



## Space, Alterity, Identity, and Violence: The Horizontal and the Vertical in Views of the Turkish Enemy during the Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Century<sup>1</sup>

José María Perceval<sup>2</sup>

Recibido: 13 de marzo de 2020 / Aceptado: 3 de junio de 2020 / Publicado: 3 de julio de 2020

**Abstract.** The aim of this paper is to study the process of creation of the image of the Turk in literary and visual sources, specially during 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries. This process is studied taking into account the presence of conversos (Moriscos) in the Iberian Peninsula and how this fact was important in the configuration and perception of the otherness in that moment, as well as the construction of the identity.

**Keywords:** Otherness; Turk; Identity; Violence; Image.

### [es] Espacio, alteridad, identidad y violencia: a visión horizontal. Vertical del enemigo turco durante los siglos XVI y XVII

**Resumen.** El objetivo del presente artículo es reflexionar cómo se construye la imagen del Turco en la literatura y cultura visual de los siglos XVI y XVII teniendo en cuenta también la presencia del morisco en territorio peninsular, que pudo condicionar los procesos de creación de alteridad y la construcción de identidades en la edad moderna hispánica.

**Palabras clave:** Alteridad; turco; identidad; violencia; imagen.

**Summary.** 1. Introduction. 2. The Horizontal View: Turks Surrounding the Christian City. 3. The Vertical View: The Base Passions of the Turks versus the Christians' Exalted Passions 4. Animalization, Nightmares, and Carnavalesque Ridicule. 5. Conclusions. 6. Written sources and bibliographical references.

**How to cite:** Perceval, José María. "Space, Alterity, Identity, and Violence: The Horizontal and the Vertical in Views of the Turkish Enemy during the Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Century". In *Guerra y alteridad. Imágenes del enemigo en la cultura visual de la Edad Media a la actualidad*, edited by Borja Franco Llopis. Monographic Issue, *Eikón Imago* 15 (2020): 59-74.

<sup>1</sup> This work is a part of the research Project: HAR2016-80354-P. IMPI. Antes del orientalismo: Las "imágenes" del musulmán en la Península Ibérica (siglos XV-XVII) y sus conexiones mediterráneas. PI: Borja Franco Llopis.

<sup>2</sup> Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona  
E-mail: josepmaria.perceval@uab.cat  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9769-7235>

## 1. Introduction

What is left in modern-day Spain of the images of the Turks from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries? What expressions recall them to us? The term *turco* as it is currently used in Spain can describe a “Turkish” bed; a couch called an “Ottoman”; a scapegoat (“cabeza de turco”); a kind of emotional excess (“celoso como un turco”); or a bout of heavy drinking (“pillar una turca”).

This last expression is the most popular one and it has several possible origins. We have three hypotheses in this regard:

- a) According to María Moliner’s dictionary (a dictionary of Spanish usage), the origin of this expression is connected to the expression “vino moro” (Moor’s wine). In Spain, “Moor’s wine” is wine that has not been cut with water—in other words, strong wine. In the stories told by the writer Gonzalo de Céspedes y Meneses (1585–1638)<sup>3</sup>, a dispute arises between a gentleman (“hidalgo”) of Moorish extraction and an Old Christian innkeeper. The gentleman tries to impose a fine on the tavern owner for selling an adulterated product, but the latter responds: “My wine is as diluted as your ancestry.” However, this does not explain why the expression is “pillar una turca” (to get drunk) and not “pillar una mora”? This could be due to the fact that the Spanish word *curda* (binge, bender) rhymes with *turca*.
- b) According to the religious hypothesis, the expression comes from a need among Christians to establish an antithesis between Christianity and other religions. During this period, Spaniards called Jews *marranos* (pigs), because the latter did not eat pork. Since wine was prohibited by Islam, it followed that in order for Muslims to be shown to be hypocritical, they must be represented as inveterate drunks. It is common for European histories of the Turks to describe the legendary drunkenness of the Janissaries; *Viaje de Turquía* explains the prohibition in the Quran against drinking alcohol by claiming that the Prophet himself supposedly went on a prodigious drinking spree<sup>4</sup>.
- c) A third hypothesis is based on a two-fold antithesis, both religious and military, between Christians and Muslims. When Spanish theologians and writers spoke of Turks *qua* Muslims, they said they were drunk and that their rituals aped the movements of drunkards. Therefore, the Turks were drunk on Moor’s wine—in other words, they were drunk on Islam. Likewise, the Turks are described as “blind” warriors who attack head-on like wild boars. Only drunkards would be capable of such heedless violence. This image is an example of the animalization of Turks that will be analyzed in more detail below<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Gonzalo de Céspedes y Meneses, *Historias peregrinas y ejemplares* (Madrid: Castalia, 1969).

<sup>4</sup> Fernando García Salinero ed., *Viaje de Turquía* (Madrid: Cátedra, 1980).

<sup>5</sup> José M<sup>o</sup> Perceval, “Animalitos del Señor: Aproximación a una teoría de las animalizaciones propias y del otro, sea enemigo o siervo, en la España imperial (1550-1650)”, *Áreas* 14 (1992): 173-184.

This is only one example about the uses of the Islamic-Turkish past in the present, which has a lot to do with the topics created in the Late Medieval and Early Modern period. About these views of the past I will reflect in this chapter.

## 2. The Horizontal View: Turks Surrounding the Christian City

The horizontal view of Turks is classical in its origin and is based on the notion of the Golden Mean. The center is the *polis*, the Greek world. Outside are the barbarians<sup>6</sup>. The center has specific characteristics founded on the notion of moderation—that is, the midpoint between two extremes. Outside the center, the virtues and vices of the Greeks get deformed like reflections in a fun-house mirror: they become enormous, almost monstrous.

In the center—the Greek world and, by default, the Christian world—the Golden Mean reaches its acme: its ideal is the free adult male. There is even a perfect age according to the Golden Mean: the age of maturity, neither too young nor too old.

The opposite of this man, of this virile archetype, in the Greco-Roman world were the figures of the woman, the child, and the slave. Outside the Greek world, this opposition was grafted onto entire groups of people, who were considered either feminine (feminized), infantile (infantilized) or slaves (servile). In other words, they were characterized either by effeminacy, immaturity or their inescapable subjection to a tyrant. The fact that they occupied an extreme position relative to the ideal center conferred on them exaggerated features that were the result of their distance from the moderation of the Golden Mean: they were either very happy or very sad, extremely rich or extremely poor, exceedingly cruel or deeply compassionate.

