6. The Attraction of Repulsion: Charles Colville Frankland's *Travels to and from Constantinople* (1829)

The previous chapter has examined how the ideal of global civility starts to crack under the pressure of trafficking in human lives towards the end of the eighteenth century. Coupled with the politically turbulent context of the 1790s, as well as the 'controversy of sentimentalism,'[1] George Barrington and Mary Ann Parker's encounters with various categories of social, cultural and racial difference on the way to Australia illustrate how cross-cultural curiosity, the readiness to be favourably impressed and discursive inclusiveness give way to representational ambivalence, distance or even aloofness. Since European representations of the Islamic world are subject to a similar shift, we return to the Ottoman Empire in the present chapter in order to explore the emergence of what Edward Said has described as modern Orientalism by discussing Captain Charles Colville Frankland's *Travels to and from Constantinople* (1829).[2] Frankland's account is at once sensitive to the peculiarities of the Ottoman world and aggressively biased in many of its judgments. This situation is connected to, and complicated by, the rise of European colonial ambitions and the political turmoil in the Levant in the first half of the nineteenth century. For example, Frankland advises other travellers 'to learn a few Arabic or Turkish phrases of civility and salutation', adding that 'civility costs noth-

1 Markman Ellis, *The Politics of Sensibility: Race, Gender and Commerce in the Sentimental Novel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 190.

2 Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (1978; rpt. London: Penguin, 1995) 3.

ing.'[3] At the same time, however, he devalues the worth of such cross-cultural exchange by pouring scorn on 'the never-changing manners of the East.'[4] Moving in this field of tension between favourable representation and civilizational prejudice, Frankland's account both contributes to modern Orientalism and sheds light on the changing nature of global civility.

In what follows, I will examine how the large-scale incorporation of already existing evidence in order to substantiate and qualify one's eye-witness account contributes to the genesis of self-referential levels within selected cultural texts and the societies in which they circulate. In doing so, I demonstrate that discursive practices, such as Orientalism, are much more complex and multi-layered than straightforward periodisations suggest, as well as how individual or collective cultural agents – in this case, travellers – actively contribute to their formations. In the first part of this chapter, I follow Frankland's journey through the Balkans to Istanbul and discuss his encounters with Muslims and Ottoman imperial culture. As soon as he reaches Istanbul, his judgments become less ambivalent and more temperate as he witnesses the Sultan and the greatness of his imperial centre. At this point, I will pause in order to examine his 'Remarks and Notes' on Istanbul, which he inserted after his return to England. This part of the chapter will explore and contextualise the emergence of Saids's notion of modern Orientalism as citational system by looking at the ways in which Frankland borrows from Comte ***Andréossy's*** *Constantinople et le Bosphore de Thrace* (1828). It seems that the captain put more trust in the former French ambassador's account than in his own observations. But despite both Frankland's lack of informational depth and his shortcomings as a writer, the *Travels* illustrates Said's crucial assertion that '[e]very writer on the Orient (and this is true even of Homer) assumes some Oriental precedent, some previous knowledge of the Orient, to which he refers and on which he relies.'[5] From here, I continue retracing Frankland's journey and follow his footsteps in Greater Syria where he has to cope with the pleasures and hardships of extreme travel in the east. The last part of this

3 Charles Colville Frankland, *Travels to and from Constantinople in 1827 and 1828*, 2nd ed., vol. 2 (London: Henry Colburn, 1830), 180. All further references are to this edition. Roman numerals indicate the respective volume.

4 Charles Colville Frankland, *Travels to and from Constantinople in 1827 and 1828*, 2nd ed., vol. 1 (London: Henry Colburn, 1830), 96. All further references are to this edition. Roman numerals indicate the respective volume.

5 Said, *Orientalism*, 20.

chapter examines the historical reverberations of the multi-cultural Mediterranean in Frankland's day. It explores the way in which both sea and desert retain their essentially cross-cultural features even as Eurocentrism becomes the dominant paradigm through which other cultures are being represented in the course of the nineteenth century.

Of course, the main voice in this chapter belongs to Charles Colville Frankland, who was born in Bath in 1797 and had risen to the rank of admiral by 1875.[6] A multilingual, widely travelled and 'hardened explorer'[7], he died a year later after having served in South America and undertaken extensive journeys to the Islamic World and North-eastern Europe. Unfortunately, only little is known about this prolific, if sometimes dull, traveller-writer, who befriended the famous Lady Hester Stanhope on his journey through the Ottoman Empire. In 1829, he published *Travels to and from Constantinople* (2 vols.), which was followed by *Narrative of a Visit to the Courts of Russia and Sweden* three years later. In both accounts, there is a complex tension between his frequent complaints about indigenous peoples, customs and institutions, and a readiness to shower praise upon specific aspects of the cultures he encounters. Greedy Scandinavian innkeepers and Baltic seamanship irritate him tremendously, whilst the city of Helsinki and selected stretches of landscape offer breathtakingly beautiful views.[8] The same holds true for Ottoman lands, where, at least in Frankland's representations of the Sultan's dominions, still-existing signs of imperial greatness and audacious reforms under Mahmud II alternate with denigratory stereotypes frequently gleaned from other accounts. Accordingly, contemporary reviewers and 'critics thought little of his outbursts,' attacking him not only for the poor quality of his information, but also for being 'too hasty a traveller to make his account valuable.'[9] But the tensions in his writing and the ambivalent nature of his feelings towards the Ottoman Empire allow us to trace the emergence of Orientalist discourses and firmly to root them in tangible historical and political circumstances – in this case, in the troubled Levant that Frankland experienced in the late 1820s.

---

6 For a short account of Frankland's life consult: Reinhold Schiffer, *Oriental Panorama: British Travellers in Nineteenth Century Turkey* (Amsterdam & Atlanta, GA: Rodopi, 1999), 373-4.

7 Tony Lurcock, *'Not So Barren or Uncultivated:' British Travellers in Finland, 1760-1830* (London: CB Edictions, 2010), 178.

8 Ibid., 171, 180, 182 and 184.

9 Schiffer, *Oriental Panorama*, 374.

Travelling during the Greek uprising and between the two major Ottoman reform efforts in the first half of the nineteenth century – the *Nizam-ı Cedid* ('New Order') under Selim III and the *Tanzimat* ('Re-Ordering') under both Abdülmecid I and Abdülaziz I –, Frankland was in Istanbul only one year after the Janissaries had been abolished (1827). However, eulogising this move during his time in the capital does not prevent him from claiming 'that the Ottoman nation is the bitterest enemy to the human race, and the severest scourge that ever was sent by Providence to chastise mankind' (I, 187) when he is back in England. British views of the Ottomans in this period were indeed ambivalent and gave rise to the so-called Eastern Question: [10] the crumbling power of Ottoman Turkey created a vacuum, which Russian imperial ambitions threatened to fill. In order to prevent the Russians from expanding their spheres of influence, Western powers developed a strategic relationship with the Ottomans and supported them if it served their interests. At mid-century, this intricate triadic arrangement led to the Crimean War, in which Britain, France and the Ottoman Empire fought against the authoritarian rule of Tsar Nicholas I.[11] Thus, both the West's ambivalent relationship with the East and Frankland's seemingly contradictory sentiments call for a careful and nuanced reading that starts where this chapter's protagonist started, namely with the 'wonderful revolution [that] had just taken place at Constantinople' (I, 1).

