



Sights and insights : interactive images of Europe and the wider world / edited by
Mary N. Harris and Csaba Lévai
(Europe and the world : thematic work group 6 ; 2)

303.482 (21.)

I. Europa – Relazioni culturali I. Harris, Mary N. II. Lévai, Csaba

CIP a cura del Sistema bibliotecario dell'Università di Pisa



This volume is published thanks to the support of the Directorate General for Research of the European Commission, by the Sixth Framework Network of Excellence CLIOHRES.net under the contract CIT3-CT-2005-00164. The volume is solely the responsibility of the Network and the authors; the European Community cannot be held responsible for its contents or for any use which may be made of it.

Cover: Wassily Kandinsky (1866-1944), *Composition IV*, 1913, painting, Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg, detail
©1990. Photo Scala Archives, Florence

© Copyright 2007 by Edizioni Plus – Pisa University Press
Lungarno Pacinotti, 43
56126 Pisa
Tel. 050 2212056 – Fax 050 2212945
info-plus@edizioniplus.it
www.edizioniplus.it - Section "Biblioteca"

Member of



ISBN 978-88-8492-467-4

Manager
Claudia Napolitano

Editing
Francesca Petrucci, Eleonora Lollini

Informatic assistance
Massimo Arcidiacono, Michele Gasparello

Hungarian Travellers' and Emigrants' Images of Turkey from the 16th to the 19th Century

GÁBOR DEMETER

University of Debrecen

ABSTRACT

Using the memoirs of Hungarian travellers, emigrants and official deputies from the 16th to the 19th century, in this contribution I investigate the survival and the transformation of stereotypes of 'the Turks'. I trace the common elements and differences in the assessment of Christian and Muslim populations constituting the Ottoman Empire. I intend to focus on the opinion of Hungarian travellers regarding the decline of the Empire and the modernisation of Turkey, as well as everyday life. An attempt is also made to identify the different layers of inherited, original, persisting or disappearing features in widespread stereotypes. A comparison is made between the Roman image of Carthage and the Hungarian image of Turkey.

A tanulmány a magyar utazók és emigránsok törökökről alkotott véleményének átalakulását mutatja be a 16. és 19. század között, melynek során a negatív ellenségkép részben politikai célok miatt is pozitív irányba tolódott. A kiválasztott források közül három hivatalos követjárás beszámolója a 16. századból, a későbbi korokból pedig a Rákóczi-, illetve a Kossuth-féle szabadságharc emigránsainak írásaira támaszkodtunk. Ezen dokumentumok egyszerre alkalmasak a sztereotípiák és nemzeti sajátosságok élettartamának és értelmezéseik időbeli módosulásának követésére, valamint a kortárs dokumentumokban megjelenő jellegzetességek olykor ellentétes értelmezésének vizsgálatára. Az általunk választott források között pozitív és negatív kicsengésű egyaránt akad, mindazonáltal e művek többsége nem járult hozzá a tömegkommunikációs offenzívához, melynek során a törökökről alkotott vélemény pozitív irányba tolódott el; magánszemélyek véleményének foghatók fel, melyek nem a közvélemény befolyásolására születtek. Figyelembe véve az 1849-es emigránsok érzelmi állapotát, hangulatát, objektívnek nem lehet tekinteni őket, de célunk éppen a felfokozott érzelmi állapot által kiváltott benyomások, felerősített sztereotípiák nyomon követése volt. Mivel ugyanazt a jellemvonást a szerzők gyakran ellentétes módon értelmezték, vagy egy tulajdonság és ellentétpárja éppúgy előfordult, ezeket irrelevánsnak vettük és a jellemvonások mindenkinél előforduló közös halmozát vettük alapul. Kísérletet tettünk továbbá a punokra vonatkozó, római és görög auctoroktól örökölt és a "keleti rassztól" függetlenül létező vagy újonnan kialakult sztereotípiák azonosítására és elkülönítésére, így a Török Birodalomra vonatkozó előítéletek eredetének meghatározására.

In this contribution I seek to demonstrate the transformation of opinions and attitudes of Hungarians towards the inhabitants of the Turkish Empire between the 16th and 19th centuries. In so doing, I aim to trace the origins, persistence, adaptation and the reasons for such stereotypical attitudes, as well the role of attitudes that were not in keeping with these stereotypes. I have chosen to focus mainly on the first half of the 19th century when the number of works describing the Turkish Empire increased, making this period unique due to the growing diversity of opinion, whereas earlier the same stereotypes were repeated. The influence of the chosen publications on public opinion was not considerable. They reflect personal impressions influenced by the political situation, pre-existing prejudices and generalizations; thus their objectivity is at least questionable. Since my aim is to analyse the stereotypes, this kind of material seemed to be adequate, therefore have I omitted works describing Turkey generally based on secondary sources, works of scientific interest, or travel accounts from the second half of the 19th century¹.

The hostile attitudes towards the Turks developed in the 15th and 16th centuries turned into a positive attitude in the second half of the 19th century. The negative image and stereotypes that spread across Europe as well were partly due to the clash between the Turkish Empire and Hungary, and partly due to different cultural heritages. A thorough explanation of this phenomenon, as well as a rejection of the unjust stereotypes, is to be found only in the travel account of the exiled ex-prime minister and ex-minister of the interior, Bertalan Szemere.

The growth of more positive opinions was partly caused by the intensifying conflict between Turkey and Russia, which fuelled the pan-Slavonic aspirations of the southern Slavs subjected to Turkish rule. The activity of Russia and the political awakening of the Slavs also endangered the stability and plans of Austria-Hungary. Another reason for the development of a positive attitude was that the Turks supported the anti-Habsburg efforts of the Hungarians, and therefore Turkey became a target country for Hungarian emigrants hoping to exact revenge in a probable Austrian-Turkish war. The two greatest waves of emigration took place in 1711 and in 1849 after the decline of the wars of independence led by prince Ferenc Rákóczi and later by Lajos Kossuth. However, as decades passed, the Turks became unable to take effective action and had to abandon their ambitions to regain their former significance. The disillusioned Hungarian emigrants became effective instruments in the game for the survival of Turkey, then forced on the defensive. Therefore, in their memoirs, these emigrants often accused Turkey of impotence, hesitation, indecision, irresolution, obscureness, decadence, and inability to secure their own political interests. Partly in response to these accusations, Szemere wrote his memoirs, which are an apologia indeed.

The formulators of Hungarian foreign policy² considered Turkey a natural enemy of the Russians, and one that could act as a dam in the Balkan peninsula while securing the interests of the Monarchy. This concept had a permanent influence on cultural policy and – through the press – on public opinion, culminating in the announcement of a Hungarian-Turkish friendship from the 1850s. However, the positive attitude towards

Turkey was not typical in the period under examination, which is the last period undisturbed by mass communication.