What happened when the center became decadent, when it declined?

We might imagine the Golden mean as being encircled by a kind of moral wall. The decadence of original moderation would have provoked weakness in this wall. Invaders could then penetrate through its weak points, the breaches caused by errors in the Golden Mean. This is, for example, the view of the Germanic peoples in Tacitus's *Germania*, a republican writer coming to terms with the decadence of the Roman republic as it became an imperial system. It is possible that the Germanic tribes are stronger since they retain the virile virtues that the Romans have abandoned. Christianity will add the notion of sin to the classical horizontal view of the Other: it is the Christians' sins that create the breaches in the city walls.

This paradigm was applied to the Turks in two different ways: on the one hand, the chroniclers say that the Turks invaded Christendom because of our sins<sup>7</sup>; on the other, it is the sins of Eastern Christianity, the Orthodox world (i.e., the Schism),

<sup>6</sup> François Hartog, *Le Miroir d'Hérodote. Essai sur la représentation de l'autre* (Paris: Gallimard 2001) and François Hartog, *Anciens, Modernes, Sauvages* (Paris: Galaade, 2005).

<sup>7</sup> Albert Mas, *Les Turcs dans la littérature espagnole du Siècle d'or* (Paris: Centre de Recherches Historiques, 1967), 1:174; Jerónimo de Corte Real, *Felicísima Victoria concedida del cielo al señor Don Juan de Austria, en el Golfo de Lepanto de la poderosa armada Otomana* (Lisbon: Antonio Ribero, 1578), 120; Juan Rufo, *La Austriada* (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, 1864), 2: 4.

that have opened the breach in the wall (this is the view expressed in *Viaje de Turquía*)<sup>8</sup>.

But apropos of the Golden Mean, where did Christianity —the alleged heir to the Greek world— locate its center, the center point of its world? Until the modern period, this point was situated in Jerusalem. In *La Austriada*, a work that Juan Rufo dedicated to John of Austria, the Great Turk says, “Mine is Jerusalem, which I understand / which occupied the center of geography.”<sup>9</sup> He is thus talking about the Golden Mean and the highest point on earth, the point closest to heaven<sup>10</sup>. The fact that it was held by people “from elsewhere” produced an ideological conflict and led to the crusades. All of these geo-religious issues were dealt with by Ramon Llull<sup>11</sup>. He attempted to study the enemy, to analyze him to discover the reasons for his success. He himself learned Arabic with the help of his slave in order to be able to read the Quran. He had two goals: to study its theory in order to strengthen Christianity and, at the same time, to show its statements to be false and expose its treachery. The story goes that Ramon Llull had such a burning desire to learn Arabic that his slave died of exhaustion.

Ramon Llull wavered between two possible conversion strategies: elimination of the ruling elites in order to catechize the people directly or pressuring the elites (through military intervention) to convert with the understanding that the people would follow. He had no doubt, however, that the task of converting the elites would be an easy one, since in his view, an educated people could not possibly entertain such a stupid and simple religion, one that is appropriate for the masses.

Thus, Ramon Llull inclined toward the latter strategy, which was the same one that was promoted by Ginés Pérez de Hita at the end of his book *Guerras Civiles de Granada* (1595)<sup>12</sup>. The support of such important figures for this strategy explains to a certain extent the privileged status of the aristocracy of Muslim lineage in the years directly following the conquest and the obsession with convincing them of the superiority of the Christian religion. We also find in the literature of this period constant allusions to the pashas (*bajás*), to the Great Turk’s surroundings as a profoundly Christianized space. Ramon Llull’s ideological line was taken up by Pius II’s inner circle, including Nicholas of Cusa (*La Paz de la Fe*, 1453, and *Examen Crítico del Alcorán*<sup>13</sup>) and Juan de Segovia<sup>14</sup>.

In Granada, around 1500, the inner circle of Archbishop Hernando de Talavera attempted to put Llull’s theory into practice<sup>15</sup>. This campaign was followed by Erasmians Bernardo Pérez de Chinchón, the author of the *Antialcorano* (1532)<sup>16</sup>,

<sup>8</sup> *Viaje de Turquía*, 1980, 118 and 130; Rufo, *La Austriada*, 24.

<sup>9</sup> Rufo, *La Austriada*, 57.

<sup>10</sup> The same is true for the Arabic world. Rome also claims to be the center of the world in the early modern era.

<sup>11</sup> Dominique Urvoey, *Penser l’Islam (la théorie de Ramon Llull)* (Paris: J. Urin, 1980).

<sup>12</sup> María Soledad Carrasco Urgoiti, “La cultura popular de Gines Pérez de Hita”, in *Homenaje a Don Vicente García de Diego II* (Madrid: CSIC, 1978), 1-21; and María Soledad Carrasco Urgoiti. “Perfil del pueblo morisco según Pérez de Hita (notas sobre la II parte de las Guerras civiles de Granada)”. *Revista de dialectología y tradiciones populares*, 36 (1981): 53-84.

<sup>13</sup> Nicolás de Cusa, *La paix de la foi*, suivi de *Lettre à Jean de Ségovie* (Paris: Téqui, 2008).

<sup>14</sup> Darío Cabanelas, *Juan de Segovia y el problema islámico* (Madrid: Universidad de Madrid, 1952).

<sup>15</sup> Pedro de Alcalá, *Vocabulista árabe en lengua castellana* (Granada: Juan de Varela de Salamanca, 1505); and Pedro de Alcalá, *Arte para ligeramente saver la lengua árabe* 1505 (New York: Hispanic Society, 1928).

<sup>16</sup> Bernardo Pérez de Chinchón, *Antialcorano* (Valencia: Universitat de València, 2000).

and Martín Pérez de Ayala, with his 1566 grammar<sup>17</sup>. Luis Vives published *De Europe Dissidiis et Bello Turcico* in 1526 (the title echoes what had become a common expression of the theory of the Golden Mean under attack from moral decadence), and Erasmus in his *Consultatio de Bello Turcico* (1530) said, “victory is not to kill them but to convert them,” adding, “Aside from our Christian title and the banner of the cross, we clash like Turks against Turks... Moreover, those whom we call Turks are half-Christian and closer to Christianity than are most of us”<sup>18</sup>.

