sup>60</sup> Pagden A. Lords of all the world: ideologies of empire in Spain, Britain and France c.1500-c.1800. New Haven. 2005. P. 3.

<sup>61</sup> Ivison D. The Nature of Rights and the History of Empire // British Political Thought in History, Literature and Theory, 1500-1800. Ed. by Armitage D. Cambridge University Press. 2006. P. 19.

the Irish custom, or Brehon Law, the highest of these offences was punished only by fine, which they called an ericke.”<sup>62</sup>

Davies focused mostly on law and legislation in distinguishing between the English and the Irish. He used the adjective "barbarous" when describing the laws and manners of the Irish people, rather than when describing, for example, their forays: “there was no care taken for the reformation of the mere Irish; no ordinance, no provision made for the abolishing of their barbarous customs and manners”<sup>63</sup>.

One of the key points of the work is the place of the Irish in the English-Irish world. The Irish were completely excluded from the English legal system, for which Davies blamed the British of the past. They tried to conquer and subjugate Ireland without introducing their own laws and customs. He showed that the Irish even were not associated with English subjects; they sometimes were called Irish enemies<sup>64</sup>. For Davies, nevertheless, this was not the proper way to integrate barbarians into English system as he mentioned the desire of Irish be included in the English legal framework<sup>65</sup>.

Another category of people in Davies emphasizes that he did not pay attention to human genes, but it is the law and the political regime that become the main measure of barbarism. This category is the degenerate English. They are English people, who came to Ireland before time of Davies and lost English law: “For heretofore the neglect of the law made the English degenerate and become Irish; and now, on the other side, the execution of the law doth make the Irish grow civil and become English.”<sup>66</sup> The main issue for Davies was that they were the Old English, who followed the old forms of integration and did not try to bring the light of English culture and laws to the Irish. On the contrary, they lost it, adopting the local Irish customs, and by this they went from "developed people" to "barbarians."

In case of Moryson, that can be noted, that during the Elizabethan period, judicial practice often relied on historical precedents to find confirmation of a particular law<sup>67</sup>. For Fynys Morisson, a loyal subject of the British crown, it was also important to one way or another to justify the presence of English power in Ireland. The author describes the fact that the English monarchs since ancient times have the rights to this land and the people

---

<sup>62</sup> Davies J. A Discovery of the true causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued (...). CELT: Corpus of Electronic Texts: a Department of History Project at University College, Cork College Road, Cork, Ireland—<http://www.ucc.ie/celt>. P. 290.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid. P. 272.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid. P. 266.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid. P. 266 - 167.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid. P. 336.

<sup>67</sup>Kew, Graham David. n.d. *Shakespeare's Europe revisited...* Volume 1. p.133

inhabiting it (“...also they acknowledge that the power of the Brittaines ouer the Irish hath bene of antiquity and that of old the kings of Britany had their rights ouer the Irish., namely that Gurguntius king of Britany (whome we call Gurgustus) did about the yeare of our lord 375 graunt leaue, to a people sayling out of Spayne into Ireland, to setle themselues in that hand, As also that the kings of Ireland payd tribute to the Britten Arthur Sonne to Vther Pendragon, whome they write to haue raigried about the yeare of our lord 516, and to haue bene of great fame...<sup>68</sup>). So Fynes Moryson described political regime and laws of meere Irish in quite an unpleasant way. The first thing the author says about the laws of Ireland is that they are unrecorded and reproduced only through tradition, what can mean that these laws and the political system do not have a clear basis. Their judges are uneducated and are actively trying to please Spain (swillers). Also in their rules for land inheritance, as Moryson describes them, there is no clear system of inheritance, from father to son. Instead, they choose the candidate themselves, what guides to political instability in this land, because the main quality of a candidate is his valor (dissolution), which leads to murder, parricide and the outbreak of uprisings during the elections. In addition, if the holder of the land, for one reason or another, transferred his possessions to the English king, and then received them back as a gift, local judges can simply invalidate this act and take the land, which means that local political and economic laws are a direct threat to the dominance of the metropolis on the island. This is even clearer when Moryson begins to describe Anglo-Irish lawyers who know English law and are constantly looking for loopholes in it, in order to justify local law and incite Irish lords to revolt<sup>69</sup>.

Contrary to Davies and Moryson, Rycaut does not pay much attention to turkish laws. What really matters to him in this case is how easily these laws are violated by the Grand Signior, whatever they may be. The grand Signior is a tyrant and absolute ruler, who stands above the law and who himself becomes a law. “But the learned Doctours among the Turks more clearly restrain the Imperial power onely to the observation of that which is Religious in the Mahometan Law, saying, That in matters which are Civil his Law is Arbitrary, and needs no other Judge or Legislatour than his own will.”<sup>70</sup> The notion of arbitrariness is one of the key points in Rycaut’s description of the sultan's rule and can be well seen in the account of hereditary nobility and land possession in the Ottoman Empire.

---

<sup>68</sup>Ibid... Volume 1 p.139

<sup>69</sup> Ibid. Volume 3. p.743

<sup>70</sup> Paul Rycaut, “The History of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire”, P. 11.

The case of hereditary lands and status is as important to Rycout as it is to Moryson, and shows not only the difference between English laws and those of the Other, but also the superiority of the former over the latter. While in England nobility “enjoy them [lands] by the title of a fixed and settled Law, never to be forfeited but upon Treason and Rebellion”, in the Ottoman empire people can lose their possessions because of the Grand Signor`s spontaneous wish.<sup>71</sup> In this case Rycout is not original, as such portrait of nobility under the tyrant (and, more precisely, the Turkish nobility) was a well-established tradition already in the 17th century.<sup>72</sup>

Although Rycout describes three main themes which are the Turkish government, their religion and army, the first one interests him the most. He tries to find out the maxims of Turkish politics. First of all, it is the absolute power of the Grand Signor. As it was already mentioned, he is a tyrant.<sup>73</sup> All people in the empire must obey his orders which can be spontaneous and irrational, for example, to make a poor man, met by sultan on a street, the First Vizier. The discourse of tyranny appears in other work, for instance, in Moryson`s account of Ireland, and inevitably implies hierarchy as by the definition it is about corruption, coercion, illegitimacy. It was true for Turks, but, what is interesting, for them tyranny was also about stability and success of the empire; moreover, the Grand Signor was a legitimate ruler for Europeans.<sup>74</sup> And, if the Irish are to be brought to civility (in the English sense of it), Rycout argues that for the Turks it is better to continue their living in conditions of oppression, tyranny and severity because they are used to it since their origin from Scythia. To free them would be the same as to enslave one of the free-born Christian peoples.<sup>75</sup> Of course, it is necessary to keep in mind the context of every work.