1. Captain Frankland and the Ottoman World

The Sultan's audacious efforts at reforming 'one of the most extraordinary and interesting empires of the earth' (I, 1) attracted the attention of Charles Colville Frankland of the Royal Navy. Both 'the grandeur of the supposed Barbarian Emperor's character' and the desire 'to see with [his] own eyes that admirable man' (I, 2) take him to Ottoman lands in 1827:

> The Sultan Mahmoud had trod in the steps of the greatest reformer of nations the world had yet seen – Peter the Great, and, like that monarch, had extirpated a factious and ungovernable soldiery [the Janissaries], who upon all occasions had shown themselves the enemies of civilization and of the best interests of humanity. (I, 1/2)

10 Stefanie Markovits, *The Crimean War in the British Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 7.

11 Ibid.

Formerly the backbone of Ottoman military supremacy, the Janissaries had become synonymous with stagnation and retrogression by the early nineteenth century. They had toppled two Sultans in quick succession and Mahmoud II took considerable time before he violently abolished these military units so rich in tradition.[12] In doing so, the Ottoman ruler caught the imagination of those enamoured by improvement and progress like the Russian Tsar had done more than a century earlier. But favourable portrayals of Peter and Mahmoud are frequently bound up with their efforts of rebuilding and reorganising their empires in accordance with western standards.[13] Frankland's emphatically expressed desire to witness on-going changes in the Ottoman realm is no exception: what at first sight appears to be in line with admiring representations by travellers from previous centuries, turns out to be a deeply divided, ambivalent and often inconsistent picture of a long-lived polity under internal as well as external pressures.

Political Reflections on the Way

Frankland's journey starts in Vienna from where he proceeded through the Balkans to Istanbul. He does not travel alone but refuses to reveal his fellow-traveller's identity, only mentioning that he was 'an English gentleman who was going thither upon business of importance' (I, 2).[14] The Captain's detailed, and sometimes long-winded, account of this voyage is a mixture of general information and personal observations, in which complaints about the locals' incompetence or indolence on the one hand and favourable representations of hospitality on the other add up to an ambivalent whole.[15]

This ambivalence informs his political remarks, too. On several occasions, Frankland, a Philhellene and supporter of Greek independence, encounters

12 Caroline Finkel, *Osman's Dream: The Story of the Ottoman Empire, 1300-1923* (London: Murray, 2005), 413-446.

13 Schiffer, *Oriental Panorama*, 318–321; and Frankland, I, 207: 'the Sultan is taking every opportunity of assimilating, as much as possible, the new institutions to those of Europe; and, should he live, he will effect great ameliorations in the state of things in this country.'

14 Frankland later adds that his 'companion was charged with despatches from Sir Henry Wellesley [British ambassador to Austria] to Mr. Canning.' (I, 3-4).

15 Compare: Donna Landry, 'Saddle Time,' *Criticism: A Quarterly for Literature and the Arts* 46: 3 (2004), 441-58, here: 445: According to Landry, Frankland's 'pleasure and pain were deeply interfused' and cannot be separated from one another. This somewhat paradoxical constellation informs the entirety of Frankland's account.

the newly organised troops who prompt him to reflect on the empire's past and present. Immediately before reaching the imperial capital, his praise of Greek culture finds an outlet vis-à-vis the Sultan's forces:

> I could not help being struck with the circumstance of meeting these barbarous and implacable enemies of the Grecian name and nation, the hordes of Asia, upon their march to invade the classic fields of Attica and Lacedemon; and I was, in imagination, carried back to the days of Darius and Xerxes, of Leonidas and Miltiades. (I, 87)

Not only is this disparaging judgment of the new troops diametrically opposed to his initial objective of seeing the Ottoman Peter and the changes he had already effected,[16] it is also sandwiched between two accommodating references to the very units that trigger this reflection. This apparently paradoxical constellation is rooted in gross political facts: whenever the Ottomans seem to violate Frankland's philhellenic sentiments, he is quick to invoke the achievements of classical antiquity in defense of the Greek cause. By contrast, in the absence of threats to Greece's 'suffering sons and ravished daughters' (I, 283) the author is ready to survey contemporary Ottoman civilization and its various manifestations which can signal everything from innovation over misgovernment to decay in his account. Accordingly, these two impulses – either representation of conditions on the ground or hasty vilification – do not cancel each other and largely anticipate the pattern for further observations of this kind. Interestingly, upon approaching the new troops in the above passage, Frankland and his companion 'met with no incivility on the part of these troops' (I, 86), and after his rant at them he reminds his readers that 'we must not forget that the Turks are now only beginning to discipline their troops; and that all things must necessarily have a *beginning*, and cannot at once reach perfection' (I, 87; emphasis in original).[17]

Like Blount nearly two centuries earlier, Frankland encounters an Ottoman army on the march. Unlike Blount, however, he is only moderately impressed and often reminds us that the centre of gravity of international

16 Schiffer, *Oriental Panorama*, 318-321.

17 Immediately after this encounter, Frankland informs us that 'not an instance of pillage or disorder ever occurs with the new troops, in the towns and villages through which they pass. Formerly, the people always fled upon the approach of troops, well knowing that their rapacity and indiscipline were equally dangerous to their friends and foes' (I, 88)

politics and diplomacy has shifted to the west. Overwhelmed by their order, discipline and strength, Blount had to integrate the soldiers he met into his framework of imperial rationality and global civility, whereas Frankland could afford a dismissive comment every now and then. Given recent unrest and political efforts at reform, the Ottoman Empire of Frankland's day was on the retreat. On his outward journey, for example, our naval officer tells us that Budapest is 'renowned for its warm mineral baths, constructed, I believe, by the Turks, when they were so long masters of this country' (I, 6). The Ottomans gained control over this city in the sixteenth century under Süleyman the Magnificent but their glory in Hungary had long since vanished. Accordingly, whilst seventeenth century travellers admired an efficient and powerful military apparatus that threatened Europe with its capabilities, Frankland's impressions in the Balkans signify past greatness in territories the Ottomans had already evacuated.

En route to Istanbul: To be civil, or not to be civil, that is the question.

Early travellers in the Ottoman Empire were frequently overwhelmed by its splendour, grandeur and military power. In this realm, Europeans had to be civil and recognise their guides, interlocutors and hosts as members of a highly advanced, if not superior, culture, with both a global reach and a long history. In the Balkans in 1634, Henry Blount caught the attention of an Ottoman general 'who presently sent for me, and making me sit, and drinke *Cauphe* in his presence.'[18] In this situation, Blount had ample opportunity to observe a powerful empire at work but only because it was his 'fortune to hit his [the general's] humour so right.'[19] Invited to join the Ottoman forces, he eventually has to wiggle out of what seems to have been a complicated cross-cultural predicament, since denying hospitable offers from a 'representative of absolute power' was 'potentially life-threatening.'[20] But the skilful lawyer finds the solution to his problem in the linguistic barrier between himself and his Ottoman counterparts, emphasising that he would be causing '*tumults*' and was unable to obey '*Commands*.'[21] However, he does not leave the general's tent without expressing the admiration of Englishmen for 'the *Turkes*, whom we

18 Henry Blount, *A Voyage into the Levant* (London: John Legatt, 1636), 15.

19 Ibid., 15

20 Gerald MacLean, *The Rise of Oriental Travel: English Visitors to the Ottoman Empire, 1580-1720* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2004), 152.