The anonymous author of *Viaje de Turquía*<sup>19</sup> provides a clear picture of this Erasmian period in Spain. According to this work, Turks have enviable but extreme characteristics. The description of these virtues in comparison to Spaniards’ virtues—and defects—constitutes the work’s plot. In order to defeat the Turks, it is necessary to learn these values, to return to primitive Christianity, to cover the trenches of the moral walls. *Viaje de Turquía* tells us that the Turks are disciplined but that they are slaves<sup>20</sup>. They are clean, but excessively so. The author tells us that Turks have to return home if they “pass gas” in the street; they must wash themselves immediately<sup>21</sup>. They have simple but somewhat silly customs; their system of justice is speedy and efficient, but their punishments are cruel<sup>22</sup>. They also have a virtue that sounds strange to us in the twenty-first century: they are contemptuous of women<sup>23</sup> (contrary to the Christian armies, usually attended by numerous prostitutes) and are for the most part homosexuals<sup>24</sup>.

One of the characteristics attributed to the inhabitants “from elsewhere” by the Greeks was their slavish nature. The Persians were the quintessence of slavishness. There is a book by the Erasmian Juan Cordero entitled *Las quejas y llanto de Pompeyo donde brevemente se muestra la destrucción de la república romana. Y el hecho terrible y nunca oído de la muerte d’el hijo d’el Gran Turco Solimano dada por su mismo padre* (1566), which is a mix of Erasmus’s political texts and two essays against tyranny.

### 3. The Vertical View: The Base Passions of the Turks versus the Christians’ Exalted Passions

“Let us leave earth”

St. Teresa of Ávila (1577), *The Way of Perfection*

The vertical view provides a different structuring of the geo-ideological space, another worldview, so to speak. Turks are found in the underground of Christian passion. From this viewpoint, there is no terrestrial center but rather two poles of

<sup>17</sup> Martín Pérez de Ayala, *Doctrina cristiana en lengua árabe* (Valencia: Hijos de F. Vives, 1566).

<sup>18</sup> Marcel Bataillon, *Erasmus y España* (Mexico: F.C.E., 1966), 136.

<sup>19</sup> This work is not well known, despite the excellent book by Marcel Bataillon, *Le docteur Laguna, auteur du voyage en Turquie* (Paris: Librairie des éditions espagnoles, 1958).

<sup>20</sup> *Viaje de Turquía*, 80 and 218: “Acá todos somos esclavos”.

<sup>21</sup> On the Turks’ hygiene, see *Viaje de Turquía* 198, 234 and 230. On the excess of the baths: 234.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 98.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 109.

<sup>24</sup> “Bujarrones” is the most common accusation. *Ibid.*, 57, 207, 219, 221, 234 and 235.

attraction (above and below the earthly space). One of them, beyond the world, is the center of the *cosmos*, the privileged place of the Idea. The other, below the earth, is the origin of forces that are Titanic, inferior, Plutonic. Mankind should not in this case seek the Golden Mean but rather flee from idleness (the ease of comfort) and rise to the world of ideas —the real world, opposed to this earthly world, the world of appearances.

Gnosticism and Christianity add the idea of the fall to this view. Man has fallen in this world and must resist the attraction of evil. Man's earthly, bodily existence is imprisonment, since his ideal form is spirit, which is opposed to content, to flesh. In this view, unlike in the earlier horizontal view, our senses deceive us, and appearances are misleading.

In this vertical view, there is a cosmic drama that is unfolding, a great conflict between the realm of light (the upper realm) and the realm of darkness (the lower realm). What matters is not reality but symbols, the symbolic. The battle between form and matter leads to the notion of representation, to baroque representation, the triumph of theater, the *auto de fe* in the street and the *auto sacramental* (a play about the Eucharist) in the *corral de comedias* (a permanent theater, open to all, set up in the interior patio of a house). These manifestations are clearly not ways of knowing reality but rather demonstrations of the power of light. They provide clues and lead to clarity through the use of symbols.

How is knowledge produced according to this view? The source of knowledge is the soul, imprisoned inside the flesh. According to Zuccari, it is a flash of lightning caused directly by the Idea<sup>25</sup>. This is an elitist view. Men are divided into two kinds: those who are spiritual, who have been liberated from the flesh (see, for example, El Greco's paintings), and those who are tied to the earth<sup>26</sup>. This view is therefore hierarchical, aristocratic, mystical, and tragic. Moderation disappears, ceases to exist, in this dramatic representation.

As in the horizontal view, Turks are an extreme also in this vertical view, but now they are closer to Tartarus, more tied to the earth: all their characteristics are negative and antithetical to Christianity. They have nothing to offer. They are the army of darkness, rising up from the bottom of the earth or the sea (see Titian's Neptune in Turkish dress). The apocalyptic view of Christianity merges here with neo-Platonic aristocratism. The text of *Viaje de Turquía* reveals an ambiguous and intermediate situation in its propositions between the need to imitate the Turkish system and the complete opposition that appears after Lepanto. However, we are still in 1557, and the anonymous author of *Viaje de Turquía* calls for an opposition to Aristotelianism and, especially, Averroism<sup>27</sup> (the Arabic interpretation of Aristotelianism).

The author of *Viaje de Turquía* says, "Turks believe that they become more worthy, more zealous, when they do the reverse of what we do, and they say (...) that everything should be done opposite to the way of the Christians and they would even walk backwards if they could."<sup>28</sup> In the work there are some clear

<sup>25</sup> Definition cited by Erwin Panofsky, *Idea* (Madrid: Cátedra, 1981), 83, note 211.

<sup>26</sup> Erwin Panofsky, *Ensayos de Iconología* (Madrid: Alianza, 1985), 183.

<sup>27</sup> *Viaje de Turquía*, 162.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.* 238, 246, 253-254, 258.

oppositions having to do with food<sup>29</sup> and marriage<sup>30</sup> but also with keeping one's word.<sup>31</sup> After Lepanto, a much more complete picture will develop, as for example in Cervantes's *Los Baños de Argel* (1582), from a half century later<sup>32</sup>.

This work is organized by a series of oppositions: in dress<sup>33</sup>, language<sup>34</sup>, romantic customs<sup>35</sup>, marriage and dowry<sup>36</sup>, honoring promises and oaths<sup>37</sup>, or even sitting postures<sup>38</sup>. The characters are drawn in a way that highlights several different oppositions: the Christian children who are ready and willing to martyr themselves versus the horde of Moorish children<sup>39</sup>; the aged Pedro, who respects the martyrs, versus the *cadi* of Algiers, who wants to adopt them and sodomize them<sup>40</sup>; the true love between the Christian couple versus the immoral and adulterous love between the Algerian couple<sup>41</sup>; the Christian clown (buffoon, "el gracioso") versus the Jewish clown (the many anti-Jewish jokes in the play are told by both)<sup>42</sup>; even the two renegades express opposite positions. Cervantes follows the outline created by Diego de Haedo<sup>43</sup>.