All people in the Ottoman Empire live in the condition of slavery, and even the ruling Grand Signor himself is born from a slave taken by Tatars.<sup>76</sup> This is also true for people who are appointed to positions in the Turkish government, such as viziers, pashas, beglerbegs etc. (It is worth mentioning that Rycout tries to describe all offices in the government and seraglio using original Turkish terms) All these people are raised in the seraglio under the watchful eye of a sultan. This maxim of Turkish politics aims to supply the Grand Signor with

---

<sup>71</sup> Ibid. P. 8.

<sup>72</sup> Grüne N. and Ehrenpreis S. *Liberty and Participation: Governance Ideals in the Self-Fashioning of Sixteenth- to Early-Eighteenth-Century Europe // Contesting Europe: Comparative Perspectives on Early Modern Discourses on Europe, 1400-1800* / ed. N. Detering, C. Marsico and I. Walser-Bürgler. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2020. P. 285.

<sup>73</sup> Paul Rycout, “The History of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire”, P. 9.

<sup>74</sup> Çirakman A. *From Tyranny to Despotism: The Enlightenment's Unenlightened Image of the Turks // International Journal of Middle East Studies*. 2001. Vol. 33, No. 1. P. 50-51.

<sup>75</sup> Paul Rycout, “The History of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire”, P. 4.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid. P. 16.

subordinates loyal only to him.<sup>77</sup> Such a situation leads to another feature of the Ottoman government, namely the lack of ancient hereditary nobility.

The fact that Rycout acknowledges Turks to have their own maxims of politics, different from European one, leads us to the concept of cultural relativism. This concept implies uniqueness of every culture. Moreover, as Thomas says, it rejects hierarchy among cultures and the notion of only one way of civilization<sup>78</sup>. However, this statement is rather controversial, since the idea of a barbarian culture as less developed remains, which is seen in the example of Rycout's account of the Ottoman Empire. On the one hand, the Turks have their own maxims of politics. On the other hand, these basic rules of the Ottoman government lead to tyranny, slavery and severity, which is necessary for Turks but inappropriate for civilized people like Englishmen. In addition, all these maxims appeared in ancient times and have not changed since then. Since these maxims are rooted in a condition that Europeans consider barbaric, they cannot be equal to those that exist in Christian countries. Thus, Rycout admits that the Turks have their own rules of government, but the hierarchy remains.

## Religion

Kidd writes about the common claim that early modern nationhood was strongly related to the confessional identity<sup>79</sup>. In the case of our authors, religion also becomes an important base for cultural differentiation, and there are several strategies for it. A hierarchy among religions can be built with cultural, ideological and political accents. Some authors simultaneously deal with both discrediting and artificially lowering the hierarchical status of religion of the Other, and spreading exotic, new to readers information about it.

Moryson devotes much of the text to the religion of the Irish. For him, she is presented from two sides: political and ideological. Firstly, he tries to describe the history of the Roman Catholic Church, not only in the case of Ireland, but also in other countries, in a light that denigrates it, in order to undermine the image of the Pope as the viceroy of God on earth and expose his claims from the human, sinful side. He demonstrates the path of the papacy from truly holy people to the powers of darkness, which usurped the God's word and were overthrown by the Reformation of the church. Events such as the defeat of the invincible Spanish armada and the death of Catherine de Medici confirm this event, according to

---

<sup>77</sup> Ibid. P. 46.

<sup>78</sup> Thomas K. In Pursuit of civility. P. 249.

<sup>79</sup> Colin K. British Identities before Nationalism. Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600-1800, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999. P. 10.

author's opinion and "the voge of all Christendome was turned.." Due to the loss of its influence, "the Pope first resolved to sett the marke of the Beast vpon the foreheades of his followers, forbidding them to come to our Churches, to ioyne with vs in private prayer, or so much as to say Amen to our graces at table." <sup>80</sup>. That is, all who refuse to convert to the Protestant religion, including the Irish, are adherents of the wrong, damned religion and the ideological enemy of England. Such phrase of Moryson that "it was more easy, for the foresayd reasons, to bring a Beare to the stake, then any one of them to our Churches"<sup>81</sup> and numerous other references to the wrong Irish faith prove this.

On the other hand, the political side, it turns out that the Catholic Church is directly related to the undermining of British rule in Ireland. Fynys Moryson openly accuses the Catholic Church of launching two uprisings (...haue shewed that after this tyme Religion first began in /30/ Ireland to be made the Cloke of ambition, and that by Popish Combinations two great Rebellions were raised.)<sup>82</sup>, and their priests openly incite local lords and people to revolt against the British authorities and blindly carry out the will of the Pope, at the same time being completely corrupt, dishonest and fallen people, like whole Catholic Church<sup>83</sup>. Therefore, religion is an important aspect of the alienation of the Irish people, according to Moryson.

As mentioned earlier, religion for Petrejus played a significant role in determining the place in the hierarchy of peoples. Petrejus pointed out that Muscovites adhered to Orthodoxy, were critical of the Catholic faith, and called the Lutheran faith closest to them<sup>84</sup>. Petrejus claimed that the Russians considered themselves the only Christians on earth, and all others in the world were pagans and heretics who did not truly confess God – despised Him, did not have the proper and right faith, and rejected the Old and New Testaments<sup>85</sup>. The Muscovites did not accept other faiths' teachings and were stubbornly rejecting them. They had many religious fasts, which they all strictly observed, and some excessively strictly. Monks and priests punished severely those who broke the fast. Nevertheless, Petrejus also mentioned the opinion of the "common people", who believed that much generous and diligently collected alms served only for various vanity, intemperance, and gluttony of the clergy. Moreover,

---

<sup>80</sup> Kew, Graham David. n.d. *Shakespeare's Europe revisited: the unpublished Itinerary of Fynes Moryson (1566-1630)*. Thesis / Dissertation ETD..University of Birmingham. 1995. Volume 2. pp. 527-528

<sup>81</sup> Ibid. P. 1182

<sup>82</sup> Ibid. P. 665

<sup>83</sup> Ibid. pp. 1187-1189

<sup>84</sup> O nachale vojn i smut v Moskovii / Isaak Massa. Petr Petrej. P. 447-450.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid. P. 452.

Petrejus mentioned that among the clergy, for the most part, there were those who were richer than the noblest boyars in the country<sup>86</sup>.

It could be said that there was a hierarchy of religions in Petrejus' work. The Tatar faith was the pagan faith, which stood in the last place in comparison with the Mohammedan faith. After that the Mohammedan, since it was different from Christianity. The Tatars and the Turks were often considered together. Among Christianity, it is more difficult to say, since Petrejus reviewed the religious position of the Muscovites and did not vividly express his opinion.