The sources I have chosen to examine vary in both timescale and genre. Of these documents, three were written by official deputies in the 16th century³. Hungarian emigrants had longer and deeper relations with the Turkish Empire. Kelemen Mikes, living in exile in Rodosto/Tekirdag wrote his letters between 1717-1760 (first published in 1794). The material concerning Turkey shows no significant changes during these years, indicating both the long life of stereotypes and the uniformity and persistence of Turkish structures as well.

This investigation includes the memoirs of general György Klapka (1820-1892), Bertalan Szemere (1812-1869) ex-Prime Minister, Gábor Egressy (1808-1866) acting government commissioner and general Lázár Mészáros (1796-1858) ex-Minister of War, written between 1849-1853⁴. These memoirs were compared with Count István Széchenyi's (1791-1860) travel account of 1818-1819, who made a journey also to the West, as Szemere did in the 1830s. Széchenyi compared the western and eastern modernisation in order to define Hungary's position between East and West. The contrast between the two regions had a negative influence in assessing Turkey. The comparison of contemporary and earlier conditions is observable mainly in the work of Szemere, the only one of the writers under discussion who, besides describing the land and the people, also tried to understand them.

The emotional state of the emigrants and travellers also influenced their opinions and value judgements. Count Széchenyi started his journey because of the failure of his military career and to alleviate his severe depression. His social status also influenced his behaviour, which manifested itself in his incomprehension, intolerance and pride, sometimes turning into arrogance. Moreover, he did not appreciate the slow eastern way of life. In contrast to Széchenyi's account, Szemere's Turkey at least shows the will to live: it is a picture of an awakened though not enlightened nation. The ironic Mészáros mainly dealt with the political situation in Turkey and the tensions among the emigrants. The sensitive Egressy, worrying for his family, complains in every situation. Most of the emigrants were desperate, nervous and impatient, which also influenced their impressions of Turkey.

By the time Klapka's and Mészáros's diaries became available the positive change in opinion of the Turks had already taken place. In this process only Szemere's work could be influential (published in 1870). Széchenyi's account was published in German for a small circle (in Hungarian only in 1979), while the diary of Mészáros remained unknown until the present millennium. This was because he was a utopian socialist, which would have been shocking to public opinion. Egressy's work was published in 1851, but he usually spoke negatively about the Turks, thus he could not be said to have contributed to the change in the attitude. His imagery is not a set of prejudices but of stereotypes, as it is not the result of uninformed pre-conceptions but a summary of his experiences⁵. My goal is to demonstrate how these personal experiences promoted stereotypes.

Other subjects of the Empire were at least as incomprehensible for a Hungarian mind as were the Turks, since they were also considered infidels and unreliable due to their orthodoxy. The defeat of the war for independence in 1849 was brought about by Russian intervention, which made the distrust towards the southern Slavs, who had awaited the Tsar as the Messiah, understandable. Considered servant-nations without a sense of identity, their abilities were underestimated even in comparison to those of the Turks. However, while Széchenyi's defeatism saw no hope for the small nations, only three decades later Mészáros and Szemere saw Turkey's survival among the Slavs in Europe as hopeless, and they advised the abandonment of Rumelia, retreat to Asia and the reorganisation of a pure, ethnically Turkish Turkey, which was promoted by the Young Turks. Turks would have to resign from power, since they were no better than others and therefore not entitled to supremacy.

THE NATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS – STEREOTYPES

Before analysing the Hungarian image of the Turks, one must also deal with Turkish opinions of and prejudices towards other nations. These were not negligible, since negative opinions about a nation often generate similar feelings from the other side. How a nation judges others is part of its identity, which has two more important components: self-image, the positive image it seeks to present to other nations, and the opinion of other nations, which ruins the illusions while creating others through prejudices, stereotypes, attitudes and deeds at different levels. How did the Turks judge other nations? Karagöz in the 19th century cited the famous song of Meali from 1535:

The Albanese are bad enemies, itchy as lice,
and the infidel Serbs are even worse, twice,
the Russian cooties are surely dangerous,
but the Hungarian bedbugs are the worst⁶.

Furthermore, perceptions of physical features often depend on the observer: the same feature can be evaluated in different ways: "Our claws are sharper than eagle claws, we dig our nails into the flesh, grab, and never let it go until our claw is cut down," claimed the Turks. The Christian responded,

Tatars are... not human beings, they are similar to wolves: if they grab something, they escape with the prey, and never dare to oppose us. If they had been as resolute and lion-hearted as we are, and had searched for military glory rather than for cows, they would have perished by now⁷

Opinions of the ferocity of the Turks had changed by the 18th century. Mikes wrote: "The more the Turks speak about war, the more they wish peace if the Turks are beaten, they accept peace immediately"⁸.

A simple description of Turkish habits often affords the opportunity for abstraction, which can then lead to generalisations, and thus to stereotypes:

They were sipping coffee, enjoying the smoke of their pipes, and when they are satisfied, they twirl the Turkish rosary among their fingers, which is both a religious practice and an amuse-

ment or pastime. Turks scarcely have needs, if they own a little property, there is no other nation on Earth which can enjoy or go without better⁹.

This viewpoint is confirmed by Egressy, who wrote along very similar lines:

No one could understand how the Turkish urban people subsist – they smoke, sit quietly all day long and never work – if we did not know that the Turkish lifestyle is so simple and cheap and they settle for less¹⁰.

In this case the descriptions are positive, though that does not mean that these were widespread perceptions: these were time- and class-specific images extended to the whole society.

Another stereotype – though not always confirmed by the sources – is the hospitality of Turks. The description by Szemere illustrates the nature and quality of services:

On the fourth day I disembarked at Silistria... where all the eastern comfort and convenience that a Turkish *han* [hostel] can offer awaited me: when I asked for candles, I was kindly shown the way to shop, when I needed meat, I was advised to go to the butcher's, when I wanted fresh fruits, I was guided to the market, when I wished to eat bread, I was sent to the bakery to buy it. Our room had no glass on the window, so I was able to enjoy all the blessings of the climate¹¹.

The same is confirmed by Széchenyi in 1818, when he wrote that he had to go to his lice-infested room through the beggars and dogs guarding the doorway instead of having a door: "their homes are stinky, nests of disgusting worms and diseases"¹²

A typical stereotype is judging a nation from its external features and first impressions. Szemere dressed up as a Turk, which did not mean that he understood Turks' behaviour better, but at least it demonstrates the positive attitude of the writer towards the people he examined. "My first thing to do was to buy a Turkish hat (fez) and pipe, Turkish slippers with pointed toes, a Turkish rug and a scarf-like belt in which I put a pistol and a knife."¹³ The others, like Széchenyi, did not try to acclimatise at all: "Constantinople and the East lack any taste"¹⁴; "Whoever has seen one Turkish town, has seen them all... Constantinople is a real dump"¹⁵, complained Egressy. "Everything brings here melancholy [...] The landscape looked beautiful, but to me it signified an unhappy and dying country"¹⁶.