In this vertical view, the Turks, as the forces of Tartarus (meaning that they come from below) display a lasciviousness bordering on bestiality; as the forces of Pluto, they are represented as full of greed, caprice, and cruelty. The contrast with Christians could not be more complete. Their sexual inversion is sodomy; their skin is black. They are men without faith or law, without honor, ruled by deception and insincerity, pride and arrogance. As a sign that they are descendants of the Titans, the Turks exhibit sensual, instinctual abandon (shouting, lust, drunkenness, gluttony, uncleanliness, blindness, etc.): they are made into beasts.

#### 4. Animalization, Nightmares, and Carnavalesque Ridicule

Albert Mas argues that Spanish literature conflates the Morisco, the Berber, and the Turk<sup>44</sup>. According to him, they are all jumbled together on the basis of their shared religion. In his view, Islam is the unifying force that melds these three communities into a compact unit. Moreover, the Turk —the enemy par excellence,

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 255.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 212.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 64.

<sup>32</sup> Miguel de Cervantes. *Los Baños de Argel* (Madrid: Taurus, 1983), Act. II, v. 435-438, and v. 446-447.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, Act III, v. 1059-1060.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, Act II, v. 239-244.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, Act I, v. 437-439.

<sup>36</sup> The Christian keeps his word (*Ibid.*, Act II, v. 266-268 and 750-751, and Act III, v. 698-751). They on the other hand are "faithless infidels", *Ibid.*, Act III, v. 50, and in Act II, v. 1140-1142, the *cadi* says: "the blasphemous Mohammed himself".

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, Act III, v. 1059-1060.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, Act II, v. 604.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, Act I, v. 667 and Act II, v. 602-603.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, Act II, v. 889-893.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, Act II, v. 377-424 and v. 794-848; Act III, v. 22-25, v. 256-257, v. 493-503, and v. 803-806.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, Act I, v. 775-881.

<sup>43</sup> Diego de Haedo. *Topographia e Historia de Argel* (Valladolid: Diego Fernández de Córdoba y Oviedo, 1612), chap. XI, 9.

<sup>44</sup> Albert Mas. *Les Turcs dans la littérature espagnole du Siècle d'or* (Paris: Centre de Recherches Historiques, 1967).

“Christianity’s common foe,” as he is described in the texts—is more fully represented, while images of the other two serve only an auxiliary function. This hypothesis allows Mas to transpose accounts about Moriscos or Berbers onto the image he offers us of the Turk, in order to make it more complete. It is true that, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, most Spanish writers tended to group all of Spain’s enemies, and not only Islam, into a single enemy conspiring against the Catholic Monarchy.

But, there are three problems with Mas’s hypothesis. First, he sees this unifying trend, which appears after the defeat of Philip II, as going back to the beginning of the sixteenth century.

Secondly, Mas fails to see that this accusation of universal conspiracy constitutes a tragic reflection on a country that the author considers to be “sick,” on Spanish decadence, and on the call for national renewal, for “regeneration” (the term is highly significant).

Thirdly, most writers made distinctions between Turks, Moriscos, and Berbers, even during the period in which there was maximum conflation of all of Spain’s enemies, and even in the period when there was a division of North Africans into citizens and nomads. This classification is provided by Haedo in his *Topografía e Historia de Argel* and is taken up by Cervantes in *Don Quixote*<sup>45</sup>, and was previously outlined in Bernardo Pérez de Chinchón’s *Antialcorano*<sup>46</sup>. Citizens were usually referred to as *moros*, and nomads as *alárabes* or *moros nómadas*. However, we might add Bernardo de Aldrete’s description in his book *Varias Antigüedades de España, África y otras provincias*:

Such is the life of the nomadic Moors who live in the deserts and in the country and mountain villages. The civilians, or members of the *polis*, who live in the cities, are very different, but they are all of the same substance<sup>47</sup>.

This work was written in 1614, at the height of this tendency toward conflation, and Aldrete presented in it the absolute vertical view in which Arabs are cave dwellers who come from darkness, and they are represented as cave dwelling animals. “It is as if the Arab troglodytes took with them to Africa the name of Barbarians that Arrian had given them, as well as Herodotus and others who said that their speech was like the shrieking of bats and that their tongue was barbarian”<sup>48</sup>.

The animalization of Muslims is more common in the vertical view. The Spanish neo-Platonic writer Pedro Soto de Rojas exemplified animalization in the speech he gave to the Granada Academy in 1619, which he reproduced as the introduction to his *Fragmentos de Adonis*, published in 1652. This polemical text is very interesting because in it Soto attacks the notion of idleness (the Roman *otium*):

The depraved are equivalent to animals (...) and it is true that if we look at animals without reason, they are made of the same elements that we are, and like

<sup>45</sup> Miguel de Cervantes, *Quijote*, I, edited by Martín de Riquer (Barcelona: Austral, 1980), 1: 39.

<sup>46</sup> Pérez de Chinchón, *Antialcorano*, 170.

<sup>47</sup> Bernardo de Aldrete, *Varias Antigüedades de España, África y otras provincias* (Amberes: Iuan Hafrey, 1614), 402.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 448.

us, they are our fellow inhabitants of this part of the world. They enjoy the fruit that the merciful earth produces as common food, as well as the light that informs truth. They are unworthy of imitation, yet we find examples among them, though these be of astonishing cruelty, bouts of rage, expressions of greed, and many similar signs that are the effects of only the senses and appetites<sup>49</sup>.

First I will analyze the terms that the writers used to animalize all Muslims, terms that could also be applied to Protestants or the French, or to anyone who opposed the power of light, truth, Catholicism, Spain. The opposition lamb/wolf<sup>50</sup> seems to me a classic example that originated with a traditional Indo-European tale. With the advent of Christianity, the lamb acquired a mystical dimension: bread as the essential source of nourishment was conflated with or assimilated to Christ (the Eucharist is the divine lamb). Christ will also be the good shepherd. The flock is divided between the shepherds (the priests) and the flock (the faithful, the people). The Church plays the lead role, although the equation between lamb and Christ is maintained. The lamb is an animal that is edible, tender, profitable and usable. It is also an animal that is instinctively gregarious, that the good shepherd must protect, and that wolves attack: a weak being. There are no allusions or metaphors to be found of a warrior defined as a lamb except in the case<sup>51</sup> of a king: a lion to his enemies, but a lamb to his own people. The Turks are “wolves”,<sup>52</sup> the Berbers howl like wolves (“howling of wolves and crying of marabouts”)<sup>53</sup>, Algiers is a city where wolves howl from the minarets.