It is interesting that despite the fact that the Muscovites were Christians, and the Turks and the Tatars were, mostly, Mohammedans, Petrejus still compared the customs of the Muscovites with them, and not with other Christians. (For example, in the issue of choosing the number of wives<sup>87</sup>). Another example is that Petrejus claimed that all honest laws and regulations were weak and insignificant for the Russians<sup>88</sup> (as for the Tatars), and almost all sins and vices were allowed among them so that an honest and decent person would be horrified. In general, Petrejus often used the description of a civilized person as honest and decent, which neither the Muscovites, nor the Tatars, nor the Turks were<sup>89</sup>. Thus, it is possible to say that Petrejus considered the Muscovites as barbarians who adhered to Christianity but still remained "the Others" as the Tatars and the Turks.

Concerning the place of religion in the travel diary of Sparwenfeld the following can be said. The author does not give any characteristics to the Muslim subjects of the Russian Tsar (Tatars) when they appear in his narrative. At the same time, regarding other foreigners - Ingermanland Finns - a large descriptive passage is given at the beginning of the diary, in which there is also a Muscovites' image of instrumental nature. "Here in Ingria, and especially in Noteborg province, there are, apart from the proper Lutheran Finns, three kinds of Russians. Russians proper, who are unconstrained in their religion as they understand it as well as they do the language. The so-called Ingrians. They are of Russian creed and prepared to die for it, although they are Finns and might not understand a single word of Russian and even less do they know anything about their religion. Yet they maintain the kissing of the cross by habit and by heritage and under no circumstances do they want to have their children baptized by our priests, rather letting them remain unchristened until it can be done by the Russians. The so-called vatjalaiset [Votes]. They are of the same kind as the last mentioned,

---

<sup>86</sup> Ibid. P. 439.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid. P. 418-465

<sup>88</sup> Ibid. P. 205.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid. P. 437.

although different by name. But concerning all these who do not properly understand Russian, orders have been issued that they be instructed in the Lutheran religion and that their children be taken by force and baptized etc. as the instructions to the priests read, decreed by Sperling, the Governor General of Narva, and by the Superintendent Johannes Gezelius, which I have seen and read”<sup>90</sup>. This extract traces the apologetics of the policy of Ingermanland's Lutheranization and related actions carried out by Archbishop of Turku Johannes Geselius. Additionally, it offers an image of Russians serving both as a measure of culture and righteousness for Finns, and as a reason for the difficulty of consolidating Protestantism in the described lands because of the Russian influence on the local population.

Regarding specifically Russian religious matters, Sparwenfeld writes a lot, especially at the beginning of his journey, about the features of priests. So, after transferring his conversation with one of the ministers, he states that “They do not consider the Old Testament holy enough to be brought into their churches, because of all the many historical tales on one occurrence or the other, some of which they see as profane, some as unchaste etc”<sup>91</sup>. Perhaps the presence of this remark in the diary serves the purpose to expand an understanding of the religion (and partly the worldview) of Muscovites by offering the specific customs of Orthodox clerics. Unlike Petrejus eight decades earlier, here is no author’s claim for building the religious hierarchy. However, there is also room for a relatively negative comment in the text, which implies that a certain suspicion and some prejudice towards foreigners is still present in Russian ministers: “Apart from this, the monks today sent word to the ambassadors asking them not to reside there in the village, as it belonged to them and they were afraid that we might profane their sacred place during the holiday or commit some outrage”<sup>92</sup>. Finally, as well as for Russian dishes, drinks, official positions, architectural elements etc., Sparwenfeld occasionally uses Slavic terms to describe the religious side of Muscovite life.

As in the case of Petrejus and Moryson, religion becomes an important point on which comparison and hierarchy are based. Mahometanism for Rycout is a sect, a superstition “aims to deceive mankind”<sup>93</sup>; the fact that it is an irrational doctrine is acknowledged even by Turkish lawyers.<sup>94</sup> Mahometanism is worse than Christianity because it is an absurd

---

<sup>90</sup> J. G. Sparwenfeld's Diary of a Journey to Russia 1684-87. Ed. and trans. and with a commentary by Ulla Birgegård. Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien. Slavica Suecana. Series A - Publications. Vol. 1. Stockholm, 2002, 43.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid. P. 105.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid. P. 101.

<sup>93</sup> Paul Rycout, “The History of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire”, P. 197.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid. P. 195.

combination of it and Judaism.<sup>95</sup> Moreover, it was established in the way as Turks do everything, namely by sword and violence in comparison to peaceful Christianity.<sup>96</sup> Moreover, Rycaut gives an account of various sects and debates within Islam, mainly to discredit them, but also to provide his readers with the new information.

Comparing with the fragments of Rycaut's work, where he discussed the matters of Turks' religion with overt hostility, della Valle seems to have quite different views on Islam. First of all, he shows considerable degree of curiosity on the religious customs and practices of Muslim population of the Ottoman Empire. There are abundant descriptions of these topics in his text. Giving an account of the religious customs of the Ottomans, he describes quite elaborate the interior of the mosque, mentioning among other things the prohibition to depict people and any living creature in Islam. By this he explains why it was necessary to cover all images in Hagia Sophia. Besides the author touches upon some Muslim customs, such as the ban of entering the mosque in shoes and that it is not customary by Muslims for women and men to pray together<sup>97</sup>.

Although this information about Muslim customs was well known to Europeans since times of Peter Alfonsi, della Valle's narrative demonstrate no signs of hostility and he makes no attempt to interpret his observation in a negative way. The religious practices of Muslims are recorded in a quite unbiased way, and this may indicate that in this respect della Valle is free from the influence of the traditional anti-Islamic narratives, while he is most certainly influenced by them when it comes to describing the Turkish culture. His main purpose here seems to collect knowledge so as to entertain the reader.

Some comments here have to be made on how della Valle deals with problems of expressing cultural differences in terms of his own language, because it is manifested especially clearly exactly in the 'religious' fragments. Unlike many earlier authors, he is familiar with some terms and concepts crucial for the Ottoman culture. For instance, he actively uses the word 'mosque'. But in other cases he mostly lacks the knowledge on how exactly some things are called by Turks themselves. Here he usually gives a functional description in a form of comparison, based on his understanding of the role of the object, person or event he mentions. Thus he refers to the minarets as to the Muslim belfries, where they have muezzins instead of bells<sup>98</sup>.

---

<sup>95</sup> Ibid. P. 261.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid. P. 195.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid. P. 38.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid. P. 65.

It could be said that della Valle does not try to portray Islam in demonized way as some dangerous heresy, on the contrary, he seems to invite his reader to join him in an attempt to understand the similarities and differences between Islam and Christianity. Islam here is not explicitly depicted as inferior in respect to Christianity. On the one hand, his narrative demonstrates an effort to normalize Islam, i.e. to show it as one of the world's confessions with its own rules and special features. On the other hand, his description often seems to exoticize Islam through choosing those aspects of Muslim daily life which a Christian reader would consider as at least peculiar.