21 Blount, *Voyage*, 16, [emphasis in original].

not only honored for their glorious actions in the world; but also loved, for the kinde *Commerce of Trade* which we finde amongst them.'[22]

If we follow Frankland's footsteps in the same region about 200 years later, we find that cross-cultural traffic had lost its clear-cut power differential by then. For him, the Ottomans are no longer 'the only moderne people, great in action.'[23] They are rather a retreating, if still somewhat powerful, shadow of their own past, and his ambivalent representations of Ottoman life, customs and politics bear witness to this shift. Entering Ottoman lands in Pitesti, Romania, Frankland is clearly aware of both a territorial and a cultural transition.[24] However, he and his companion are eager quickly to proceed to Bucharest, only to discover 'a strange mixture of European luxury and Oriental filth and squalor' (I, 32). Of course, this dichotomously structured and generalised impression is not new and our naval officer joins, consciously or obliviously, a long tradition of experienced or imagined transitions into the East.[25] Yet unlike many of his predecessors, Frankland only revises preconceived ideas when he is inescapably confronted with imperial grandeur or scenic beauty on the one hand or flawless, and thus unexpected and surprising, interpersonal conduct on the other.

Unsurprisingly, then, Frankland's first forays into Anglo-Ottoman interaction are superficial and lack sensitivity to cultural difference. From Bucharest, his company travel with a guide – 'a Tartar, with a green Turban' (I, 39) called 'Hadjee Emir Achmet' (I, 40) –, whom he represents somewhat stereotypically as 'preced[ing] us with the utmost gravity of countenance, smoking his short chibouque, or pipe, neither appearing to sympathize in our discomforts, or to partake in our joviality' (I, 40). The turbaned, grave and smoking Turk is a contemporary metropolitan vignette, of course. Painters like Eugene Delacroix had already offered their European audiences Orientalist canapés with paintings such as *Turk Sitting smoking on a Couch* (1825) and *Portrait of a Turk in a Turban* (c. 1826).[26] These exemplary scenes portray

22 Ibid., 15.

23 Ibid., 2.

24 'Here one begins to feel that one has left Europe and arrived among a different people; for at this point the manners and constume of the East first begin to show themselves' (I, 30-1).

25 Gerald MacLean, *Looking East: English Writing and the Ottoman Empire before 1800* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2007), 148-150, and: Landry, 'Saddle Time,' 447.

26 Compare Chapter 6 in: Frank Anderson Trapp, *The Attainment of Delacroix* (Baltimore, Md. & London: John Hopkins Press, 1971), 111-141.

decontextualised, inert and exoticised figures of an imaginary and imagined Orient, which 'was always already familiar as the object of representation – written, printed, painted, orally transmitted.'[27] But where is Frankland's place in this emerging Orientalist tableau? Like Delacroix, he presents us with an exotic appetiser which, while worlds away from Blount's admiring portrayal of the Ottomans, is not yet part of Orientalism's representational inventory in all its unvarnished cruelty.[28]

On the cusp between enlightened cosmopolitanism and Orientalist contortions, Frankland's journey and the resultant picture of the east are divided and ambivalent. Spending time in Ottoman lands does not render him particularly susceptible to cultural subtleties so that the country is often barren and his comprehension shallow. We do not know whether he had ever enjoyed eastern hospitality or seen Muslims pray before this journey, but he has to prove at any cost that the last word is his in cultural, and for that matter religious, affairs. Having 'coffee with the Turks' in 'a tolerably clean and spacious khan' (I, 48) after a long day on the road seems to be an excellent opportunity for the Captain to tempt members of his host culture in their own territory. Even though 'it were Ramazan', Frankland 'left a glass full [of punch] purposely on a little tabouret, which was placed near me; and in the morning the punch had disappeared, although the glass remained!' (I, 48). One of the five pillars of Islam, fasting during Ramadan is essential to the religious identity of Frankland's hosts.[29] But even outside the holy month the Qur'an does not permit 'intoxicants' of any kind. [30] Disregarding fundamental rules of hospi-

27 Landry, 'Saddle Time,' 447.

28 Compare Said, *Orientalism*, 118: 'Popular Orientalism during the late eighteenth century and the early nineteenth attained a vogue of considerable intensity.' However, in the course of the nineteenth century, writers, artists and politicians take up these stock representations and develop them into the self-referential and solidified network that Said has called modern Orientalism. Henri Regnault, for example, moulds terrifying distortions from his predecessors' material and thus helps to popularise the putative horrors of oriental despotism. His *Summary Execution under the Moorish Kings of Grenada* (1870) is a fully-fledged Orientalist contortion of Al-Andalus and its cultural production. Compare: Roger Benjamin, *Orientalist Aesthetics: Art, Colonialism, and French North Africa, 1880-1930* (Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press, 2003), 71.

29 The five pillars of Islam are the declaration of faith (shahadah), giving alms (zakah), prayer (salah), fasting during Ramadan (sawm) and the hajj (pilgrimage to Mecca).

30 Sura no. 5, 90-1, Al-Ma'ida (The Feast): 'You who believe, intoxicants and gambling, idolatrous practices, and [divining with] arrows are repugnant acts – Satan's doing –

tality, Frankland has to 'prov[e] that he knew better than the locals'[31] and was able momentarily to suspend their religious zeal. And zealous they were indeed: 'During the whole of our journey to Constantinople, at sunrise and sunset, Hadjee Achmet and our surrudjees [postillions] never failed to perform their religious ceremonies, and to pray and sing to Allah' (I, 50). Apparently relating Islamic devotion, this passage suddenly tips over into an assertion of difference: 'Sometimes, by way of contrast, I would sing them a cavatina by Rossini, or an aria by Mozart, to their great astonishment' and 'was now and then tempted to laugh at their barbarous shouting and monotonous chanting' (I, 50). Frankland here pitches his own culture against his hosts' religious practices at the same time as he depends on their knowledge and guidance. His attitude is thus not only self-congratulatory and culturally solipsistic,[32] it also degrades the east to a screen for purposes of display, appealing to European audiences and turning the locals into mere supernumeraries.

Since these situations merely serve as backdrop against which he defines himself, Frankland's behaviour seems to be akin to A. W. Kinglake's orientalist crudities published only a few years later. In *Eothen* (1844) Kinglake resorts to sweeping generalisations and objectifies the Islamic world for his purposes of self-fashioning. Equipped with an English saddle and spurs,[33] Kinglake both celebrates his 'equestrian egotism'[34] and deliberately renounces Ottoman accoutrements. However, despite his sallies, Frankland relies on and employs local guides and resources throughout his journey and is not consistently dismissive or ironic in his account.[35] His judgments constantly oscillate between approval and disapproval, favourable representation and denigration, or admiration and derision and thus illustrate 'the tension between shared space and unshared values'[36] in the contact zone as well as the discursive changes within global civility.

---

shun them so that you may prosper. With intoxicants and gambling, Satan seeks only to incite enmity and hatred among you, and to stop you remembering God and prayer. Will you not give them up?' *The Qur'an*, transl. M.A.S. Abdel Haleem (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 76.

31 MacLean, *Looking East*, 155.

32 Landry, 'Saddle Time,' 444.

33 Ibid., 444.

34 Ibid., 442.

35 Ibid., 443.

36 Graham Huggan, *Interdisciplinary Measures: Literature and the Future of Postcolonial Studies*(Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2008), 11.