While the traditional enemy is the wolf, the cunning and deceptive enemy is the fox, which specializes in stealing from farms (hens, rabbits, etc.). In Spain this image was not commonly used save in the case of *alfaquis*, who were described as deceitful animals during the assimilationist period, and Moors, the invaders of Spain (“the bloodthirsty, predatory wolves and vixens that set fire all the way to the Pyrenees”)<sup>54</sup>. In general, the Moriscos were not referred to as wolves because the wolf is, after all, a dangerous, worthy, and valiant animal, while the Moriscos were considered to be a horde of cowardly animals (they were compared to hens). The Moriscos were beasts but hardly dangerous (“Untamed beasts”)<sup>55</sup>.

In any case, it was always best to be careful: “Listen to what happened many a time, when a wolf cub was raised in some house, and after being there for one or three months, and after years of being well trained, in the end it attacked its master’s mule or horse or cattle” (in reference to the Moriscos, who were said to carry betrayal in their hearts)<sup>56</sup>.

<sup>49</sup> Pedro Soto de Rojas, *Paraíso cerrado para muchos, jardines abiertos para pocos, con los fragmentos de Adonis* (Madrid: Cátedra, 1981), 147-148.

<sup>50</sup> “Cordero” is the main term used by writers to describe King Philip III. Damián Fonseca, *Justa Expulsión de los moros de España* (Roma: Iacomo Mascardo, 1610); and Marcos de Guadalaxara, *Memorable Expulsión y Iustissimo destierro de los moriscos de España* (Pamplona: Nicolas de Assiayn, 1613).

<sup>51</sup> Jaime Bleda, *Corónica de los moros de España* (Valencia: Felipe Mey, 1620), 913. “Lobos carniceros y rabiosos” (bloodthirsty, rabid wolves), and *Ibid.*, 882.

<sup>52</sup> *Viaje de Turquía*, 195; Rufo, *La Austriada*, 19, 134.

<sup>53</sup> Haedo, *Topographia*, 21.

<sup>54</sup> Rufo, *La Austriada*, 45; Guadalaxara, *Memorable Expulsión*, 150.

<sup>55</sup> Alcalá, *Arte para ligeramente*, II.

<sup>56</sup> Guadalaxara, *Memorable expulsión*, 71.

The opposition dove/crow is religious in origin: the dove is the symbol of the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Holy Trinity, while the crow is its opposite by virtue of its dark color, in addition to its treacherous nature (there is a common saying in Spain about ingratitude: “feed a crow and it will gouge out your eyes”<sup>57</sup>).

The dove is also a symbol of purity and virginity. In Spain, the Virgin Mary is called “the white dove”. An extreme illustration of the use of birds that are bad omens to represent Muslims is the equivalency drawn by Aldrete between the Arabic language and the “shrieking of bats”<sup>58</sup>.

The opposite of wolves and foxes is the lion. The lion is a heraldic animal and even appears on the coat of arms of Spain’s royal house. John of Austria, who is typically associated with the eagle of the Habsburgs<sup>59</sup>, is also associated with the lion, which is the embodiment of the solitary, noble hunter.

Opposed to the lion is the dog, which Spaniards considered contemptible, because it scrounges and steals<sup>60</sup>. The exception was the greyhound, because it is a hunting dog. *Perro* was a term commonly used to refer to Muslims by Haedo<sup>61</sup> and Cervantes<sup>62</sup>, whose anti-Morisco book is titled *El coloquio de los perros*. This was by far the most common way to refer to Muslims as animals: there is an almost geometric progression in the frequency of its use during the sixteenth century, beginning with Vicente Roca’s book, *Historia de los Turcos* (12 occurrences), and *Viaje de Turquía* (4 occurrences), up to Cervantes’s *Baños de Argel* (36 occurrences)<sup>63</sup>.

The eagle/serpent opposition is typical of the vertical view, although the two animals come to this opposition by different routes<sup>64</sup>. They physically occupy the highest and the lowest planes in the animal world; one is closest to heaven, and the other, closest to earth. The nature of the serpent is established by the biblical story about original sin. An expression frequently used in reference to Moriscos was: “calentar una serpiente en su seno” (to warm a snake at his breast)<sup>65</sup>. The eagle is normally the king or military chief but also religion, in Spain.

The opposition falcon/sparrow hawk comes from falconry, which is a noble art that was introduced in Spain —or, at least, codified— by the Burgundian court.

<sup>57</sup> Rufo, *La Austriada*, 32. He also calls them “arpías de Mahoma” (Muhammad’s harpies) and “trasgos” (hobgoblins), *Ibid.*, 39.

<sup>58</sup> According to Bleda, “relinchan” (they neigh) when they speak. Bleda, *Corónica*, 1002.

<sup>59</sup> Rufo, *La Austriada*, 27 and 134. On the eagle, see Alain Boureau, *L’Aigle, chronique politique d’un emblème* (Paris: Cerf, 1986). The title of a dramatic work by Luis Vélez de Guevara about the Battle of Lepanto is *El Águila de agua* (2003).

<sup>60</sup> “España produce fieras y África humildes lebreles” (Spain produces ferocious beasts and Africa weak greyhounds), Rufo, *La Austriada*, 21, 50 and 73. Mas, *Les Turcs*, 223: “los términos ‘perro’, ‘perrazo’ se utilizan continuamente” (the terms *dog* and *mongrel* are used repeatedly).

<sup>61</sup> Haedo, *Topographia*, 21.

<sup>62</sup> Miguel de Cervantes, *Coloquio de los perros* (Madrid: Castalia, 1965).

<sup>63</sup> “Rindieronse los perrazos”, “cuando lo vieron los perros” (the mongrels surrendered, when the dogs saw it), Santiago Álvarez Gamero, “Nueve romances sobre la Expulsión de los moriscos”, *Revue Hispanique* 23 (1915): 420-438.

<sup>64</sup> See Borja Franco Llopis, “Images of Islam in the Ephemeral Spanish Art: a first approach”, *Capitale Culturale* ext. 6 (2017): 87-116.