We must also pay attention to the significance of *aslama* (islam) and the resignation, meekness and indolence: these all were part of the Turkish self-image, which they thought to be the sign of intellectual and moral greatness, but which European travellers found quite annoying and strange:

The trees were burning [...] as giant torches around us. This resembled hellfire in my mind, [...] the rustling and groans of falling trees imitated the agony of the damned, which was emphasised by the shrieks of birds trying to escape. I asked, who would stop this fierce destruction, and my coachman pointed upwards. I thought he was hoping to have a rainfall from the darkened sky, but when he started to call Allah, I realised that these people expect everything from their God¹⁷.

According to Szemere's dervish friend, influenced by sufism, the Muslim moral code was based on the following sentences:

The best human being is the one who seeks help for his fellows. The one who makes others do good is equal – in God's eyes – with the one who does good. The existing world is a jail for believers, a paradise for infidels. This world is a carcass, and those who desire its treasures are dogs¹⁸.

In fact, the Turks were not really concerned about justifying their actions and were not fond of sweet talk, though in the vague pragmatism of the following sentence we can observe that they tend to moralize: "Only Allah knows whether I'm good or evil." This pragmatism (denied by sufism!) gave them an excuse for the consequences of their actions.

Before the death of Mohammed one of his followers stood up and admitted that he was a doubter, a hypocrite, and therefore not a good disciple. When the angered crowd wanted to expel him from the mosque, shouting that it was unnecessary to reveal what Allah knew but tolerated to be hidden, Mohammed defended him stating that it was better to feel shame in this world than to suffer in the next world¹⁹. The social significance of this adapted principle is that in Ottoman Turkey, after punishment for a crime, everybody could return and be reintegrated into society, while elsewhere such people often became outlaws and were expelled to the periphery.

The above mentioned attitudes are in sharp contrast to the opinion of Habardanecz from the 16th century: "There is one common feature in the different territories bound together and subjected to the Sultan's power: fear [...]. According to the Koran: the origin of wisdom is the fear of God."²⁰ This turned into a fear of the state and the sultan.

According to Széchenyi and Szemere, human life was not respected by the Turks: "It was really astounding that Turks prefer birds, snakes, dogs and horses to Christians... my valet killed a snake and a soldier immediately asked the reason of our deed, pointing out the snake did not do any harm to us."²¹ The often described cruelty of Turks was explained with the pragmatic words of the prophet, justifying cynical behaviour and refusing to accept responsibility: "If the person killed is one chosen to go to heaven, we have to promote the way; he loses nothing because of death. If the one killed is one of those condemned to fail and fall it is a merit to get rid of him..."²²

Turks had different ideas about death as well: "[...] there's a candle on each grave glowing at night in the gardens. After sundown the Turkish family goes to have a coffee and to smoke in the garden around the grave. This is almost inconceivable to Christians, whose religion dresses death in black and surrounds it with sorrow."²³

The houses are colourful like flowers, and made of wood. They are not built for eternity; as the Turks used to say: life is a journey, man is a wanderer, home is only a hostel, which we [...] leave so easily. Why should we erect buildings from stone, if we, wanderers, won't stay on Earth for a long time²⁴?

This characteristic was also judged in negative terms. "The Turks build nothing, they let the old buildings perish." The personal opinion of the travellers and emigrants led to many contradictory opinions on the same habit²⁵.

The clothes worn by Turks were generally considered the external signs of the inner features and values of a nation. In this respect the above-mentioned calmness of the Turks did not reflect in their clothing:

While the European citizen in his black suit looks funereal, the inhabitants of the eastern cities with their colourful and flying dresses look like waving flags. I was totally amazed by the Turkish people, by this eastern race, that dresses like the flowers of the meadows and birds of the sky²⁶

There is no other people on Earth for whom family ties are so important [...]. Apart from religion, limitless hospitality and charity are their most prominent characteristics [...]. The ideal happiness for a Turk is calmness and silence, bordering on indolence, apathy and unconcern. He lacks the eternal fever that forces Europeans into permanent motion. He loves comfort and commodity above all. A Turk is never a rambler, like the Persians and the Arabs, he is moderate, serious, thoughtful, honourable in each situation no matter what fate arises or submerges him. He always finds his place under the sun. The former servant remains ever unrecognisable in a present-day *pasha*: the man had not changed, just his position, which is open for all. Thus Turks don't know the meaning of the word "parvenu" [...]. Never judge this nation by what you have heard about its *pashas* and others. Their crimes are sins of individuals, not of the nation. Generally speaking the Turks are a temperate and sober race. What they prefer are fruits, vegetables, milk and black coffee five times a day²⁷.

In contrast to Szemere's opinion, Széchenyi criticized the opportunism of newcomers – but his was also a criticism of a system which made a negative selection of immigrants, to the indifference or the lack of concern of the natives:

Has there ever been a country which attracted more adventurers? It is a great depository of scum: those who have tried everything and been expelled from everywhere else have a chance to be treated as honest, moderate persons here. I advise every ignorant rascal and villain to come to the Levant, and they will find their happiness and welfare, if they look good, because here it is enough to make a career²⁸

Mészáros, who stayed in Turkey just before the great reforms of 1856, as well as Szemere was also

fed up with the behaviour and treatment of the bureaucrats, their talent for blackmailing and bribing [...]. I cannot see any loyal, straightforward, non-hesitating, outspoken, truthful and righteous deeds. I only saw flattering, slimy, downward cruel, arrogant treatment. I've got to loathe them [...] Pragmatists are right: a rotten race [...]. Poor Turks, they play the role of the strong and behave like this, but they dance as others wish²⁹.

"I love the Turks very much as individuals, but I hate them as a nation"³⁰ wrote Széchenyi.

As is known, the inhabitants of the Isle of Chios have more rights than other Greeks, and the Turks who usually stick to the old ways constantly and obstinately – even more than Hungarians – do not want to change this tradition [...]. Greeks buy new books, order equipment from Paris – everything happens in secret not because of the Turks, who consider learning and teaching a waste of time, but because of the Greek priests, who fear that this would endanger their supremacy³¹.

Szemere tried to explain the mental darkness:

Asia is the mother, Europe is only an appendix: the mystical tree of knowledge grows in the East. The West was only able to create denominations, while Asia produced religions. I know

that the East is the home of tyranny, superstition, slavery, cruelty, wildness, spleen, sloth, mental darkness, where everything is in opposition, [...] but as the most beautiful flora is created by the previous rottenness, so the most brilliant minds and ideas emerge from the darkness of centuries and light the fire of humanity³².