For a moment, however, Frankland approximates Kinglake's ignorant solipsism when a postmaster in Burgas, Bulgaria, demands an extra charge for his services. Although the guide tries to dissuade the Captain from having his way – Hadjee Achmet 'pointed to his throat, and showed evident signs of terror and dismay' –, Frankland's 'wrath was kindled' (I, 74). His performance aims at proving both his intrepidity and superiority in matters of cross-cultural negotiation by threatening the postmaster 'to set fire to his khan if he did not immediately order out the horses:'

> The Tartar and the Turks meanwhile looked on in utter amazement, expecting every moment to see the Hadjee postmaster draw his yatagan, and smite off the head of the presumptuous giaour, who had dared thus to beard the lions in his den. This demonstration of resolution on my part produced however, although tardily, the order for the horses, which were to carry us on, all the way to Constantinople (three days' journey). (I, 75)

Has an Englishman abroad ever confronted adversities more heroically and at the same time behaved more insensitively and ignorantly? Though efficient and only brief, this outbreak nevertheless bears witness to global civility's discursive transformations and concomitant changes in the representability of cultural alterity. Those who were once the 'Present Terrour of the World' or the only 'race of men' strong enough to 'beare downe the world before them'[37] can now be challenged in their own territory by the new imperial subjects from the British Isles.[38] But what is more, not only does Frankland's relation underscore this contemporary process, his language also corresponds to the geographical parameters of his journey: 'beard[ing] the lion in his den' is to be taken literally, given the Captains's proximity – 'three days' journey' – to the Ottoman capital.

Colourful self-assertions on foreign soil such as Frankland's seem to point to an Orientalist mindset, especially when they are spiced up with a good deal of ostentatious, but unverifiable, heroism. Such a perspective would, however, neglect his receptivity towards selected aspects of Ottoman imperial culture and his favourable representation of some of his hosts along the way, which are interwoven with moments of privileged-induced idiosyncrasies. Hence, a

37 Richard, Knolles, *The Generall Historie of the Turkes, from The first beginning of that Nation to the rising of the Othoman Familie*, 5th ed., (London: Adam Islip, 1638), 1, and: Blount, *Voyage*, 97.

38 Compare: MacLean, *Looking East*, 174-198.

glance at the other side of the coin reveals the representational complexities of Frankland's oriental rambles at the same time as it sheds light on some persistent, though situationally contingent, features of global civility. Even-handed exchanges and comparative perspectives did not disappear with the rise of modern Orientalism and continued to exist even as Europe's expansive forces gathered pace.[39] The *Travels* preserve this shift in the form of Frankland's attraction and repulsion to the territories he criss-crossed in 1827-28, and thus allow us, in Said's words: 'to see complementarity and interdependence instead of isolated, venerated, or formalized experience that excludes and forbids the hybridizing intrusions of human history.'[40]

Frankland's everyday adventures and struggles on the road, then, defy straightforward categorisations and complicate Orientalism's historical trajectory considerably. His divided attitudes to Ottoman culture are neither expressive of a consistently Orientalist perspective nor do they sustain the division between European self and Turkish other in domineering terms throughout the account. His disparaging comments are inextricably intertwined with favourable representations, friendly encounters and new impressions, just as his pleasure and pain are 'deeply interfused.'[41] What readers find in Frankland's *Travels* is thus not 'an internal consistency and a highly articulated set of relationships'[42] which support, reproduce and normalise colonialist mentalities and their solidified cultural visions. Instead, Frankland's account presents a divided picture of the Levant which maps discursive transitions and bespeaks emerging rather than consolidated Orientalist structures and paradigms.

Whilst his tour may have lost the piquancy of earlier journeys in the east, it nevertheless adds important pieces of knowledge to the west's archives. Reenactive by nature, oriental voyages necessarily follow in the footsteps of those who went before.[43] But since there is no repetition without differences, the Ottoman Empire's contemporary reforms testify to both its efforts at remaining an important player in international diplomacy and a general will-

39 Raymond Williams's distinction between dominant, residual and emerging cultural features is pertinent here. Compare: 'Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory,' in Vincent B. Leitch et al., eds., *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, 2nd ed. (London & New York: Norton, 2010), 1420-1437.

40 Edward W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1993), 115.

41 Landry, 'Saddle Time,' 445.

42 Said, *Orientalism*, 22.

43 Landry, 'Saddle Time,' 447.

ingness to break open encrusted structures.[44] The abolition of the Janissaries was the most decisive domestic measure at a time when the empire had to confront internal as well as external pressures, and observers like Frankland were fully aware of possible ramifications of Mahmoud's move. Not far into Ottoman territory, he encounters some of the new troops and complies with their wish to exercise them. Faced with their aptitude, Frankland recalls past greatness 'for should the Turks once take cheerfully to the new system of organization, Europe will find them more formidable than she had ever thought them to be' (I, 46). In the thick of military exercise, he lacks the time to reflect on the soldiers' putative barbarity or to indulge his rather abstract affinities to Greek antiquity. In lieu of condemnation of all things Ottoman, he presents his readers with a culturally and historically comparative perspective that allows for change, adaptation and eventually resurgence. In this situation, Frankland is very close to Blount's praise of the Ottoman army and does not judge rashly.Vis-à-vis Europe's others, his bloated sense of self collapses and global civility's cracks are glossed over by showers of praise. Accordingly, the seemingly paradoxical juxtaposition in his account of favourable instances of Ottoman life with indications of decay, cross-cultural ridicule and abstract resentfulness illuminates both the tension-ridden Levant he experiences and the large-scale changes from all-encompassing civility to the hegemonic structures of modern Orientalism.

Hence, not all is 'filth and squalor' (I, 32) in the East, nor are all Turks impersonations of oriental despotism. The Captain's breakfast 'in a clean Bulgarian cottage', in which '[t]he poor people themselves, humble and obliging, give you readily all they have' (I, 52), balances his disparaging comments upon entering the Ottoman realm in Romania. By the same token, the inclusion of the helpful inhabitants of 'the village of Emirs' (I, 62) qualifies his breaches of decorum in some of the khans he and his party pass through. Ground to a halt by an overflowing river, Frankland's party is supported by the villagers jumping into the water and leading the horses to the opposite bank:

> I was much astonished and pleased with the gallantry and alacrity with which these fellows rendered us so important a service; for indeed I think that without their assistance the horses could not have kept their footing,

44 Carter V. Findley, 'The Foundation of the Ottoman Foreign Ministry: The Beginnings of Bureaucratic Reform under Selim III and Mahmud II,' *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 3: 4 (Oct., 1972), 388-416.

> and would most probably have been washed away down the stream. Hadjee Emir Achmet paid them vey liberally […]. (I, 62)

Having bought local knowledge finally pays off in this extreme situation and encourages cross-cultural admiration in a fashion similar to Abbott's journey across the Syrian Desert. But whilst Abbott refutes charges of treachery against his Arab hosts and is consistently civil, Frankland's civility is only situational. However, faced with the villagers' helpfulness, he is pleasantly surprised. But not only does he express his astonishment, he also represents the men as subjects in their own right without either inflating his own intrepidity or imposing his culturally consolidated sense of self.