<sup>65</sup> “Como si una mujer temerosa criase una serpiente en el regazo y tuviese con paciencia ascuas de fuego encendidas en el seno” (As if a timorous woman were to rear a serpent on her lap and were to patiently have embers of fire lit at her breast), Bleda, *Corónica*, 873. “Cómo el que arroja de su seno la serpiente que le está royendo las entrañas” (Like one who tears from his breast a serpent that is eating into his heart). Miguel de Cervantes, *Persiles y Segismunda* (Madrid: Castalia, 1966), I, III, chap. XI, 356.

Many books were published on the theory of falconry up to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The falcon, which is the ideal hunting bird, contrasts naturally with the sparrow hawk and other flying animals that eat carrion. This is a military image that is not found in religious texts or texts written by clergymen<sup>66</sup>.

Normally, Turks were referred to using these descriptive terms (that is, crow, wolf, serpent, dog, carrion bird) in the context of the opposition between Christianity and Islam. The tiger, the panther, and the wild boar appeared in the context of combat between a Christian and a Turkish knight<sup>67</sup>.

The Turk specifically was most commonly associated with a bear. This comparison did not originate in Spain; rather, it appeared in a translation of Paolo Giovio, in which the Great Turk is described as a bear, Barbarossa as a wild boar, and Charles V as a lion<sup>68</sup>. The bear character would enjoy some success on the stage. The Turk on stage needed to be big, with a heavy, clumsy step and a gruff voice. The probable origin of this stereotype is the equation of Turks with Scythians, who came down out of the Ural Mountains<sup>69</sup>. In *La Austriada*, Juan Rufo uses the term *escita* (Scythian) fourteen times.

Over time, the animals to which the Muslims were compared became more and more exotic. In 1609, Cristóbal de Virués wrote, in a long poem about the glory of Lepanto, “Death to the Ottoman crocodile.”<sup>70</sup> Exoticism was used to separate the Turks further and further from Christian society.

It was necessary to describe Turkish soldiers as aggressive but disciplined, since their power came from their blind subordination to the orders of their leader, who held the reins of the state in his hands (the Great Turk tamed his subjects and ruled over his soldiers with an iron hand), restraining their passions. Thus, the term *caballo* (horse) was used to refer to the Janissaries, who were regarded as a stable of thoroughbred horses. The term appears in Vicente Roca, when he speaks of the Great Turk. Roca praises Suleiman for not sodomizing young Janissaries, though he trained them like the king of Spain trained the good thoroughbred horses left to him by his predecessors in the Kingdom of Naples:

These *bardaxas* (young Janissaries) serve the diabolical appetites of the Turk if he fancies them, and therefore they are usually very handsome and well dressed. They never leave the harem, and they are trained in many manly pursuits and exercises. Suleiman is famous for not indulging in this vice, but because of his

<sup>66</sup> “Nebf”, Rufo, *La Austriada*, 27 and 52; “Halcón”, *Ibid.*, 134; “No da lugar a que como milanos (los reyes de España) se abatan a esas sabandijas, guzalapas y caza de poca importancia” (He is unmoved by how the monarchs of Spain, like eagle rays, swoop down on those vermin, those worms and other worthless prey), Bleda, *Corónica*, 917.

<sup>67</sup> Military episodes in Cyprus and at Lepanto, in Rufo, *La Austriada*; and Jerónimo Corte Real, *Felicitísima Victoria concedida del cielo al señor Don Juan de Austria, en el Golfo de Lepanto de la poderosa armada Otomana* (Lisbon: Antonio Ribero, 1578).

<sup>68</sup> “Y como osa brava fiera / agora en sus cavernas solo atiende / al modo y manera de nuestra perdición” (And like a wild and ferocious she-bear / in her den she cares only / for the mode and manner of our perdition). Gaspar de Baeza, *Elogios o vidas breves de los caballeros antiguos y modernos* (Granada: Hugo de Mena, 1548); Mas, *Les Turcs*, 93-98 and 254.

<sup>69</sup> The author of *Crotalón* imagines a foul beast mounted by a monstrous serpent that spews its venom over the greater part of the earth, coming down from the Riphean Mountains (the Urals), and heading toward Thrace. Cristóbal de Villalón, *El Crotalón* (Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1973), 198-199; Mas, *Les Turcs*, 28.

<sup>70</sup> Cristóbal de Virués, *Egloga de la batalla naval* (Madrid: Esteban Bogia, 1609); Mas, *Les Turcs*, 208.

greatness he keeps those youths in the harem in order to preserve their race, just as our king does with the breeding of horses in the Kingdom of Naples, a practice that was passed on to him by previous kings<sup>71</sup>.

The term *domar* (to tame, domesticate) is used in Roca and in *Viaje en Turquía* to refer to the training of these youths<sup>72</sup>. It is even asserted that the soles of the feet of Turkish messengers are shod with iron in order for them to reach their destination more quickly. The identification of horses with Janissaries appears in the descriptions of battles: the Spanish terms *frenar* (to curb), *refrenar* (rein in), *embocar* (put in the mouth) all allude to the use of a bit. Although the use of the bit signified defeat, it also demonstrated the superiority of the handler. When the text uses this term to refer to the Great Turk, it alludes to the necessity of reining in his ambitions.

Whereas in the horizontal view, Turks are represented as being excessive, in the vertical view they are wild animals. The Great Turk is not able to master his passions and descends into the abyss. Here, the dragon, the most sinister of all animals, appears: a cave-dweller and the typical embodiment of the knight's clash with the forces of evil, the dragon is an aristocratic image<sup>73</sup>.

In the horizontal view in *Viaje en Turquía*, the Turks are said to have only one saint, Saint George<sup>74</sup>. This is a transposition, a search for equivalencies with the Christian saints: where the Christian saints praise kindness, the Turkish saint extols force. It is also a matter of signaling the warlike nature of the Turks, who constitute a kind of brotherhood of Saint George. But *Viaje en Turquía*, which was influenced by Erasmus, also uses the image of Saint George to criticize the large number of Christian saints: the Turks have only one and that is enough, especially since he is a highly useful saint. This is the Erasmian critique of the profusion of relics and pilgrims. Saint George has a specific objective and does not go roaming about.

In the vertical view there is a radical change and a natural movement. The Turks are no longer Saint George but rather the dragon slayed by the Christian Saint George. And in the end, the Turk-dragon will become a shapeless beast, a monster, an amalgam of all the terrors in the Bible and in classical antiquity, from the Beast of the Apocalypse to the Chimera.