Beyond natural kindness, amiability, and personal magnetism³³, Széchenyi recognised many features which acted against the consolidation of the state: “Mistrust is a charming feature of Turks, and there is nothing strange about this: why should the fool be trustful towards the clever if he has finally realised the fatal power relations?”³⁴. “Anyway, I can’t imagine a thing more ridiculous on Earth, than the stupid pride and arrogance of Turks and the more simpleminded patience of Christians with which they tolerate the former.”³⁵ In contradiction to Egressy’s account which praised the simplicity and directness of Turks (not Christians) belonging to the lower orders, Széchenyi saw no differences between the different classes of society. “The Turkish *pasha* is similar to other Turks I have met: he has natural talent, but has so little information about the present-day situation [...]. They constantly fear a congress in Vienna dealing with the partition of Turkey.”³⁶

Here I quote some examples to illustrate the differences in the characteristics of different social classes. Ungnad’s fellow-traveller quoted a *pasha* from the 1570s:

Why do you bring me wine? You know precisely that I’m not allowed to drink it! If you want to give me a proper gift, bring me weapons, so that I can beat you all [...]. The Turkish *pasha* is a real epicurean. He wants to live in the lifestyle that he enjoys most³⁷.

This account is in complete opposition to the simplicity we quoted above, but at least it conserved the personal greatness that had disappeared by the 19th century. “The Turkish *pashas* are sodomites and paedophiles”³⁸, claimed Ungnad’s fellow-traveller. This perception was based on a typical stereotype of the “infidels” – though this deviant behaviour was forbidden by the Koran too. The statement was based on the observation that in a new empire with an “international” elite, the proportion of nonconformists and deviants is usually higher, since the state is attractive to elements who cannot integrate into their original society.

I quote below a dialogue from the 1850s, between a Hungarian emigrant and a corrupt Turkish official who embezzled the money given by the Sultan for the relief of emigrants. The Hungarian major, Fiala, wanted a duel, which the Turk refused.

Fiala: “So you never fight a duel?”

Faik *pasha*: Never.

Fiala: Then how do you take recompense for an insult?

Faik: We are not so sensitive and self-respecting. Our society is made up of hierarchic relations between lords and servants and between them there is no honorary relationship, no point of honor.

Fiala: But what about the relationships among those of the same rank, who are equal in certain respects? How do you avenge an insult in this case?

Faik: Then we kill our enemy. If we trust in our strength and in the invulnerability of our class, we do it immediately and publicly. If we have to fear from court jurisdiction or the revenge of the relatives, we assassinate our enemy by waylaying. I had such a case.

Fiala: And how did you handle the situation?

Faik:[...] To pour bravery into my soul, I brought a bottle of rum. I was drinking while waiting until I collapsed, totally drunken[...]. I understood on that very night that Fate had sent me word that my enemy was in the right and I gave up my plan to assassinate him³⁹.

The negative features of the bureaucracy were projected onto the whole nation in many cases. But the lower class deeply despised their leader's morality and attitude in the 19th century. Egressy cites a conversation between him and his houselord: "We gave him wine, but he refused to drink. Why don't you drink, when Turkish soldiers used to drink wine?" "Yes, but they need it, dire necessity compels them to." "But your *pashas* drink spirits as well!" "They are not good Muslims at all"⁴⁰. This deterioration of confidence in the abilities of the elite highlights the crisis of the state and the failure of reception and integration of newcomers into the society. The state's inability to overcome this promoted its collapse and dismemberment.

According to Ferhad *pasha* (a renegade, Maximilian Stein, an exiled general of the independence war in 1849), since translation of the Koran into other languages was forbidden, only educated people could keep the Muslim laws, and the poor obeyed the superstitions thought to be in the Koran. Because of this prohibition, the text was not contaminated by other nations' customs, but since even the leaders, who were able to read Arabic, did not obey the laws, as the elite consisted in many cases of newcomers, the Koran could not function as a civil code as Ferhad wished⁴¹.

The following quotation from Egressy illustrates the misconceptions regarding Islam:

[...] Islam is based on the needs of the body, representing animal needs. Therefore laziness, emptiness, inactivity and superstition characterise the Turks[...]. Turks can think – driven by their desires – only about women, money and their stomachs. Turks are always mocking other nations' customs, while they demand respect from others[...]. The wildness and rude impatience of this folk is in serious contradiction with their friendly behaviour towards the Hungarians⁴².

But "real sympathy characterises only the lower class. The officers are ready to fulfill the orders of the Sultan, because they were ordered to do so, but they are rough, cheating, impertinent people [...]. The *pasha* says that we do not have to work to cover our needs and maintain our life: and this is the desire of all Turks."⁴³

Though there is a 250-year gap between them, both Szemere and Ungnad reported in their accounts that bribery was common. The janissaries – like the pretorians in ancient Rome (these are common features of empires, such as the rootless "international" aristocracy) – were also bribed when a new ruler wanted to take over. If he did not raise the janissaries' salary, his days would be numbered⁴⁴. The Turks had a natural sense of justice: not only did they punish the fugitive slaves and those who helped them, but they also condemned to death those who gave them up⁴⁵. This image of some kind of "barbarian justice and morals" existing in the 16th century disappeared and the stereotype of bribery became emphasised⁴⁶.

Quoting the opinion of Ferhad *pasha*, Klapka wrote that the reforms of the 1850s were forced, and initiated by those Turks who had been educated in Europe for a few years:

definitely not enough to become entirely familiar with European customs and systems, which they wanted to apply without sufficient knowledge of the recent Turkish situation. Public affairs were handled under foreign influence to promote foreign interests. Minor improvements were made without any deep change in the system. The result of these reforms was the extinguishing of old customs without substituting new values and principles for them. The decline of traditional authority without the creation of a replacement proceeded quickly, while the parallel process, the extermination of bad habits was slow. As a result, if authority is diminished, no one can exercise control, carry on and effect the transformation. (But if this traditional authority remains intact no one dares to continue the transformation). Ferhad wanted conservative reforms like some of the Young Ottomans did, which the Young Turks later refused. According to Ferhad, Turkey needed to take three steps: to create a “code civil” based on the Koran, to reduce the number of officials, and finally to construct railways to link with the European “economic space”, thus accelerating the pace of development⁴⁷.

According to the liberal Szemere, the reason for the slow pace of reforms lay not in the inability of the Turks to change, but in the fact that the reform plans implemented did not suit to the character of the population, because the worst model was chosen: that of the French. Centralization is dangerous; it promotes despotism where it did not exist before, and helps to perpetuate it, where it is a serious problem. Since France was almost homogenous, the reform process did not cause problems there, but the Turkish Empire consisted of many coexisting races that were not united, by origin, aims, moral code, nor by common political perspectives.

Some – like general Mészáros – saw the collapse of the empire as unavoidable:

[...] If the Turks do not prepare to take arms within three years, the Russians will raise the Christian people and force Turkey back into Asia[...]. Our friends, the Turks trust only in Allah and in England, waiting for the future inactive, unaware and unprepared, coming up with half-finished and unripened reforms which need at least two centuries at the present rate of progress to bring results... Turks have English, French, Russian parties, but not Turkish⁴⁸.