Frankland's brief sojourn into Ottoman military exercise and his discursive reciprocation after collectively braving fluvial dangers are not isolated exceptions to otherwise dominant Orientalist structures and paradigms. They are, rather, the favourable counterpoise to his derisive moments and recurrently complicate the relationship between European self and extra-European other. But what is more, these external scenes are being mirrored by interludes of hospitable domesticity, in which Frankland and his guide coexist counterfactually in a cosmopolitan cross-cultural setting. Immediately before reaching Istanbul

> we halted for the night, at a very neat and clean café, kept by a civil Greek; but did not find the room they assigned us to sleep in, much better or sweeter than the usual average of Turkish khans. Here we supped heartily with our Tartar upon pillau, or, as the Turks call it, pilaff, and remained until half past two in the following morning. (I, 84)

Despite the unchanged quality of accommodation, Frankland neither complains nor throws a tantrum in this passage. In the absence of female charms, feasting Turks or greedy postmasters he embraces the opportunity of participating in this scene of hospitality. The oriental model of global civility, which was initiated by Blount and emphatically endorsed by Abbott, had thus not vanished in Frankland's day and age and could still engender even-handed exchanges. However, discursive transformations and political changes, as well as their complex interrelationships, render mutually-improving cross-cultural traffic increasingly dependent on situational contingencies and reveal ambivalences that earlier travellers were not confronted with. Imperial grandeur, military power and samples of eastern hospitality proved both daunting and overwhelming, which is why Blount and Abbott represented

their others as civil peoples. For Frankland, this representational consistency is hard to achieve given the complex political, historical and epistemic shifts of his time. The Ottoman capital is, however, a very special chapter in this story.

In Istanbul: Imperial Grandeur or Ottoman Decay?

After many ordeals, adventures and rare pleasures all compressed into a little less than three weeks on the road, Frankland's party reach Istanbul on the 11th April 1827. The view from afar proves both singular and overwhelming for him at the same time as it reminds us of the reenactive character of oriental travels: 'No pilgrim ever hailed the towers of the Holy City with greater delight than did I, sinner as I am, the minarets of Constantinople' (I, 89). Even though Englishmen looking east had ample opportunity to prepare themselves for the Ottoman capital by 'study[ing] the writings, prints and paintings put on the market by their predecessors,'[45] actually experiencing the city's panoramic views overpowered many of them and frequently resulted in the evocation of inexpressibility topoi.[46] However, the availability of information and the city's popularity notwithstanding, the experiences of travellers did by no means conform to pre-established homogenous patterns. Blount, for example, enthusiastically reports that 'of all places, that I ever beheld, [it] is the most *apt*, to command the world,' since 'for *strength*, *plentie*, and *commoditie*, no place can equall it.'[47] By contrast, William Lithgow, another seventeenth century traveller, is more reserved and opens up a 'contrast between the hallucinatory beauty of Istanbul's exterior and its deeply disappointing interior.'[48]

---

45 Schiffer, *Oriental Panorama*, 135; Landry's notion of 'perpetual re-enactment' is also relevant in this context: 'Saddle Time,' p.447

46 Even as an avid draughtsmen, Frankland fails to convey the 'magnificent view of Constantinople' on one of his excursions: 'I endeavoured to make a sketch of this beautiful view; but I quite despair of giving anything like a true picture of the scene, either by the *trait de plume* or the *coup de crayon*' (I, 151).

47 Blount, *Voyage*, 25/26.

48 Schiffer, *Oriental Panorama*, 151; Lithgow, who was in Constantinople in 1610-11, writes: 'Truly I may say of Constantinople, as I said once of the world, in the Lamentado of my second Pilgrimage: "A painted Whoore, the maske of deadly sin/ Sweet faire without, and stinking foule within."' See: William Lithgow, *The Totall Discourse of The Rare Adventures & Painefull Peregrinations of long Nineteene Yeares Travayles from Scotland to the most famous Kingdomes in Europe, Asia and Affrica* (Glasgow: James MacLehose, 1906), 124.

Like Lithgow, Frankland describes outward beauty that gives way to wretchedness as soon as he 'reached the dirty and offensive streets of *the celebrated Pera* [the Frank district]' (I, 91).Just as the rest of his journey, his experience of Istanbul is divided between imperial grandeur on the one hand and signs of Ottoman decay on the other. But given both the city's rich history and centrality in the Roman, Byzantine and Ottoman Empires, his verdicts here are often more benign than in either the Balkans or the Levantine provinces on his return journey. And like Blount before him, he represents the city as commercial hub that is truly global in nature when he gives us a glimpse of 'the quays crowded with shipping of all nations' (I, 154). In such a place, the traveller's impressions are manifold, of course, and the Ottoman Empire's ethno-religious diversity is among the first features Frankland records: '[H]ow could I convey any idea of the grouping of the splendid Orientals among whom I found myself?'[49] (I, 94-5). Admiration for the empire's flexibility in creating a coherent whole out of many disparate communities is indeed a transhistorical element in travellers' accounts and Frankland is no exception. Confronted with a plethora of different attires in the bustling city, he comparatively describes familiar styles of clothing as 'the mean-looking costume of Europe' (I, 96). It seems that despite his philhellenic tendencies, Frankland is ready to be favourably impressed by selected aspects of Ottoman culture and not all is 'dark and filthy' (I, 91) within the city's bounds.

Three days after his arrival, Frankland and a fellow Englishman – 'Mr. Vane, (now Lord Henry Vane,) son of Lord Darlington' (I, 102) – set out to explore Istanbul together. On this and successive trips they 'met […] with no incivility from the men, who generally took no notice of us' (I, 110). However, from behind their windows some Ottoman females voice their disapproval of the two upper-class travellers perambulating their city (I, 110), and thus assert a minimum of both agency and subjectivity vis-à-vis those whose gaze failed to penetrate their veils and often idealisingly confined them to the

49 'It is easier to conceive than to describe the feelings with which I contemplated the lovely scenery before me. I now indeed felt that I was amply repaid for the fatigue and anxiety incident to such a journey as I had just performed. I longed for the pencil of the artist and the pen of the poet, to enable me to give some faint picture to my friends at home, of those sensations which, delightful as they were, almost overpowered me, and to which I knew not how to give a sufficient vent. Again, how could I convey any idea of the grouping the splendid orientals among whom I found myself? (I, 94-5).

most mysterious of oriental spaces, i.e. the harem. As this episode suggests, cultural traffic between English travellers and Ottoman subjects was indeed class- as well as gender-specific on both sides of the contact zone. Not only did male European travellers greatly outnumber female ones, they also frequently judged the Ottoman capital and its dazzling cultural fabric according to their own socio-economic backgrounds and gender-specific values.[50] In so doing, many of them centred their descriptions on aspects that seemed to match familiar circumstances at home most closely or, on the other hand, reproduced their prejudices, expectations and desires when they came close to Istanbul's population, which was gendered differently.[51]

One of the few occasions that provided travellers with first-hand experiences of the capital's social life were Ottoman outdoor recreations. Intricate and difficult to explore, yet out in the open, they offered alluring and contrastive images to Istanbul's seemingly monotonous urban streets and their crowds.[52] But many European travellers across the centuries were strictly limited in comprehending 'the multi-ethnic and essentially urban populace of the capital.'[53] Their 'images indicate a European construction of Ottoman reality'[54] which they started compiling as soon as the Turks set out to picnic either in one of the numerous cemeteries or along Istanbul's waterways. When the city's inhabitants gather 'in groups, under the deep shadows of the cypresses', Frankland is there to observe them:

> The Turks, although barbarous, are remarkable for their tenderness to their females and their offspring; and while they visit infidelity and disobedience with death, they are generally kind and caressing to the faithful wife and the dutiful child. (I, 123)

Like others before and after him, he too indulged in people-watching. Barbaric and tender, cruel and caressing, Istanbul's population proved too fascinating for our naval officer to be omitted in favour of political enquiries or scenic beauty. But his description of Ottoman sociality is full of commonplaces and decontextualized superficialities indicating an abstract desire to

50 Compare Schiffer, *Oriental Panorama*, 224, 229, 247 and 345.

51 Henry Blount is a notable exception to this pattern. Compare his *Voyage* and chapter two in this study.

52 Schiffer, *Oriental Panorama*, 209.

53 Ibid., 211.

54 Ibid., 210.

see one's flowery notions of the Orient confirmed. And he frequently peppers this perspective on his host culture with widely circulated stereotypes – for example, when he comments on 'the indolent life and the languid customs of the East' (98) or reiterates popular charges of the Turks' 'cruelty' (I, 106) –, which explains the resultant polarity of Europe's others in his works. Confronted with an ethno-religiously diverse metropolis, in which 'urban and rural elements co-existed,'[55] Frankland, and indeed many other western travellers, found Istanbul difficult to represent. Resorting to clichés while relating the city's variegated features, as well as his frequent fluctuation between familiarity and otherness, may hence be described as intercultural coping-mechanism enabling Frankland to come to grips with the city's rich texture.

Once firmly connected to the English community, Frankland nonetheless cherishes the opportunity to contribute his idiosyncratic share to western knowledge of the Ottoman capital. Always intrepid and fearless, he rejects the British embassy's offer to furnish him with guards: 'I am averse to going about with an armed attendant, as this shows a suspicious and unconfiding disposition, and cannot be at all flattering to the Turks' (I, 138-9). But Frankland being Frankland, he immediately qualifies this seemingly unconditional stance of cross-cultural openness: 'I always, however, in my solitary rambles, carried my pocket-pistols, as the "ultima ratio" in the event of my personal safety being compromised' (I, 139). In so doing, he grants himself privileges that Istanbul's inhabitants no longer enjoyed because 'the Sultan was determined to protect Franks in the most effectual manner […] by disarming the populace of the capital' (I, 143). These remarks on personal safety are indicative of his limited receptivity to cultural difference and translate well to the depth of his observations: instead of assessing the disarmament of the capital within a framework of general security, in Frankland's account it solely serves western interests and benefits the Franks first and foremost. Even though he is keen on experiencing Ottoman life, his 'untrained European eye,'[56] together with a penchant for witnessing colourful oriental scenes, curtails his ability to do so. Hence, we might say that even in times of institutional change and political tension first-hand experiences of alterity were the best antidote to ideological contortions, such as Frankland's Philhellenism. However, criss-crossing Ottoman dominions did not necessarily heighten his sensitivity to

55 Ibid., 138.

56 Ibid., 210.

their specificities, nor did it lead to great observational depth when he came face to face with their representatives.

In this regard, Frankland's adventures differ decisively from both Blount and Abbott's journeys. Unlike his predecessors, he frequently dives into the thick of Ottoman life together with other Englishmen, and this company creates an extended personal space at the same time as it contains Frankland's contact with Istanbul's population. Rather than exposing himself directly to the imperial centre's bustling life, Frankland chooses limited interaction at this point of his journey and is thus unable to develop the cross-cultural empathy required for unlearning his emergent Orientalist mind-set.[57] Accordingly, in most instances, aesthetic features of oriental splendour predominate over informational value as is the case when he 'saw the Sultan go by in immense state in his beautiful galley':

> I cannot attempt to describe this procession, it shot so rapidly past us, and was surrounded with so much state and splendour, that the dazzled imagination could not comprehend its individual features, but only seize the general effect. […] It was a lovely scene. (I, 171-2)

Whilst the Captain is clearly aware of the conditions and limits of visual perception, he emphasises the situation's grandeur and splendour. Despite his strictly political motivations at the outset, he repeatedly frames favourable aspects of Ottoman life in primarily aesthetic terms that are too general to be informative. These raptures sometimes lead to unusually temperate verdicts that emphasise cultural commonalities rather than differences:

> Indeed, I am sure that if we knew the language of this interesting people, and would try to become acquainted with them, we should find them more traitables and civilized than we are apt to imagine. (I, 173)

Unfortunately, however, such moderate judgments and comparative perspectives are situationally contingent in Frankland's *Travels*. We find them when either Ottoman splendour inescapably overwhelms him or he admires Istanbul's beauty spread out before his eyes.

In order to satisfy his appetite for picturesque views, Frankland joins English expatriates in their pastimes, of which excursions were an integral constituent. He tells us how he spent some 'delightful days' among his 'countrymen in one of the most interesting quarters of the globe' (I, 177). When the

57 Landry, 'Saddle Time,' 451.

Captain recounts these trips he apparently adopts comparative viewpoints and seems to evince his more benign cosmopolitan self:

> I shall not attempt to describe the outward beauties of the city of Constantinople. […]I should utterly fail in the endeavour to pourtray such various and glorious features; nor can I compare it with any thing I have yet seen either in Europe or America. (I, 103)

As naval officer, he has presumably seen many ports and cities but the Ottoman capital's beauty clearly stands out. Its panoramic attraction rests not merely on its otherness as both imperial and Islamic metropolis, but on the singular convergence and amalgamation of rural and urban elements within its bounds.[58] Away from both 'narrow and offensive streets' and the crowds frequenting them, Frankland's description carries favourable connotations but also sheds light on the limits of global civility in his account, which are clearly linked to his limited talent as a writer. Whilst Istanbul is represented as overpoweringly beautiful in this passage, Frankland's description is far removed from the city's human elements. As such, his vision is purely aesthetic and undercuts its own inclusiveness at the same time as he constitutes his command and authority over the scene on the basis of the other's absence.[59]

Frequently noted by travellers before and after Frankland,[60] these panoramic scenes lead us back to the reenactive quality of Middle Eastern travel. On a sojourn to 'the woods of Belgrade' (127), during which he sees beautiful 'valleys' and 'ravines' (I, 128), the Captain treads in the footsteps of one of the most famous English travellers in the Ottoman Empire: 'We visited the former abode of the charming and lively Lady M. W. Montague, now, alas! no longer inhabited by the Muses and the Graces, but by a herd of goats' (I, 128). Immensely popular, Lady Mary's *Turkish Embassy Letters* (posthumously published in 1763) provided ground-breaking insights into the private lives of Ottoman women for the first time. However, travelling more than a century after her, Frankland cannot find 'the Muses and Graces' he might have hoped to detect in the famous writer's home, but is instead forcefully reminded of both eastern decay and filth by the scene before him. This situation mirrors

58 Schiffer, *Oriental Panorama*, 138-9.

59 Edmond, Rod, *Representing the South Pacific: Colonial Discourse from Cook to Gauguin* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997) 21.