Aznar Cardona gives us, in this 1612 vertical view, a perfect illustration of the Beast, in reference to the Moriscos:

<sup>71</sup> Vicente Roca, *Historia en la qual se trata de la origen y guerras que han tenido los turcos* (Valencia: Juan Blas Navarro, 1556), 146.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, 131.

<sup>73</sup> Francesco Sorce, "Il drago come immagine del nemico turco nella rappresentazione di età moderna", *Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale d'Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte* 62-63 (2007-2008): 173-198. "One common aspect shared, albeit to very different degrees, by texts and images is the phenomenon of dehumanization, typical of offensive representations. In literature, for example, abusive metaphors and similes comparing Turks to animals generally considered dangerous or ignoble, were regularly used. The most common formulaic epithet – "dog" – was used systematically, both in elevated and more popular writing, as an indication of the "low" nature of the targets of polemical attacks. In the visual context, on the other hand, the metaphor of the monster, typically depicted as a dragon, is practically exclusive".

<sup>74</sup> *Viaje en Turquía*, 244.

And matching each of the above-mentioned heresiarchs with a stained part to produce this monstrous composition, that deformed beast then appeared, composed and forged out of a great diversity of different patches and skins, which the prophet Daniel described literally, calling it a Pard, [that is] variegated, mixed, patched and made up of a thousand pieces, a living portrait of the Chimera with the body of a wolf, the head of a camel, the mouth of a serpent, the ears of a dog, the wings of a bat, the hands of a man, the bristle of a wild boar, the spines of a hedgehog, and finally the color of dun, since this is the color that best covers and masks any kind of stain or filth<sup>75</sup>.

During the seventeenth century, the Turk, as an archetype, seeped into the world of dreams, the world of distortions. The figure became so monstrous that it was easily ridiculed, spawning the conventions associated with *turqueries*. On the stage, the Turk was a drunken bear moving slowly and awkwardly. In comedies, he was a loud-mouthed braggart who would run away at the first sign of difficulty. He was, paradoxically, similar to the stereotype of the Spanish soldier. During Carnival, he was a vain, affected, and pretentious braggart, flashily dressed, unrestrained in his appetites, and surrounded by his harem. Christian Europe, in order to overcome its fear of the Turk, reduced him to a ridiculous stock figure in *turqueries*.

## 5. Conclusions

Sixteenth and seventeenth century Spanish views of Turkey and the Turk (as an archetype) were indebted to the anti-Islamic tradition, but only in part. For one thing, the outlook changed as a result of the firm belief of Ramon Llull and his followers (which should be studied in more detail than it has been) that it was impossible for Muslim aristocratic elites to actually believe in the precepts of Islam. Either they were deceived or, for some perverse reason, they were deceiving and seducing the brutish and credulous masses.

For another, this image harks back to the Greek view of barbarians, both Scythians and Persians. Paradoxically, the Turks take on the two contradictory roles of a nomadic people (the Scythians) and at the same time a stable empire (the Persians). The idea of the warlike savagery of nomads is combined with the view of a people subjugated by a tyrant. These two different ideas —the battle against the barbarian and the rebellion against tyranny and absolutism— would play off each other in the European understanding of the Turks and the Great Turk.

On the basis of this motley, contradictory understanding, an image was constructed that was projected in two directions. We have called these directions

---

<sup>75</sup> "Y concurriendo cada uno de los heresiarcas sobredichos con una parte manchada, en la fabricación de esta monstruosa composición, apareció compuesta, y resultó forjada aquella bestia disforme, de tanta diversidad de manchas y pelos diferentes, de quien dijo el profeta Daniel a la letra, nombrándola Pardo, varia revuelta, mezclada, remendada, hecha de mil retazos, retrato vivo de la Quimera con cuerpo de lobo, cabeza de camello, boca de culebra, orejas de perro, alas de murciélago, manos de hombre, cerdas de jabalí, espinas de erizo; y finalmente de color pardo, por ser color, en quien se incorpora mejor, y se disimula mucho cualquier mancilla o suciedad". Pedro Aznar Aznar Cardona, *Expulsión justificada de los moriscos españoles* (Huesca: Pedro Cabarte, 1613), 1: 156.

the horizontal view and the vertical view of the Turks (actually, they are two views of alterity that can be extended to other societies and groups of people). These two views were constantly facing off against one another, though we do see that in Spain, to a certain extent, one followed the other chronologically: in the first half of the sixteenth century, an Erasmian, horizontal view predominated, while in the second half of that century and especially after the Battle of Lepanto, the opposite view—the vertical view—came to prevail.

In the horizontal view, it is the Christian who must control, master, curb his passions in order to be able to vigorously combat the Other. If the Turk prevails, it will be because he has certain virtues—though exaggerated or deceptive—that the Christian has abandoned or perverted. The enemy enters through the flanks of the wall, which are these weak points. This view uses the “Other” to criticize and promote the reform of one’s own society: only through the Christian’s transformation, his metamorphosis in the quest for original purity, can the Turk be defeated. The Erasmian view, or the view of Luis Vives, is not pro-Turk, as some have claimed; rather, it advocated a reform of Christianity in order to defeat the Turk. There was clear reflection about the tyranny of absolute government (in the image of the Persians).

In the vertical vision, the outlook changes radically. This is an idealized vision in which the Christian must strain heavenward in search of glory and cast off the earth and the mud, the matter that befouls spirituality. The Turks are associated with the passions and defects from which the Christian must flee in order to rise toward divinity. These passions—and the people who represent it—emerge from the underworld, from Tartarus, from darkness; they oppose the virtue, light, grace, and heaven that have been promised to the good Christian through victory. Lepanto is not a military victory but a victory of Christian spirituality over evil. This view will lead to the archetype of the Turk as a representative of the distorted world that produces nightmarish and terrifying visions as well as the amusing, carnivalesque figures seen in *turqueries*.

These are prejudices that predate any contact or association with real Turks, and they create an imaginary archetype, but the first view is comprehensive and produces a desire to learn about the Other in order to better oneself: it is optimistic, refreshing, curious. The second view rejects knowledge of the Other and desires nothing more than the Other’s eventual elimination: it is pessimistic, reductive, and closed.