However, this theme may be a side theme. As Davies pays a lot of attention to the governmental and juridical issues, he does not really insist on confession division. He mentioned Christianity mostly without real division on Catholics and Protestants. Nonetheless, Davies distinct Christianity itself and the Pope's actions.

For example, he wrote that "Pope's donation and the Irish submissions were but weak and fickle assurances"<sup>99</sup>, so for Davies the Pope is a character, like a king or a prince.

The faith itself has another meaning. It is something like a designation of a cultural space: "These two Irish customs made all their possessions uncertain, being shuffled and changed and removed so often from one to another by new elections and partitions, which uncertainty of estates hath been the true cause of such desolation and barbarism in this land as the like was never seen in any country that professed the name of Christ"<sup>100</sup>: "the one was fostering, the other gossiped, both which have ever been of greater estimation among this people than with any other nation in the Christian world"<sup>101</sup>. It can be assumed that in this way Davies is trying to overcome the complete correlation of the Irish with the whole Other, complete barbarians.

Nevertheless, religion is definitely not the main theme for Davies. He cannot avoid it as it is a great part of his world and culture, but religion does not greatly affect his hierarchical system and the image of the Other. This may be due to the fact that Davies's work has a specific purpose: to show how to properly manage the colony and its population. His entire text is built around one central theme of laws and government, while the rest of the characteristics of the barbarian, which were often used in this period, Davies largely omits, although not always completely excludes.

Thus, considering all the above, based on the content of the studied sources, the following strategies for describing the Other in a religious way can be highlighted. Narratives

---

<sup>99</sup> Davies J. A Discovery of the true causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued (...). CELT: Corpus of Electronic Texts: a Department of History Project at University College, Cork College Road, Cork, Ireland—<http://www.ucc.ie/celt>. P. 221.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid. P. 291 - 292.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid. P. 296.

by Petrejus of Muscovites and by Moryson of Irish represent the first one. This is a model of building a hierarchy of religions and peoples based on cultural and ideological (and in Moryson's case, also sharply political) accents. Another position is expressed in relation to the religious question of chronologically later authors - della Valle and Sparwenfeld. Their approach is much more "researchical", that is, first of all, solving the problem of a specific cultural "enlightenment" of the potential reader. Both of them pay attention not to the interpretation of the spiritual life of Others (Turks and Muscovites), but to the disclosure of the meaning of religious practices (although the Swedish author once demonstrates political instrumentalism in relation to the current agenda), mainly, which will seem to the inexperienced Christian the most peculiar. At the same time, both Sparwenfeld and della Valle actively incorporate some terms from the language of the Other into the "religious fragments" of their narratives. The third strategy, namely Rycout's, as it seems, to some extent, combines the first two tasks. The author simultaneously deals with both discrediting and artificially lowering the hierarchical status of Islam, and spreading exotic, new to English readers information about its internal division and problems. Finally, the most "calm" about religion is Davies' description of the Irish. The religious classification in his narrative focuses not on the confessional hierarchy of Christians, but on the separation of the Pope's agency as a political player and the ordinary Catholics of Ireland. The latter rather even retain their place in the cultural space of the author's worldview by their "Christianity".

## Culture and manners

Hardly any of our sources avoids describing some cultural and moral aspects of the Other. It can be explained by ordinary curiosity, but such descriptions also serve as a tool to construct cultural hierarchies. Our authors do it by portraying peoples' characters in a negative way and implying the discourse of degradation.

Davies draws a clear line of barbarism through legislation and government but he still draws certain traits close to the character and manners of the barbarians.

Davies shares character with the Irish and the degenerate English. He describes degenerate English like people, who ruined lives and culture for their own benefits: "By this means the English colonies grew poor and weak, though the English lords grew rich and mighty; for they placed Irish tenants upon the lands relinquished by the English".<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup> Ibid. P. 229.

According to Davies this desire of the English of the past for profit prevented them from building a colonial system that worked for the good of both the British and the Irish.

Separately, he notes the degree of merger of the degenerate English with the Irish: “upon them they levied all Irish exactions; with them they married, and fostered, and made gossips; so as within one age the English, both lords and freeholders, became degenerate and mere Irish in their language, in their apparel, in their arms and manner of fight, and all other customs of life whatsoever”<sup>103</sup>.

Another picture is in the case of the Irish: “Howbeit, in that time the Irish lords for the most part submitted themselves to him [King John], as they had done before to his father, which was but a mere *mockery* and *imposture*”<sup>104</sup>. The penchant for deception in the text is part of the Irish, especially the Irish lords. Another distinguishing feature is rebellion: “For his back was no sooner turned but they returned to their former rebellion, and yet this was reputed a second conquest”<sup>105</sup>. The description of the Irish rebellion is attributed not only to the vision of the British, but also of the Germans.: “They told him [Richard the Second] plainly that the Princes of Germany did not think him fit to command the empire, who was neither able to hold that which his ancestors had gained in France, nor to rule his insolent subjects in England, nor to master his rebellious people of Ireland”<sup>106</sup>.

The question is, who is the big barbarian for Davies here - the Irish or the degenerate English, but the description of the Irish, in general, is close to the rather typical description of the barbarian in the Early Modern era.

Fynes Moryson’s itinerary shows the similar tension with Davies, but it is much more radical. Such an attitude was connected with the political situation in Ireland at that moment. As it was said, Fynes Moryson was personal secretary of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, which had to pacify the largest uprising of Hugh O’Neill in the region during the Nine Years War, and his military actions were quite tough. So his representation of Irish was a reflection of that situation. All aspects of the meere Irish life being corrupted, not only their laws, religion and customs, as it was shown above. According to Moryson, meere Irish are rebellious, blasphemous, idle, very brutal and chaotic in warfare and they are proud of it, so their distributors of culture, so-called bards, glorify an immoral and frankly illegal way of life<sup>107</sup>.

Meere Irish of course are typical, absolute barbarians. However, it is a more interesting situation with Old English, Anglo-Irish, who became settlers of Ireland after the Norman

---

<sup>103</sup> Ibid.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid. P. 226.

<sup>105</sup> Ibid. P. 226.

<sup>106</sup> Ibid. P. 235-236.

<sup>107</sup> Kew, Graham David. n.d. *Shakespeare's Europe revisited...* Vol. 3. P. 679-697

invasion in the XIIth century and became very close with local culture, customs, and being. Moryson has an ambivalent attitude to them. From one side, he confirmed that the Anglo-Irish were a menace for English government. Most of them were heads of the rebellion and tried to make their welfare much better with use of Irish customs and laws. Anglo-Irish lawyers and priests are main enemies for the English people on that land, because they know how to influence locals' minds and make them rebellious. However, Moryson writes that you can deal with the old English if you do not give them much power, put them under supervision and treat them severely but fairly. As an example, he cites the fact that the Anglo-Irish troops are quite good if they are commanded by a good commander. Otherwise, they acquire all the characteristics of the Irish barbarians<sup>108</sup>.