60 Schiffer, *Oriental Panorama*, 138-9.

larger patterns in his account, in which overwhelming beauty, imperial greatness and political mutability coexist and are intertwined with impressions of bygone glory, indicators of decay and institutional stasis. Hence, the difference between the capital's outward attraction and its filthy and inscrutable interior – which is exemplified in Frankland's case by 'the contrast between these scenes [of panoramic beauty] and the dirt and meanness of [his] abode' (I, 125), which he tries shun by going on excursions – encroaches upon the moments of aesthetic contemplation so dear to him.

However, scenic beauty largely retains its untarnished purity for him for the rest of his time in Istanbul. And most evenings were pleasantly filled with male English conviviality (I, 155), thus acting as counterpoise to dirty streets and their crowds. But it is specifically his military expertise that widens the gulf between European self and Ottoman other when he spends his mornings 'looking at the troops and ships' (I, 155). His eye may be untrained in deciphering social intricacies of Ottoman society, but we may assume some reliability in military, and especially naval, matters. Whereas Blount experienced a well-organised and insurmountable empire in the seventeenth century, Frankland's ambivalent representations of the Ottomans are expressive of both their crumbling vigour and the ascendancy of European powers, especially Britain, France and Russia (I, 192). In the capital he reiterates earlier observations on the new troops and this is what he has to say about Mahmoud's soldiers:

> They are just now very contemptible troops, consisting almost entirely of boys, with a sprinkling of very old men to discipline them; they are, to use the French term, 'entre loup et chien,' having lost the elan and energy of their old system, and not yet attained the advantages of European tactics. Let Europe, however, beware of them; for they display an aptitude for martial exercises, which, if once properly applied by their government, and placed under the restraints of discipline, will render them again formidable to the nations of the West. (I, 117)

Ottoman defeats and accompanying retreats, as well as Western incursions into the Islamic world, such as Napoleon's mission in Egypt, had lasting effects on the balance of power between Europe and its Ottoman neighbours. Aware of these shifts and Ottoman efforts at reform, Frankland not only comments on what he saw, but also weaves his observations into larger historical frameworks. Bygone power and contemporary stagnation notwithstanding,

he reckons the Ottomans could, if they continue rigorously to adapt to political exigencies, rise again and become 'formidable' adversaries once more.

However, the language in this passage evinces greater European self-confidence than in previous centuries. Although Frankland's assessment of the new troops potentially allows for an Ottoman comeback, his use of expressions such as 'advantages of European tactics' and 'nations of the West', as well as his advocacy of 'discipline,' are indicative of the changed, and changing, dynamics between English self and Ottoman other. The empire's contemporary military apparatus seems to have been in a rather poor condition owing to Mahmoud's recent political and military purges and connoisseurs like Frankland were clearly aware of that. Commenting on 'the imposing-looking Ottoman fleet', our naval expert finds, on closer inspection, 'vessels, the hulls of which are in such a state, that I should think few Europeans would deem them sea-worthy' (I, 108). And what is more, not only are the Sultan's ships a shadow of their glorious past, the Ottoman seamen appear to be in a condition akin to their vessels – a problem that, according to Frankland, can be solved by 'the energy of the bastinade, which, no doubt, is liberally applied throughout the squadron' (I, 109). Even though he had never been aboard an imperial ship, he resorts to hearsay when it comes to judging the crews' discipline. That he can do so authoritatively on daytrips in the Ottoman capital in particular, and in his account in general, points to the increasingly ambivalent relationship between European travellers, especially those with a military eye, and the Ottoman territories they traverse.

2. Citationality and Nascent Orientalism

After his return to England, Frankland inserted a section on 'Remarks and Notes' (I, 179-219) dated 'London, Dec. 1828' into his *Travels*. Here, he retrospectively comments on the Ottoman Empire by presenting a collage of received wisdom as well as quotations gleaned from other sources on his subject. No longer in transit and equipped with 'good authority within [his] reach to refer to' (I, 179), he believes that retrospective armchair travel in a well-stocked library is conducive to sober judgments: '[N]ow that I am no longer upon the wing from one scene to another, nor under the continual excitement of constant variety, together with its accompanying fatigue, I have abundant leisure to write' (I, 179). However, safely lodged in the comforts at home, Frankland's idiosyncratic account of greatness and degeneration drawn up en route sud-

denly gives way to an untimely obituary. Vis-à-vis 'the increasing power, moral and physical, of all the nations around it' the Ottoman Empire

> remains nearly in the same condition as it did when first it forced its way into Europe, with this only difference, that it has long ceased by its warlike energies to terrify and to overcome the nations of the West. (I, 189)

His assertive employment of the term 'the West' evokes its opposite and is suggestive of the emergence of a dichotomously structured epistemological grid. In this logic, the East is stagnant, if not regressive, and displays everything the West is not through 'the handy figure of inversion' which translates cultural difference into 'anti-sameness.'[61] Although Mahmoud's difference ('the supposed Barbarian Emperor'[I, 2]) and his capability of reform initially prompted Frankland to travel east, his 'Remarks and Notes' bespeak Orientalist prejudices rather than cross-cultural curiosity. Adding that there is 'no instance in history of the regeneration of such a people as this' (I, 189), Frankland's frame of reference not only subjects the complexities of contemporary Ottoman history to simplistic degeneration narratives,[62] it also re-

61 Francois Hartog, *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*, transl. by Janet Lloyd (Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988), 212-13.

62 The association of the Ottomans with degeneration is not new. Whilst favourable accounts of Ottoman splendour, grandeur and military power circulated in Europe throughout the early modern period, they were counterbalanced by less favourable reports, in which charges of cruelty, stagnation or even degeneration served as coping mechanisms for Western intellectuals to come to grips with the Eastern empire. As early as 1668, long before the decisive victory of Christian forces over the Ottomans at Vienna in 1683, Paul Rycaut, secretary to the English ambassador at the Sublime Porte, detected omnipresent signs of decay: 'But he that takes a view of the *Ottoman* Armies, as described in various Histories, renowned for their Chivalry and Discipline in the times of *Sultan*, *Selim*, or *Solyman* the magnificent, and designs thence to extract a draught, or Copy for his present speculation, will find himself much at a loss in framing true conjectures of the puissance of the Turkes, or the Rules of their Government, by comparison of former times with this present age. For that ancient sublimity and comely Majesty in the Emperor is much abated; the forces by Land decayed, and the Maritime power by ill success and unskilful and slothful Seamen, reduced to an inconsiderable condition; the countries are dispeopled and the Royal Revenue abated; nothing remains of those plenteous stores and provisions of War, nor that Regiment and Discipline continued in Peace, none of that ancient observation of their Laws and Religion, not that love and respect to the Militia, which is now become degenerate, soft, and effeminate; nor is the *Ottoman* Court so prone to remunerate the services and

duces the Sultan's realms to a disposable political quantity. Hence, in this part of his *Travels*, Frankland takes global civility beyond its discursive breaking point and his story tips over into the projected demise of the Ottoman state.