Many in Europe still shared the intolerance that Szemere quoted from de Maistre:

[...] they are just as they were in the middle of the 15th century: Tatars who are only temporary visitors in Europe. Nothing can bring them closer to the conquered. There are two opposing laws[...]. They just stare and watch each other until the end of time without accepting the other. Reconciliation, peace, harmony and agreement are impossible[...]. How disdainfully they regard our culture, science and art, they are eternal enemies of our faith! War is a natural state between us, peace has always been forced. Once Christians and Muslims get in touch with each other, one must be the lord, the other has to fall[...]. Is this the Christian tolerance – I ask? Is it the Koran that opposes peace, alliance and progress or the Bible⁴⁹?

Since even within a single work there are contradictory statements regarding the Turks⁵⁰, we should compare the characteristics described by different authors. In order to obtain a realistic picture, the contradictory or misinterpreted characteristics have to be omitted (Tables 1 and 2) and the common set of characteristics should be examined. Among the common positive elements of Szemere’s and Egressy’s opinion are honesty,

nobility of mind and humane behaviour. The antonyms arise mainly as a result of the contingent circumstances or mood. Thus these features cannot be considered specific traits, but rather as common patterns of human behaviour in certain circumstances or as habits of individuals.

If we compare the characteristics attributed to the Greeks or Bulgars with those of the Turks we can come to the conclusion that there is no significant difference between the characteristics ascribed to Muslim or to Orthodox people – surprisingly. The reason for this generalisation and the disappearance of boundaries may be that many writers met only Turks living in Bulgarian lands, with the exception of officials, and extended the characteristics to all inhabitants regardless of their nationality. Alternatively, we meet with the phenomenon of ‘acculturation’, mutual assimilation, integrating elements of culture and behaviour into a unifying culture.

Beside these problems, an exciting question is to what extent possible stereotypes of Turkish populations changed and were associated with stereotypes referring to Islam or with other stereotypes. I have begun to explore the layering of positive and negative images and their interplay by comparing the stereotypes of an originally eastern people, the Phoenicians, or rather their Carthaginian descendants, well-known from the writings of the ancient Romans and Greeks, with the traits Hungarians ascribed to ‘the Turks’. Since both the objects and the subjects of the stereotyping differ, it is perhaps possible to find some specific characteristic that tended to be ascribed to cultures perceived as ‘others’, which reappear through the centuries. Certainly stereotypes by their nature – not needing to be based on fact, but on elements of perception and prejudice – readily draw on one another. So ‘typical’ Turkish features can be seen as having something in common with the ancient stereotypes.

In the case of the *interpretatio Romana* [Roman interpretation], the negative features attributed to Carthaginians are dominant, and these seem to have many traits in common with the supposed Turkish characteristics. The Greek interpretation was a little more favourable than that of the Romans: as Table 3 shows, many of the characteristics listed were also attributed to the modern Greeks.

One might think that ancient and modern stereotypes differ enough to be completely incomparable. However, the results seen in Table 3 show not only the same features and stereotypes applied both to modern and ancient peoples, but also the adaptation of the same features on the peoples of the Turkish Empire regardless of their ethnicity. In the previous discussions we mainly focused on the Turkish element of the Empire, but the latter consisted of other different peoples, like the Greeks. It is interesting though to compare the features attributed to peoples considering the Christian element as well as those categorised as ‘Turkish’.

Szemere wrote:

The Greek race – wherever it be – is clever, imaginative, inventive, full of the spirit of volunteers, but is gripped by vanity as every woman[...] and it is furthermore selfish, ready to intrigue, infidel, unreliable, toady, a minion who serves the Turks with pleasure if he finds any advantage in it,

but at the same time is consumed with hatred for them[...] In Galata people are in contact with each other with the help of interpreters who cheat and trick both buyers and sellers⁵¹.

Another voice could be heard three decades earlier from Széchenyi who saw nothing attractive in the behaviour of the Greeks:

A man with self-esteem cannot be treated and humiliated as they are: this pale face, the deep furrows on their skin can only be the results of long lasting deep oppression and the consequences of their shameful and dishonourable habit which enables others to oppress and exploit them. These men with fake humility and torn souls wore their miserable feelings – which predicted and determined them by God to be slaves – on their faces[...]. I guess the Greeks are people who can be cooked and burnt on fire without any objections being raised, since they lack almost every virtue, with the exception of virility – that is why this nation never dies out[...]. Turks,[...] treat Greeks like animals,... they made a humiliated servant-race from this nation⁵².

The Turk is fair in need, while a Greek would try to benefit from an emergency situation⁵³.

His words might be interesting because within few years the Greeks revolted against Turkey and the public opinion of Europe compared the Greek heroism (that Széchenyi could not find anywhere) to their ancestors'. Had there been a sudden change merely in the assessment of the nation's features or in the nation's virtue itself? Another opinion to add to the palette of contradictory judgements comes from Egressy after the successful freedom fight (in 1850). Reading his lines based on personal impressions one can hardly believe that these people were resolute enough to revolt:

How knavish and degenerate the Greek nation has become! The nation which gave wisdom, science and arts as heritage to the other nations![...] It is a terrible example of a people committing collective suicide! The present day Greek cannot understand the language of his fathers, nor can he feel their emotions and virtue in his veins. In respect of mentality he is at the same level as Serbs, Bulgars and other Slavic people. His religion, fate and sentiments are Russian, he dresses like a Turk, he has not inherited anything from the character of his ancestors but the drawbacks, of which he cannot be proud: finesse, shrewdness, perfidy, and disloyalty⁵⁴.

So was it a Hungarian misjudgement of Greeks, or was it the 'romantic' Europe that identified Greeks with heroism: which is reality and which is a stereotype? These questions need further investigation

The mentality and behaviour of the oppressed is typical in the following situation too as Egressy reports of his experience of accommodation in the villages:

We asked for food from the Bulgarian houselord; I don't have – he responded; [...]. But we pay with cash. Sorry. We complained about this to the *bimbasi* (colonel), that we would starve to death as the guests of the Sultan. Beat them all, beat the dogs – he advised. – And you will see he will give everything to you[...]. The Bulgarian discovered that we had gone to complain, so when we arrived back, a laid table awaited us. But the Turk beat him up – just to remind him of the "law" and not to return "empty-handed". So there is nothing strange about the fact that these people trust no one⁵⁵. Their houses look poor from outside, but rich inside indeed. This is for tricking the Turkish tax-collectors and to prevent harrassment[...]. The Bulgarian houses are crowded, full of secret rooms, small backdoors and corridors connecting the whole Bulgarian town without going onto the street. On the one hand these are used as emergency exits in case of danger, if they have to escape from the Turks, on the other hand these shelters are used for conspiring[...]. The Bulgar-

ian is a raffish, unworthy, impertinent fellow: selfish, lying, cheating, utilitarian, crude, insidious, malevolent, inhuman and bigoted. He hates Catholics as well as Turks... He is a Russian indeed. He hates us as well, and though he sells even his soul for money, he would not have accommodated us hospitably even for money, if the Turks had not ordered it[...]. These people under Turkish rule had lost all of their features, customs and original identity; with the exception of his language they have no national character⁵⁶.