Also apparel is very important for Fynes Moryson. For him, the English gentleman, the outfit is straight expression of civility. Therefore, the clothes of ordinary Irishmen, who quickly enough turn into rags, clearly show their barbarism. Also for him, clothing expresses a person's commitment. It proclaims their country, their loyalties and even national characteristics. This was particularly the case in Ireland where conquerors and conquered found cohesion and identity, what Moryson calls "...a generall bond of amity...". Therefore, when describing the Anglo-Irish, he says these words: "...infected with the barbarous Customes of the meere Irish..." adopted the long hair or glibs, and long cloaks of the natives..." to show that they are not English, they are not loyal<sup>109</sup>. Also, their alienation is expressed in the fact that they speak Irish, because according to Moryson, language is what holds people together<sup>110</sup>.

In general, Moryson believes that Anglo-Irish people are not very different from ordinary Englishmen. He says they have become so corrupted by a barbarian culture almost by necessity, although he accuses them of being "weak" in having succumbed to tainted influence. During the Wars of the Roses, Ireland was cut off from England, and the English colonists had to cooperate with the locals, marry, establish relations, etc. And accordingly it affected their existence. And accordingly it affected their existence. The British government, Moryson says, has already tried to treat them well. At the beginning of the active stay of the British, many Anglo-Irish people received important posts, they were provided with financial assistance in resolving local problems, instead of trying to figure it out with the help of the armies. And accordingly, Moryson believes that the state itself allowed the O'Neill uprising

---

<sup>108</sup>Ibid. P. 703

<sup>109</sup> Ibid. P. 212-213

<sup>110</sup> Ibid. P. 715

by strengthening the local lords, instead of controlling them. And now strict hand of the English government can only deal with antagonistic relationships of metropolis and local Anglo-Irish lords<sup>111</sup>.

This course of conquest and control of Ireland has been a typical situation since the 1530s. Beginning from Henry VIII, administration of Tudors and then the first Stuarts, quite actively promoted this course on Ireland under the pretext of bringing civilization. But this was only possible with the supremacy of higher English law. Because of this, the word "civilized" became equal to the word "obedient". Because of this, all who did not want to obey were automatically branded a barbarian and bad<sup>112</sup>. This system is seen very clearly in Moryson's notes. The Meere Irish are depicted as ultimatum barbarians. They are so from birth, therefore, incorrigible, so the only way to pacify them is brute force. The Anglo-Irish, though degraded under the influence of the Irish life, can be civilized with the help of the highest English law and religion. The hierarchy of one over the other is expressed quite eloquently.

The issue of Turks' morals does not seem to be crucial for della Valle. Still there are some particular cases where he highlights their barbarism, indicating their cruelty and brutality. One of the most prominent examples of this is his description of Constantinople city prison. He writes that all the sultan's enemies go there without any hope of liberation, because 'the arrogance and barbarity of these [Turkish] rulers do not allow them to pardon their prisoners or release them for ransom'<sup>113</sup>. Still the rhetoric of Turks' cruelty does not dominate the narrative as well as does not determine the inferiority of their culture.

Contrary, the discourse of Turkish severity and warlike habits is omnipresent in Rycaut's work, and in this case Paul Rycaut is closer to his compatriots Moryson and Davies. Rycaut describes Turks as mighty people; men of great strength, health, and agility, fit for wars, and all active employments.<sup>114</sup> Cruelty is the usual mode of their government. One of the themes which our authors use to describe the Other is desolations and destructions "barbarous" peoples bring to their lands. Davies writes about it; it is also a topic for Rycaut. The Turks can rule over their country only by force, "by killing, consuming, and laying desolate the Countries"<sup>115</sup> and "executing all they do with strange haste and violence"<sup>116</sup>.

---

<sup>111</sup> Ibid. P. 723-732

<sup>112</sup> Thomas K. In Pursuit of civility. pp .223

<sup>113</sup> della Valle P. Viaggi di Pietro della Valle, il pellegrino : descritti da lui medesimo in lettere familiari all'erudito suo amico Mario Schipano, divisi in tre parti cioè : La Truchia, La Persia, e l'India, colla vita dell'autore. Brighton: G. Gancia, 1843. P. 21.

<sup>114</sup> Paul Rycaut, "The History of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire", P. 50.

<sup>115</sup> Ibid. P. 125.

However, what complicates Rycaut's text, is again the notion of cultural relativism absent in other works. Apart from their own maxims of politics Rycaut highlights that Turks have their own kind of civility: 'For though the Turks out of pride and scorn, comport themselves to Christians with a strange kind of barbarous hastiness and neglect, they are yet among themselves as courtly and precise in their own rules of complement and civility, as they are at Rome, or any other parts of the civilized World.'<sup>117</sup> Only once Rycaut refers to Turks as uncivilized people while describing how they receive foreign embassies.<sup>118</sup> Thus, to one another Turks are courteous while towards Christians they are rude. There we can see that the words "civility" and "civilized" are mainly mentioned in the context of behavior at the court. As Thomas shows, in the sixteenth century these words, especially "civility", began to replace "courtesy" and "virtue", i.e. good manners.<sup>119</sup>

However, both Rycaut and della Valle imply the discourse of degradation in their descriptions. Rycaut highlights that the art of navigation has degraded. It is put in a more general context, namely, that the subjects, which are attributed to universities and can be called science, are absent in the education of men who then would take a position in the government. No logic, physics, mathematics, geography.<sup>120</sup> Instead of it, Turks study languages, poetry, music and also train their bodies by throwing the iron bar, dart or drawing the bow.<sup>121</sup>

In della Valle's text we also can trace features of the 'degradation' narrative. But since for della Valle the main line of comparison is between Christian culture of old and contemporary Turkish one, he considers the way in which the material culture degraded with Ottoman conquest. For instance, emphasizing the beauty of the landscape and particular views and buildings, the author repeatedly points out that it is mostly just a beautiful frontage, which hides dirty streets and extremely poorly built and maintained houses. The responsibility for such a deplorable state of the former Christian imperial capital he most certainly lays on Turks<sup>122</sup>. The mosques' architecture is appreciated quite highly, but still della Valle considers it necessary to mention that they are mostly the former Christian churches. In a similar vein he writes that Turks inherited most well-built and beautiful buildings from Christians, and then simply transformed them according to their law and

---

<sup>116</sup> Ibid. P. 163.

<sup>117</sup> Ibid. P. 55.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid. P. 167.

<sup>119</sup> Thomas K. In Pursuit of civility. P. 15.

<sup>120</sup> Paul Rycaut, "The History of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire", P. 58.

<sup>121</sup> Ibid. P. 49-50.