Following the Battle of Lepanto, in the allegorical painting that the Spanish government commissioned from Titian, giving him very precise specifications, King Philip is portrayed offering up his son Fernando Víctor (from “victory”) to heaven: in the upper part of the painting, the heavens open and an angel carrying a palm branch to symbolize victory takes up the little prince; in the middle part, the Battle of Lepanto can be seen in the background; and below, the Turk is shown chained, like a Titan in the depths of the sea. There could be no more conclusive evidence that the vertical vision ultimately prevailed in Spain.

#### 4. Written Sources and Bibliographical References

- Alcalá, Pedro de. *Vocabulista arábigo en lengua castellana*. Granada: Juan de Varela de Salamanca, 1505.
- Alcalá, Pedro de. *Arte para ligeramente saver la lengua arábigo* 1505. New York: Hispanic Society, 1928.
- Aldrete, Bernardo de. *Varias Antigüedades de España, África y otras provincias*. Amberes: Juan Hafrey, 1614.
- Álvarez Gamero, Santiago. “Nueve romances sobre la Expulsión de los moriscos”. *Revue Hispanique* 23 (1915): 420-438.
- Aznar Cardona, Pedro. *Expulsión justificada de los moriscos españoles*. Huesca: Pedro Cabarte, 1613.
- Baeza, Gaspar de. *Elogios o vidas breves de los caballeros antiguos y modernos*. Granada: Hugo de Mena, 1548.
- Bataillon, Marcel. *Le docteur Laguna, auteur du voyage en Turquie*. Paris: Librairie des éditions espagnoles, 1958.
- Bataillon, Marcel. *Erasmus y España*. Mexico: F.C.E., 1966.
- Bleda, Jaime. *Corónica de los moros de España*. Valencia: Felipe Mey, 1620.
- Boureau, Alain. *L'Aigle, chronique politique d'un emblème*. Paris: Cerf, 1986.
- Cabanelas, Darío. *Juan de Segovia y el problema islámico*. Madrid: Universidad de Madrid, 1952.
- Carrasco Urgoiti, María Soledad. “La cultura popular de Gines Pérez de Hita”. In *Homenaje a Don Vicente García de Diego II*. Madrid: CSIC, 1978: 1-21.
- Carrasco Urgoiti, María Soledad. “Perfil del pueblo morisco según Pérez de Hita (notas sobre la II parte de las Guerras civiles de Granada)”. *Revista de dialectología y tradiciones populares* 36 (1981): 53-84.
- Cervantes, Miguel de. *Coloquio de los perros*. Madrid: Castalia, 1965.
- Cervantes, Miguel de. *Persiles y Segismunda*. Madrid: Castalia, 1966.
- Cervantes, Miguel de. *Quijote*, I, edited by Martin de Riquer, Barcelona: Austral, 1980.
- Cervantes, Miguel de. *Los Baños de Argel*. Madrid: Taurus, 1983.
- Céspedes y Meneses, Gonzalo de. *Historias peregrinas y ejemplares*. Madrid: Castalia, 1969.
- Corte Real, Jerónimo. *Felicísima Victoria concedida del cielo al señor Don Juan de Austria, en el Golfo de Lepanto de la poderosa armada Otomana*. Lisbon: Antonio Ribero, 1578.
- Cusa, Nicolás de. *La paix de la foi, suivi de Lettre à Jean de Ségovie*. Paris: Téqui, 2008.
- Fonseca, Damián. *Justa Expulsión de los moros de España*. Roma: Iacomo Mascardo, 1610.
- Franco Llopis, Borja. “Images of Islam in the Ephemeral Spanish Art: a first approach”. *Capitale Culturelle* 6 (2017): 87-116.
- Guadalaxara, Marcos de. *Memorable Expulsión y Iustissimo destierro de los moriscos de España*. Pamplona: Nicolas de Assiayn, 1613.
- Haedo, Diego de. *Topographia e Historia de Argel*. Valladolid: Diego Fernández de Córdoba y Oviedo, 1612.
- Hartog, François. *Le Miroir d'Hérodote. Essai sur la représentation de l'autre*. Paris: Gallimard 2001.
- Hartog, François. *Antiens, Modernes, Sauvages*. Paris: Galaade, 2005.
- Mas, Albert. *Les Turcs dans la littérature espagnole du Siècle d'or*. Paris: Centre de Recherches Historiques, 1967.

- Panofsky, Erwin. *Idea*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1981.
- Panofsky, Erwin. *Ensayos de Iconología*. Madrid: Alianza, 1985.
- Perceval, José M. “Animalitos del Señor: Aproximación a una teoría de las animalizaciones propias y del otro, sea enemigo o siervo, en la España imperial (1550-1650)”. *Áreas* 14 (1992): 173-184.
- Pérez de Ayala, Martín. *Doctrina cristiana en lengua arábica*. Valencia: Hijos de F. Vives, 1566.
- Pérez de Chinchón, Bernardo. *Antialcorano*. Valencia: Universitat de València, 2000.
- Poumarède, Géraud. *Pour en finir avec la Croisade. Mythes et réalités de la lutte contre les Turcs aux XVIe et XVII siècles*. Paris: PUF, 2004.
- Roca, Vicente. *Historia en la qual se trata de la origen y guerras que han tenido los turcos*. Valencia: Juan Blas Navarro, 1556.
- Rufo, Juan. *La Austriada*. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, 1864.
- Sorce, Francesco. “Il drago come immagine del nemico turco nella rappresentazione di età moderna”. *Rivista dell’Istituto Nazionale d’Archeologia e Storia dell’Arte* 62-63 (2007-2008): 173-198.
- Sorce, Francesco. “Conflictual Allegories: The Image of the Turk as the Enemy in Italian Renaissance Art”. In *15th International Congress of Turkish Art*, 553-567. Ankara: Ministry of Culture, 2018.
- Soto de Rojas, Pedro. *Paráiso cerrado para muchos, jardines abiertos para pocos, con los fragmentos de Adonis*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1981.
- Urvoy, Dominique. *Penser l’Islam (la théorie de Ramon Llull)*. París: J. Urin, 1980.
- Vélez de Guevara, Luis. *El Águila de agua*. Newark: Juan de la Cuesta, Hispanic Monographs, 2003.
- García Salinero, Fernando ed. *Viaje de Turquía*, ed.. Madrid: Cátedra, 1980.
- Viaje de Turquía*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1965.
- Villalón, Cristóbal de. *El Crotalón*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1973.
- Virués, Cristóbal de. *Egloga de la batalla naval*. Madrid: Esteban Bogia, 1609.