[...] The Bulgarian is not a good peasant, willingly he would never decide to cultivate the land even among the most favourable conditions[...] once he collected and saved 50 piasters, he starts swapping and trading immediately, tricking even his brother and the Turks heartlessly⁵⁷.

The state of the countryside often affords an opportunity for generalisation in order to assess the mental state of a nation:

I travelled through nearly whole Valachia with closed eyes sunken deeply into my dreams: this is such a boring, bold, bleak, flat landscape. Where the folk are unfree and illiterate, there the land is an uncultivated wasteland[...]. We travelled more than half a day between two villages, with their sunken pitch-houses looking like molehills. Are these mentally and emotionally sunken people the descendants of Trajan and Caesar's Rome?... and if they are, how can they be compared with the people of demi-gods that settled on the Capitol, without any shame on their faces?"⁵⁸ "The uncultivated land is always the sign of deep misery, referring to sloth or limitless oppression."⁵⁹

Turkish rule brought nor development neither relief for these nations.

In this contribution I investigated the survival and the transformation of the image of 'the Turks' emphasizing the role of stereotypes. I traced common elements in the assessment of Christian and Muslim populations constituting the Ottoman Empire.

My conclusions can be summed up as follows: many of the stereotypes investigated were based on misunderstandings; they originated from the different interpretations of the same acts or behaviours, thus yielding a number of contradictory assessments of the people observed. The images registered in the texts analysed display many common features, but also show variations according to the culture and experience of the observer; some of negative stereotypes were similar to those already attested in ancient times, with regard to the Carthaginians. The negative stereotypes included the non-Muslim population; the Slavic population of the empire were underestimated; a transformation in the way Hungarian emigrants perceived and described the 'Turk' between the 16th and 19th century can be observed and was shown in this study.

Table 1.

A comparison of features mentioned in the text analysed. The words in italics have antonyms or are interpreted differently in the other column

Negative	TURKS (16th century)	Positive
not human beings, wolves (Tatars)		honour and reputation (relatively)
not resolute and lion-hearted (as we are - opposition pairs)		self-discipline
sodomites and paedophiles		good farmers
tyranny and oppression, violence		
	TURKS (19th century)	
<i>different</i>		<i>noble-minded</i>
<i>lacking taste</i>		<i>sublime virtues</i>
uniformity		<i>honesty</i>
scarcely have needs		<i>humanity</i>
there is no nation which can enjoy or go without better		bravery
never working, contempt for work		<i>adoration of water</i>
simple and cheap		<i>colourful</i>
settle for less, minimalists		hospitality
<i>stinky</i> , worms and diseases		charity
<i>indolence</i>		<i>calmness</i>
<i>resignation</i>		silent
<i>shortsightedness</i>		moderate, serious,
<i>tyranny, superstition, slavery, cruelty,</i> <i>wildness, spleen, sloth, mental darkness,</i>		<i>thoughtful, honourable</i>
contradiction		<i>temperate and sober</i>
convenience		a natural talent
depot of scum		<i>pure mind</i>
<i>not loyal, straight</i> , non-hesitating,		oracle
<i>not</i> outspoken, <i>truthful</i> or righteous		<i>can be trusted</i>
flattering, <i>slimy, prostrating</i>		fair in need
<i>crude, cruel, arrogant</i>		<i>soft, polite, honest, gentle</i> (if not in power)
a rotten race		<i>humbleness</i>
stick to old things constantly and obstinately		noble, courageous, religious,
consider learning and teaching as a waste of time		virtues inducing admiration and respect,
<i>silly</i>		grand emotions
<i>mistrust</i>		humane,
<i>stupid pride</i>		solid, but <i>tolerant</i>
poor information (ignorant)		sharing the passion
no honorary relation (hierarchic society: in self- image: democracy!)		reliable
exaggerated trust in strength and in the invulnerability of the higher-class		tells the truth
lustful women		despising insincerity
<i>laziness</i> , emptiness, standstill		dignity
mocking		<i>politeness</i> , staidness and deliberation
demand respect		<i>not slimy</i>
<i>rude impatience</i> - intolerance		<i>not proud,</i>
uneducated, not sophisticated		<i>natural kindness, amiability,</i>
<i>weak in explaining and rationalising opinions</i>		personal magnetism
rough, cheater, impertinent		<i>religious piety</i>
inactive and cold, unaware and unprepared		open society (outwards)
passivity		reintegrating
contempt		principled
<i>perdition</i>		
bribery		

GREEKS (19th century)	
<u>simple-minded patience</u>	<u>clever, imaginative,</u>
<u>vanity</u>	<u>inventive,</u>
<u>feminine</u>	<u>full with the spirit of volunteers,</u>
<u>selfish, ready to intrigue,</u>	<u>virility</u>
<u>infidel, unreliable,</u>	
<u>toady, minion</u>	
<u>hypocrite</u>	
<u>tricky cheaters</u>	
<u>without self-esteem</u>	
<u>fake humbleness</u>	
<u>shameful and dishonourable habit</u>	
<u>lacking almost every virtue</u>	
<u>miserable feelings</u>	
<u>slaves</u>	
<u>utilitarian</u>	
<u>knavish</u>	
<u>finesse, shrewdness</u>	
<u>perfidy, and disloyalty</u>	

Table 2.

Traits mentioned in the texts analysed as typical of various Balkan populations in the 19th century

BULGARIANS	ROMANIANS
<u>trust no one</u>	<u>unfree and illiterate</u>
<u>raffish, unworthy, impertinent</u>	<u>mentally and emotionally sunken folk</u>
<u>selfish, liar, cheater, utilitarian, crude, insidious,</u>	<u>molehill-like houses</u>
<u>malevolent, inhuman</u>	<u>uncultivated land, a sign of deep misery connected</u>
<u>Russians, bigoted zealots</u>	<u>with sloth</u>
<u>losing national identity</u>	
<u>tricking heartlessly</u>	
ARMENIANS	SERBS
<u>honest, clever, active and tidy</u>	<u>distrustful</u>
	<u>haughty</u>
	<u>selfish, self-conceited, blind, bigot (orthodox)</u>
	<u>despising all nations, glory and culture</u>
	<u>uneducated and illiterate</u>

Table 3.