<sup>122</sup> della Valle P. *Viaggi di Pietro della Valle, il pellegrino : descritti da lui medesimo in lettere familiari all'erudito suo amico Mario Schipano, divisi in tre parti cioè : La Truchia, La Persia, e l'India, colla vita dell'autore.* Brighton: G. Gancia, 1843. P. 21.

custom<sup>123</sup>. Thus in these parts, where della Valle uses both cultural and religious rhetoric and concepts, we see how Turkish culture, even if is not considered as entirely anti-civilized and primitive, is portrayed as inferior to the culture of former rulers of these lands. Despite this, della Valle seems to accept at least some of the Turkish achievements. Thus, speaking of the Ottoman palaces, he easily admits that they are probably even better built and organized than European ones<sup>124</sup>.

An element of cultural mediation can be traced in Sparwenfeld's narrative when he periodically notes his adherence to the practices of Russians, for example: "Then I went up into the bell tower and rang the bells as the other people were doing because at Easter everyone is free to ring the bells"<sup>125</sup>. This function may also be partially performed by the abundance of Russian terms in the author's vocabulary (the names of Muscovite positions and ranks, as well as some architectural and gastronomic things). Most often they are given in context, and a number of terms are separately presented and explained at the end of the diary.

In Sparwenfeld's diary there is no place for the topos of treachery or meanness of the Muscovites, with the exception, perhaps, of one comment by the author, when the embassy had already arrived in Moscow and he resided in the capital: "... here in Moscow people are talking quite openly about the fact that the Russians do not want to get on with their dealings with Sweden, although it has been decided in the treaty and sworn to by both sides"<sup>126</sup>.

Many people - mostly clergymen who "are well-mannered and they are very different from other Russians"<sup>127</sup> - in the provinces are seen by Sparwenfeld to be quite courteous and understanding in relations with foreigners. So, in one place he writes that "The archimandrite of Valdaj sent bread and kvass, and the monk who brought it drank a considerable amount of wine... They [monks] showed us hospitality outside the gate and the porter went in to the archimandrite to ask permission for us to enter. In the meantime another entertained us by talking politely to us and showing us the icons found on the outside above the gate... When we had looked at all this the porter came back and informed us that we could not enter now. He asked us not to blame the archimandrite, as he has been much criticized in Moscow for having been very complaisant in his dealings with foreigners. But when the pristav arrives or

---

<sup>123</sup> Ibid. P. 22.

<sup>124</sup> Ibid. P. 27.

<sup>125</sup> J. G. Sparwenfeld's *Diary of a Journey to Russia 1684-87*. Ed. and trans. and with a commentary by Ulla Birgegård. *Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien. Slavica Suecana. Series A - Publications. Vol. 1.* Stockholm, 2002, 97.

<sup>126</sup> Ibid. P. 221.

<sup>127</sup> Ibid. P. 98.

when we get permission from him, we will be welcome to enter, even if there are 200 of us"<sup>128</sup>.

In another fragment, he describes the case of how hard it was for him and his people to overcome the hospitality of the Russian family with its tipsy head: "Returning from the monastery in the evening, we walked slowly across the ice and in half an hour we were back in the village again. We went past a house, where the host was standing in front of the door, very drunk, and he and his son bowed to the ground and insisted that we come in. He treated us to two kinds of beer and constantly bowed to the ground before us. Their wives drank a cup of beer to us all, and to each of us separately they emptied a cup themselves, and took offence if we did not do the job properly. These wives seemed very favorably disposed towards us and regarded us well and we got away with difficulty from their hospitality at 9 o'clock, when we had supper and went to bed"<sup>129</sup>.

Here we may observe the characteristic topos of "drunkenness" of Muscovites, but herewith, firstly, it is deduced empirically through the narrative, and secondly, it does not carry with it clearly negative connotations (but rather neutral and even positive), in contrast to the generalized description of the manners of the Finnish population Ingermanland at the beginning of the diary. "On the way we saw and looked inside a church, which is called Moloskovicy. It is the one and only church built of stone and the most beautiful one in the whole of Ingria, not quite completed, however. It is situated in the Vrudskoj pogost. There they preach in Finnish for the peasants and in German for the nobles. Here most of our coachmen are Finns, but between Narva and Jama most of them were Russians. There is a big difference between these two nations in terms of their way of life and honesty. The Russians here live morally well and seldom get drunk, but the Finns are addicted to all manner of wickedness, and when they are drunk they care neither about faith nor law"<sup>130</sup>. The last passage also demonstrates the way in which information is presented, which is characteristic of diary entries and allows, if made public, to strengthen the credibility of the author's theses through "empirical reinforcement".

And although in the course of the diary the author practically does not sharpen problematically the Muscovite society (in the main only relations with specific individuals with whom he communicates), we can find such lines written at the end of the way back from Moscow to Sweden: "The 7th to Novgorod, where the voevoda Petr Vasil'evič Seremetev

---

<sup>128</sup> Ibid. P. 98-99.

<sup>129</sup> Ibid. P. 101.

<sup>130</sup> Ibid. P. 67.

openly demonstrated his resentment and animosity towards Prince Jakov [Dolgoruky] on every matter, so it is no wonder if foreigners are badly treated... As regards the city of Pskov, it is almost as large as Novgorod, although its uezd or district is smaller, although the people here are richer and more polite than in Novgorod... In the evening we went to visit the Metropolitan of Pskov, Markell, who treated us extremely politely. He mostly spoke Latin and complained about the fact that people who know a bit more than others are badly talked of in this country, while idiots walk comfortably to the highest positions in church affairs"<sup>131</sup>.

## Absolute or relative barbarians?

The analysis of four chosen aspects illustrates that one of the key themes in describing the Other as barbarian and an inferior people is the author's attitude towards foreigners and those who can be called "ours" for the author. The figure of an Englishman or, in other cases, a Christian, appears in all texts to some extent. The authors did not strive to describe the Other in a vacuum, but to one degree or another tried to include it in their picture of the world<sup>132</sup>. The tendency to classify the world around and people in it is noticeable. This trend also touched upon the discourses of description. This fact raises the question of absoluteness and relativeness of the Other in the Early Modern accounts.

In della Valle's text the main reference point for the comparison is the European culture, which is associated with both Christianity and the legacy of classic antiquity. Thus, the hierarchy is created predominantly in terms of culture rather than laws, political regime or religion, the fragments which della Valle dedicates to the estimation of the Ottoman culture, lack the spirit of empiricism. Here we can see clear manifestations of the classic narrative about the Turks' barbarity, which could be traced back as far as to the 16th century. Although the experience of observing the city and the lives of its inhabitants seem to constitute the essence of della Valle's descriptions, rhetorically and structurally they are set by the age-old tradition of portraying the Turks as barbarians, hostile to the true civilization. At the same time, Turks still are not 'absolute barbarians', and their barbarism is obvious only if we compare their cultural achievements with European ones.