The “common Eastern heritage”: a comparison between Carthaginians as described by the Ancients and Turks/Islam

CARTHAGE (Two points of view)	“Turks”; and Balkan peoples in the 19th century
<i>A dangerous enemy (Greek interpretation)</i>	
<u>calliditas (shrewdness)</u>	<u>Greeks (shrewdness)</u>
<u>insidiae (treachery)</u>	<u>Greeks</u>
<u>fraus (dishonesty, cheat)</u>	<u>Greeks, Bulgars (cheaters)</u>
<u>dolus (dishonesty, cheat)</u>	<u>Bulgars, Greeks (cheaters)</u>
<u>versutia (finesse)</u>	<u>Greeks (finesse)</u>
<u>strategema (military knowledge)</u>	<u>Turks, only in the 16th century (military knowledge)</u>
<u>perfidia (perfidy)</u>	<u>Greeks (perfidy)</u>
<u>fides Punica (trustless)</u>	<u>Turks, Bulgars, Serbs (infidels, cannot be trusted)</u>
<u>foedifragi – foederum ruptores (covenant breaker)</u>	<u>Turks in the 16th century</u>
<u>periuria (misjudgement)</u>	<u>Serbs, Turks (haughty)</u>
<u>superbia (arrogance)</u>	<u>infidels</u>
<u>nullum deum metuunt (not fearing any God)</u>	<u>”barbarian justice”</u>
<u>nullum ius iurandum (no jurisdiction)</u>	<u>Turks, Bulgars, Serbs (infidels)</u>
<u>nulla religio (no religion)</u>	
<i>An untrustworthy nation (Roman interpretation)</i>	
<u>crudelitas (cruelty)</u>	<u>Turks (cruelty)</u>
<u>dirus (severe, crude)</u>	=
<u>saevitia (rage)</u>	=
<u>barbara feritas (irrationalism, cruelty)</u>	=
<u>furor (fury)</u>	=
<u>luxuria (luxury, convenience)</u>	<u>Turks (luxury, convenience)</u>
<u>avaritia (greed, avarice)</u>	<u>Turks (the case of 25 000 piasters)</u>
<u>philargyrous (love of money)</u>	<u>Turks (bribery)</u>
<u>impotentia (impotence, sloth)</u>	<u>Turks (sloth, passivity)</u>
<u>levitas (levity)</u>	=
<u>infidi (infidels)</u>	<u>Turks, Greeks (infidels)</u>
<u>vanitas (vanity)</u>	<u>Greeks (vanity)</u>
<u>ingenium mobile¹</u>	

¹ For the image of the Carthaginians see, M. Dubuisson, *Das Bild des Karthagers in der lateinischen Literatur*, p. 237. Original: *L'Image du Carthaginois dans la littérature latine.* “*Studia Phoenicia I/II.*” Eds.: E. Gubel E. Lipinski, Leuven 1983. pp. 159-167.

NOTES

- ¹ Among those omitted we have to mention S. Decsy, *Osmanografia, azaz a Török Birodalom természeti, erkölcsi, egyházi, polgári és hadi állapotjának és a magyar királyok ellen viselt nevezetesebb hadakozásainak summás leírása*, Bécs, 1788-89 /1799. Hungarian writers of the 19th century (even the famous Mór Jókai) used this work as a source for their novels. Another work is: S. Kováts, *Mohammed élete és történetje*, Pesten, 1811, and I. Lassu, *A török birodalom statisztikai geográfiai és történelmi leírása*, Pest 1828. The peak of the pro-Turkish sentiments was represented by the orientalist-turcologist Ármin Vámbéry (*Dervisruhában Közép-Ázsián át*) and by Ignác Goldzieher (*Adalékok a keleti tanulmányok magyar bibliográfiájához*, 1880. I. Goldzieher, *A keleti tanulmányok történetéhez hazánkban a XVIII. században*, 1883). Balázs Orbán (*Utazás Keleten, Pest 1861*) and Elek Fényes (*A török birodalom leírása*, Pest 1854) also described Turkey. The latter was based on secondary sources and not on personal impressions, though it had great influence on forming the public opinion. In the early 20th century we have to mention the ethnologist István Györffy, who also dealt with the Turks. I have no knowledge of recent investigations of the image of Turks. In the works I have chosen the image of Turkey is of secondary importance: historians keep focusing on the personality and political ideas of the authors who are important because of being the members of the Hungarian political elite and not because of visiting Turkey.
- ² The Minister of Finance and later Foreign Policy István Burián, the secret councilor Lajos Thallóczy, and Benjamin Kállay, Minister of Finance and Governor of Bosnia.
- ³ Laski, a Polish nobleman, as a career diplomat was the delegate of the Hungarian king, János Szapolyai in 1528. Habardanecz, a Slav in origin, was a soldier, and represented the Habsburg king, Ferdinand I, in Constantinople. Their descriptions of the negotiations show a small segment of the empire: individual and national character influencing decision-making. The journey of David Ungnad took place in the 1570s.
- ⁴ The diaries of Egressy, Széchenyi, Szemere and Mészáros are available at: www.terebess.hu/keletkultinfo/index2.html.
- ⁵ The last page of Egressy's diary is in total contradiction to what he wrote earlier: "Farewell, noble-minded nation of the East, brothers in race and in most sublime virtues of soul. Farewell, state of honesty and humanity, who gave shelter for the refugee, and bread for the hungry..." *Egressy Gábor Törökországi naplója 1849-1850*, Budapest 1997, 12 August 1850, p. 241. This duality will be important in the discussion below. (All quotations have been translated by the author).
- ⁶ B. Szemere, *Utazás Keleten a világsi napok után*, Budapest 1999, 6 August 1850, p. 120.
- ⁷ H. Laski, *Két tárgyalás Sztambulban*, Budapest 1996, p. 125, 139.
- ⁸ K. Mikes, *Törökországi levelek*, Budapest 2000, p. 9, 19.
- ⁹ Szemere, *Utazás*, cit. 1850, "indolence", p. 92, p. 37.
- ¹⁰ *Egressy* cit., 25 March, 1850, p. 171.
- ¹¹ Szemere, *Utazás* cit., 15 January 1850, p. 11.
- ¹² *Egressy* cit., 17 September 1849, p. 34.
- ¹³ Szemere, *Utazás* cit. 15 January 1850, p. 9.
- ¹⁴ I. Széchenyi, *Morgänlandische Fähr*t, Budapest 1999, p. 48.
- ¹⁵ *Egressy* cit., 30 June, 1850, p. 207.
- ¹⁶ Széchenyi, *Morgänlandische* cit., 9 November 1818 and 4 January 1819, p. 84, 128.
- ¹⁷ Szemere, *Utazás* cit., 15. January 1850, pp. 13-14.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*, Chapter X, 6 August 1850, p. 159.
- ¹⁹ Szemere, *Utazás* cit., 1850, Chapter 17, p. 257
- ²⁰ *Két tárgyalás* cit., Habardanecz, p. 176.