A big part of Rycaut's account of the Ottoman Empire depends on the relationship between Turks and "poor" Christians. Turks are the great oppressor, a cruel enemy; their goal

---

<sup>131</sup> Ibid. P. 237-241.

<sup>132</sup> Colin K. British Identities before Nationalism. Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600-1800, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999. P. 22 - 23.

is to strengthen their country by ruining Christians. They are the most hypocritical among all peoples and usually lie when there is a conflict between them and Christians (there Rycaut repeats the words of de Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq).<sup>133</sup> Apart from repeating old discourses of Turkish tyranny and irrationality, Rycaut always tries to provide a reader with his own observations and results from talks with Turks, which still discredit the image of the Ottoman Empire.

However, whether this is an old stereotype or empirical knowledge, the Turks are never an “absolute barbarian”. This is more evident in Rycaut’s than in della Valle’s account due to some ideas of cultural relativism found in Rycaut’s work. Among themselves, Turks have their own understanding of civility and politics, which are natural and appropriate for them, though severe etc. But it is only with the emergence of “civilized parts of the world”<sup>134</sup> in the narrative – we understand that it is Europe, at least Italy and England - Turks become barbarians.

An interesting case is presented in Petrejus` text. There the description of the Tatars often referred to the Turks. Petrejus claimed that the Tatar language was slightly different from Turkish. Moreover, many Tatars adopted the Turkish faith – the Mohammedan faith<sup>135</sup>. Despite the fact that the Turks and Tatars were similar, the Tatars were much braver than the Turks. Petrejus cited that in a situation when the Tatar was knocked off his horse and lost all his weapons, he bit and kicked with all his strength until he was killed or tied up. The Turk, who understood that he could not escape from the enemy fell on his knees, threw down all his weapons, and humbly begged for his life<sup>136</sup>. Petrejus said that although the Muscovites were not particularly brave and undaunted in battles, they were impudent, cunning, and courageous, and resisted with long hooks, spears, stones, and anything else that came into their heads before they gave up.

Petrejus typified the appearance of the Tatars and natural desires, which they resemble the Russians and the Turks. In that case, the Tatars' place in that hierarchy was determined by the comparison with the Russians and the Turks.

After describing the customs and life of the Tatars, Petrejus began to talk about the ancient Muscovites. It is very important to note the comparison that he made between the Tatars and the Russians. Petrejus emphasizes that the ancient Muscovites were cruel, merciless barbarians who thought day and night about new ways to torment people: hang,

---

<sup>133</sup> Paul Rycaut, “The History of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire”, P. 141.

<sup>134</sup> Ibid. P. 55.

<sup>135</sup> Ibid. P. 158-217.

<sup>136</sup> Ibid. P. 412

boil, or fry them<sup>137</sup>. He went on to say that no other people, neither the Turks nor the Tartars, would do anything more terrible and cruel<sup>138</sup>. Mores and customs Petrejus called disgusting and Sodom. During dinners the ancient Muscovites were so dirty and shameless that they did not only hiccup, cough, spit, but also brought out different sounds, which were indecent to talk about in Petrejus' society<sup>139</sup>. Thus, although Petrejus does not focus on relations of the Other to his society or Christians, he still uses comparison between Turks, Tatars and Muscovites to create hierarchies.

However, it does not mean that our authors describe only relative barbarians, and the case of Moryson illustrates that both types, absolute and relative barbarians, can be presented in one text. If we talk about the absoluteness of barbarism, then such type appears only in Moryson in relation to the unmixed Irish. According to him, they are practically animals: "The Irish are "ladish" and "froward" who "haue euer kicked at the least. The Irish women deliver children with an almost bestial fecundity and facility...<sup>140</sup>". The constant comparison with animals often comes up in Moryson's descriptions. And for them there is only one solution - brute force: "the Irish espetilly being by their nature plyable to a harde hand, and ladish when vpon the least pricking of prouender the bridle is lett loose vnto them"<sup>141</sup>. The Anglo-Irish case is more complex. They are precisely infected with barbarism. They were degenerated, but they are not absolute barbarians.

Contrary to Moryson, Davies's representation of the Irish is associated with this of the English. The Irish are barbarians as they do not follow the English way of life and he describes the differences that were most significant to him.

This statement can be closely connected with the idea of the ethnic variety of the English people. Davies is in much the same tradition as Francis Bacon and he could share Bacon's opinion of the mixed origin of the English from Britons, Saxons, Romans, Danishes and Normans. This makes the idea of the superiority of the British in their origin difficult, but it is well included in the idea of cultural superiority, which has a complex and developed system than<sup>142</sup>. Unlike Thomas thesis of the absence of a hierarchy of cultures,<sup>143</sup> in this direction of the ethnographic thought of the British, the superiority of their culture over

---

<sup>137</sup> O nachale vojn i smut v Moskovii / Isaak Massa. Petr Petrej. P. 215-216.

<sup>138</sup> Ibid. P. 215-216.

<sup>139</sup> Ibid. P. 215-216.

<sup>140</sup> Kew, Graham David. n.d. *Shakespeare's Europe revisited...* Vol.1 pp.196-197

<sup>141</sup> Ibid. p.198

<sup>142</sup> Colin K. *British Identities before Nationalism. Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600-1800*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999. P. 75-76.

<sup>143</sup> Thomas K. In *Pursuit of civility*. P. 249.

others is well traced. Nevertheless, Davies wrote his text when the program of transferring English culture to Ireland in order to civilize it was not new and raised serious doubts, since it did not show sufficient results.

## **Conclusion**

Based on the analysis of the sources concerning various peripheral zones, we found several general ways of describing the image of the Other. All our sources shape more or less visible cultural hierarchies and relate them to one degree or another to Other's past, governance and laws, religion, some aspects of culture and manners.

They follow common descriptive practices, but nevertheless place emphasis in different ways within the text. In the text of Petrejus, culture and morality very often depend on religion. Nevertheless, Muscovy is paying the price for the tyranny of Ivan the Terrible. Rycaut also describes tyranny in detail, placing it at the center of the definition of barbarism, supplementing it with a fairly strong influence of religion.

Sparwenfeld pays a lot of attention to religious issues, as well as differences concerning behavior and morality. However, Davies pays little attention to religion, placing at the center the problem of laws and government, with which he associates culture and morality. Moryson, on the other hand, whose work, like Davies's, is devoted to Ireland, illuminates all the above-mentioned ways of describing the Other in sufficient detail. They also mention religion, even if this is not the main direction of describing the Other.

Our authors not only create cultural hierarchies, but also instrumentalize the image of the Other to some extent, and it can be the reason why they focus on government, laws, religion and manners. The choice of these aspects aims to highlight problems important not for (or not only for) the Other, but for authors' societies themselves. The fact that most accounts describe relative barbarians rather than absolute also can be a consequence of such instrumentalization, because comparison between "us" and the Other becomes important.

We also should keep in mind the context of every work. For example, in the cases of Davies and Moryson the Irish should be reduced to civility in case to subdue them to the English, while for Rycaut the present state of the Ottoman Empire should not be changed.

## Primary sources

1. Charles Hughes (ed.), *Shakespeare's Europe; Unpublished Chapters of Fynes Moryson's Itinerary, Being a Survey of the Conditions of Europe at the End of the 16th Century; With an Introduction and an Account of Fynes Moryson's Career* (London, Sherratt & Hughes, 1903).
2. Davies J. *Discovery of the true causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued nor brought under obedience of the Crown of England until the Beginning of His Majesty's happy Reign (...) 1612 in Ireland under Elizabeth and James the First*. London, 1890.
3. Giraldus Cambrensis. *The topography of Ireland // Translated by T.Forester. Revised and Edited with additional notes by T.Wright/ Medieval Latin Series*. Ontario, 2000.
4. *I viaggi in Persia degli ambasciatori veneti Barbaro e Contarini*. Ed. L. Lockhart, R. Morozzo della Rocca, M. F. Tiepolo. *Il Nuovo Ramusio*, VII. Rome: Libreria dello Stato, 1973.
5. Interiano, G. *La vita e sito de Zichi chiamati circassi: historia notabile*. Venezia, 1502.
6. J. G. Sparwenfeld's *Diary of a Journey to Russia 1684-87*. Ed. and trans. and with a commentary by Ulla Birgegård. *Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien. Slavica Suecana. Series A - Publications. Vol. 1*. Stockholm, 2002.
7. Kew, Graham David. n.d. *Shakespeare's Europe revisited: the unpublished Itinerary of Fynes Moryson (1566-1630)*. Thesis / Dissertation ETD..University of Birmingham. 1995.. Vol. 1-4
8. *O nachale vojn i smut v Moskovii / Isaak Massa. Petr Petrej*. Moscow: Fond Sergeya Dubova. Rita-Print, 1997.
9. Paul Rycaut, "The History of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire, Containing The Maxims of the Turfyjh Polity, the most Material Points of the Mahometan Religion, their Sects and Heresies, their Convents and Religious Votaries. Their Military Discipline, with an Exact Computation of their Forces both by Sea and Land". London, The 6th edition, 1686.
10. *Stora oredans Ryssland. Petrus Petrejus ögonvittnesskildring från 1608*. Stockholm: Carlsson, 1997.

## Secondary literature

1. Akopyan O. *Europe or Not? Early Sixteenth-Century European Descriptions of Muscovy and the Russian Responses // Contesting Europe: Comparative Perspectives on*

Early Modern Discourses of Europe (15th–18th Century), ed. Isabella Walser-Bürgler, Nicolas Detering and Clementina Marsico. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2019. P. 248–271.

2. Armitage D. *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 239 p.

3. Canny N. Edmund Spenser and the Development of an Anglo-Irish Identity // *The Yearbook of English Studies*. 1983. Vol. 13. P. 1-19.

4. Çirakman A. From Tyranny to Despotism: The Enlightenment's Unenlightened Image of the Turks // *International Journal of Middle East Studies*. 2001. Vol. 33, No. 1. P. 49-68.

5. Çolak H. The Nature and Limits of Toleration in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire // *Historisch Tijdschrift Groniek*. 2017. P. 377-388.

6. Colin K. *British Identities before Nationalism. Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600-1800*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999. 302 p.

7. Darling L. T. Ottoman Politics through British Eyes: Paul Rycout's "The Present State of the Ottoman Empire", *Journal of World History*. 1994. Vol. 5, No. 1. P. 71-97.

8. Erusalimskii K. *Istoriia na posolskoi sluzhbe: diplomatiia i pamiat' v Rossii XVI veka // Istoriia i pamiat': istoricheskaia kultura Evropy do nachala Novogo vremeni*. Moskva, 2006. P. 664-732.

9. Grüne N. and Ehrenpreis S. Liberty and Participation: Governance Ideals in the Self-Fashioning of Sixteenth- to Early-Eighteenth-Century Europe // *Contesting Europe: Comparative Perspectives on Early Modern Discourses on Europe, 1400-1800* / ed. N. Detering, C. Marsico and I. Walser-Bürgler. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2020. P. 275-316.

10. Ivison D. *The Nature of Rights and the History of Empire // British Political Thought in History, Literature and Theory, 1500-1800*. Ed. by Armitage D. Cambridge University Press. 2006. P. 191-211.

11. Lenihan P. *Consolidating conquest : Ireland 1603-1727*. London: Routledge, 2014. 344 p.

12. Morley H. ed., Sir John Davies. *A Discovery of the true causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued nor brought under obedience of the Crown of England until the Beginning of His Majesty's happy Reign (...) 1612 in Ireland under Elizabeth and James the First*. London, 1890. (henceforward — *A Discovery of true causes*).

13. Neville K. Gothicism and Early Modern Historical Ethnography // *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 2009. Vol. 70. No. 2. P. 213-234.

14. Neville K. The land of the Goths and Vandals: the visual representation of Gothicism at the Swedish court, 1550-1700 // *Renaissance Studies*, 2013. Vol. 26. No. 3. P. 435-459.

15. Pagden A. Lords of all the world: ideologies of empire in Spain, Britain and France c.1500-c.1800. New Haven. 2005. P. 3.
16. Taylor K. Ancients and moderns in sixteenth-century ethnography // History of European Ideas. 2020. Vol. 46 / 2. P. 113-130.
17. Thomas K. In Pursuit of Civility: Manners and Civilization in Early Modern England. New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 2018. 457 p.
18. Tolstikov A. “Shvedskost” i “gotstkost”: shvedskii goticism XV-XVII vv. // Sushchnost’ i metamorfozy shvedskoi identichnosti. Moskva: RGGU, 2008. S. 59-76.
19. Tolstikov A. Zachem perevodit’ “Regni Muschovitici Sciographia” Petra Petreia so shvedskogo iazyka // Srednie veka. Moskva: IVI RAN, 2011. T. 72, No. 3-4. S. 175-186.
20. Uyar M. The Ottoman Empire and the Early Modern World // Early Modern History. 2015. Vol. 50/4. P. 22-28.

## **Contact details and disclaimer:**

Feliks E. Levin

National Research University Higher School of Economics (Saint Petersburg, Russia).

Department of History, Senior Lecturer;

[flevin@hse.ru](mailto:flevin@hse.ru)

**Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.**

**© Baigushev, Khvalkov, Kuznetsova, Levin, Malinovskiy, Paramonov, Selin, Shisterova, Zakrzhevskaja, Zubkova 2020**