- ²¹ Széchenyi, *Morgänlandische* cit., 21 September 1818, p. 43.
- ²² Szemere, *Utazás* cit., Chapter X, 6 August 1850, p. 110.
- ²³ *Ibid.*, Chapter V, 26 March 1850, pp. 38-39.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, Chapter VIII, 1 June. A good example of the differences between cultures, and also of the intolerance, corruption and material utilization of this religious principle is the following: "...A Bulgarian wanted to build a house made of stone, and he was condemned to death for building a fortress. He had to pay 25000 piasters to have his life spared... According to the Alkoran it is a sin to build houses made of stone challenging eternity. Allah permits only a few years stay on Earth...", *Egressy* cit., 17 Sept. 1849, p. 33.
- ²⁵ *Ungnád* cit., p. 113. Another example: "A typical eastern custom is the adoration of water: even the water not blessed by priests is considered as holy and temple-like wells are erected as shelters. Water is not only used to eliminate thirst but it is also a part of ritual ceremonies". Szemere, *Utazás*, cit., Chapter II. 15 January 1850, p. 15. But Mikes interprets this custom in a different way: "The Turks think that what makes the body dirty, makes the soul dirty, and what cleans the body, cleans the soul too". Mikes, *Törökországi* cit., p. 127.
- ²⁶ Szemere, *Utazás* cit., Chapter V. 26 March 1850, pp. 36-37.
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*, Chapter X. 6 August 1850, pp. 93- 95.
- ²⁸ Széchenyi, *Morgänlandische* cit., 29 November 1818, p. 106.
- ²⁹ *Mészáros Lázár Törökországi naplója, 1849-1850*, Budapest 1999, 2 June 1850, p. 75.
- ³⁰ Széchenyi, *Morgänlandische* cit., 28 October 1818 p. 64.
- ³¹ *Ibid.*, 28 November 1818. p. 99.
- ³² Szemere, *Utazás* cit., Chapter V, 26 March, 1850, p. 40.
- ³³ Széchenyi, *Morgänlandische* cit., 29 November 1818, p. 106.
- ³⁴ *Ibid.*, 12 September 1818, p. 36.
- ³⁵ *Ibid.*, 13 Novembe 1818, p. 91.
- ³⁶ *Ibid.*, 6 January 1819, p. 131.
- ³⁷ *Ungnád* cit., p. 158.
- ³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 109.
- ³⁹ *Egressy* cit., Shumla, 10 January 1850, p. 139.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, Samoden, 20 November 1849, p. 95.
- ⁴¹ Gy. Klapka, *Emlékeimből*, Budapest 1986, pp. 443-444. For some misinterpretations and superstitions in connection with the Koran see the following quotation: "There is no emancipation. The women have only one right: to get married without previously being seen. But the husband can send them back within 10 days. They are considered merely as goods, marriage as a deal[...]. Turkish women cannot go into the mosques to praise the Lord [...]. If she is accused of being false to her husband, and it proves to be an untrue rumour, she has the right to be false to her husband for three days in front of her husband's eyes[...]. As not having any rights, Turkish women have no duties at all[...]. Therefore the men work here: sewing, cooking and washing[...]. Anyway the women here are lustful and they love to flirt[...]. A woman with an open cloak means: You can do with me whatever you wish". *Egressy* cit., Vidin, 2 October 1849. pp. 52-54. The above mentioned are definitely against the laws of Islam, though they could have been practised in Arabia in ancient times.
- ⁴² *Egressy* cit., 17 September 1849, pp. 33-34.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*, 17 September 1849, pp. 33-34.
- ⁴⁴ *Ungnád* cit., p. 145.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 173.

- ⁴⁶ Orbán, *Utazás Keleten*, Pest 1861, p. 38.
- ⁴⁷ Klapka, *Emlékeimből* cit., p. 440. "Since Europeans cannot see the legislative corpus, they think that Turks suffer from a limitless autocracy. But Turks do not think they have to make laws, because everything is written in the Koran; they only have to apply and explain the law by the *ulemas* [bodies of Muslim doctors of theology] as a controlling power, while the execution is the duty of the Sultan as the main executive power. His power is not unlimited, and the people have rights to hinder the officials and the Sultan to break the law of the Koran", Szemere's dervish friend explains.
- ⁴⁸ *Mészáros* cit., 10-13 January 1850, 1-2 May 1850, pp. 38, 72, 75.
- ⁴⁹ Szemere, *Utazás* cit., 1850, p. 307.
- ⁵⁰ For positive images see footnote 3, and Szemere, *Utazás* cit., pp. 305-306 "[...] the Turks as a race are the first and most honorable among those constituting the empire. The Turk's character is noble, his courage is undeniable. Religious, with civil virtues inducing admiration and respect in the spectators. His emotions are grand, his heart is humane, his decisions and convictions are solid, but tolerant. His soul is full with warm, amicable feelings, with tendency towards charity, sharing passion in good or bad. He is reliable in promises, honest in deeds, always tells the truth, despises insincerity. Dignity shines on his forehead, he speaks with politeness, staidness and deliberation when he talks, neither is he slimy in his behavior, nor prideful, keeping his dignity in all situations[...]. It is a race of contemplators". See also p. 93.
- ⁵¹ Szemere, *Utazás* cit., Chapter VIII, 1 June 1850, p. 77.
- ⁵² Széchenyi, *Morgänlandische* cit., 5 January 1819, pp. 130-131.
- ⁵³ *Ibid.*, 15 February 1819, p. 154.
- ⁵⁴ *Egressy* cit., 20 August 1850, pp. 239-240.
- ⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 14 November 1849, pp. 90-91.
- ⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 16 November 1849, p. 92, and 12 October 1849, p. 66. Even the rich Bulgars build small houses to avoid the harrassment of Turks.
- ⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 16 November 1849, p. 93.
- ⁵⁸ Szemere, *Utazás* cit., Chapter II, 15 January 1850, pp. 8-9.
- ⁵⁹ *Egressy* cit., 27 August 1849, p. 20.
- ⁶⁰ For the image of Carthaginians see, M. Dubuisson, *Das Bild des Karthagens in der lateinischen Literatur*, p. 237. Original: *L'Image du Carthaginois dans la littérature latine*, in "Studia Phoenicia I/II", eds. E. Gubel, E. Lipinski, Leuven 1983, pp. 159-167.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Banton M., *Sociologie des relations raciales*, Paris 1971.
- Dubuisson M., *Das Bild des Karthagens in der lateinischen Literatur. L'Image du Carthaginois dans la littérature latine*, in "Studia Phoenicia", 1983, 1, 2, pp. 159-167.
- Egressy Gábor Törökországi naplója, 1849-1850*, Budapest 1997.
- Két tárgyalás Sztambulban. Régi Magyar Könyvtár. Források 5. Hieronimus Laski tárgyalása. Habardanecz János jelentése*, Budapest 1996.
- Klapka Gy., *Emlékeimből*, Budapest 1986.
- Mendras H., *Éléments de sociologie*, Paris 1965.
- Mészáros Lázár Törökországi naplója, 1849-1850*, Budapest 1999.
- Mikes K., *Törökországi levelek*, Budapest 2000.
- Miroglia A., *La psychologie des peuples*, Paris 1971.

Orbán B., *Utazás Keleten*, Pest 1861.

Széchenyi I., *Morgänlandische Fähr*t, Budapest 1999.

Szemere B., *Utazás Keleten a világsi napok után*, Budapest 1999.

Ungnád Dávid *Konstantinápolyi utazásai*, Budapest 1986.

www.terebess.hu/keletkultinfo/index2.html