Retrospective Glances at the Ottomans: Emerging Citationality

For centuries, global civility as practiced by Westerners among the Ottomans contained respect for the empire's power and efficiency at the same time as it allowed for cultural cross-fertilisation. After the Ottomans had ceased to threaten Europe with their military capabilities,[63] the so-called Orient became a screen onto which Enlightenment thinkers could project their desires and artistic yearnings. 'Ex Oriente Lux' – 'Light from the East'[64] – was a popular contemporary motto and inspired a good deal of the cultural production of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.[65] However, according to Edward Said, the late eighteenth century also marks the onset of modern Orientalism, a far-reaching and drastic shift in Europe's relations with the Islamic world brought about by Napoleon's mission in Egypt.[66] It gave rise to 'a powerful system of citationality'[67] that has provided the west with an authoritative toolkit to speak for and about the east in ways completely divorced from its subject-matter. The result is a fully-fledged and self-referential corpus of tropes, rhetorical strategies and (mis-)representations that exerts its domineering influence on the basis of 'flexible *positional* superiority.'[68]

---

exalt the interest of the Cavalry, or maintain the reputation of the Janizaries. In brief there are no reliques of ancient justice, or generosity of discreet Government, or Obedience to it, or Courtesie or Concord, of Valour or Counsel, nor yet Confidence, Friendship, or generous Fidelity.' Paul Rycaut, *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire* (London: John Starkey and Henry Brome, 1668), 169-70.

63 After the second siege of Vienna in 1683, the Ottomans began withdrawing forces from their European provinces, especially since the so-called Holy League constantly increased its pressure on the empire's resources.

64 Juergen Osterhammel describes this perspective *ex negativo* in: *Die Entzauberung Asiens: Europa und die asiatischen Reiche im 18.Jahrhundert* (Munich: Beck, 1998), 308-9

65 *Pars pro toto*, I would like to mention Lessing's *Nathan the Wise* (1779), Mozart's *Abduction from Seraglio* (1781), Beckford's *Vathek* (1786) and Goethe's *West-Eastern Divan* (1819).

66 Said, *Orientalism*, 3 and 87.

67 Gerald MacLean, 'Strolling in Syria with William Biddulph,' *Criticism: A Quarterly for Literature and the Arts* 46: 3 (2004), 415-439, here: 433.

68 Said, *Orientalism*, 7.

In the preface to his *History of British India* (orig. publ. in 1818), James Mill explicates the inception of citationality precipitated by the detached, and thus seemingly objective, scholar. Solely based on the study of representations, Mill's comprehensive work illuminates the internal dynamics of Orientalism:

> Whatever is worth seeing or hearing in India, can be expressed in writing. As soon as everything is expressed in writing, a man who is duly qualified may obtain more knowledge of India in one year in his closet in England, than he could obtain during the course of the longest life, by the use of his eyes and ears in India.[69]

Obviating sensory contact with India is key in Mill's rationale and makes possible the systematisation of its culture, which, in turn, renders it manageable for other scholars. But '[e]xtracting the precious ore from a great mine of rude historical materials'[70] is always bound up with the hegemonic patterns underlying the observer's society. It involves both asymmetrical cultural translations and complex transitions from orality to literacy, especially when these histories of extra-European peoples are written for metropolitan audiences. According to Said, Mill's influence 'on British rule in the Orient (and India particularly) was considerable,'[71] illustrating the ways in which consolidated knowledge-power bases evolve from detached research in the 'closet.' By contrast, Javed Majeed interprets the *History* 'as a text whose contradictions are indicative of a body of thought struggling to articulate itself'[72] in contemporary ideological battles between 'conservatism and utilitarianism.'[73] In his book *Ungoverned Imaginings* (1992) he contends that 'current approaches to "colonialist discourse" are misguided when they deal with texts such as this,'[74] emphasising that 'in using British India as a testing ground for utilitarianism, it was fashioning a critique of British society itself.'[75] Whilst for those involved in the intellectual and political debates at the time there may have been a self-reflexive element in Mill's *History*, its influence and reception history came to embody 'a vigorous reason shaping the matter of the world according to its

69 James Mill, *The History of British India*, Vol. I. (London: James Madden, 1858), 23.

70 Ibid., p. 23

71 Said, *Orientalism*, 214.

72 Javed Majeed, *Ungoverned Imaginings: James Mill's The History of British India and Orientalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 4.

73 Ibid., 2.

74 Ibid., 3.

75 Ibid., 128.

own dictates.'[76] When such positions are socially, culturally and institutionally reproduced and normalised, they become dominant epistemological grids by incorporating increasing numbers of texts, paintings and other artefacts. Within this framework, armchair archaeology and travel tell us more about the Orient's past and present than travellers were able to learn by actually going there. As a consequence, scholars, politicians and colonial administrators can take decisions without having to experience a given geo-physical unit, in this case the Orient, in sensory or personal fashion.

Frankland's *Travels* is crucial in this context, since it helps us to understand Orientalism's emergence as citational system as well as its historical trajectory. The Captain initially went to Istanbul in order to see for himself whether Mahmoud was the Ottoman Peter. His eye-witness account and personal experiences notwithstanding, after his return to London he finds it necessary to furnish his readers with 'some authentic information, in the shape of notes and extracts, from an author whom I have consulted since the compilation of the few rough and ill-composed pages of my Journal' (I, 180). But what is more compelling than either personally visiting the Ottoman Empire or relating first-hand experiences of it? From Frankland's point of view, Comte Andréossy's *Constantinople et le Bosphore de Thrace* (1828) seems to have been more 'authentic', instructive and interesting than what he had seen in the East. He quotes extensively from Andréossy's book, and in so doing introduces a representational level divorced from his actual experience into his account. The resultant intratextual tension between his impressions recorded along the way and his retrospective additions mirrors the one between the Islamic world's diverse culture and the west's reductive representations of it.

Andréossy was crucially involved in this complex relationship from the late eighteenth century onwards: after having accompanied Napoleon on his mission in Egypt and subsequently contributing to several works on that country, the Comte served as France's ambassador to the Sublime Porte from 1812 to 1814.[77] Whilst his German translator Johann Adam Bergk praises the breadth and depth of Andréossy's knowledge of all things Ottoman, he fundamentally

76 Ibid., 135.

77 Antoine-Francois Andreossy, Constantinople *et le* Bosphore *de* Thrace*: pendant les années* 1812, 1813 *et* 1814 *et pendant l'année* 1826 (Paris: 1828); A German translation was published in the same year: *Konstantinopel und der Bosporus von Thrazien in den Jahren 1812, 1813, 1814 und 1826*, aus dem Franzoesischen mit Anmerkungen Uebersetzt von Dr Bergk (Leipzig: Johann Friedrich Glueck, 1828), 6-7 and 5.

disagrees with his verdicts: 'Andréossy has represented the Turks and their Sultan Mahmoud II in a much more favourable light than both time and history show them.'[78] Characterising the Turks as 'indolent, superstitious, full of prejudices and intolerant,'[79] Bergk not only resorts to generally accepted stereotypes, he also disregards the Comte's expert knowledge both derived from living among the Ottomans and sustained through continued contacts with the French embassy in Istanbul.[80] Despite emphasising that Andréossy's role enabled him to observe Ottoman life and government in some detail, Bergk, a literary gentlemen and translator, assumes authority on a subject that he was only acquainted with through texts. This is citationality in full armour and is in keeping with Mill's insistence on the detached, and seemingly more objective, study of cultural difference from within the 'closet'.

Frankland adopts a similar stance in his 'Remarks and Notes' by selectively and strategically quoting from Andréossy's work in order to lend retrospective colour and weight to his report. In so doing, he exacerbates the divided and ambivalent representations of the Ottomans in his account at the same time as he forgets his fascination with selected aspects of their culture. The lack of personal connections with the Ottoman world after his return to England, as well as his unquestioned praise of the Greeks, explains the radical disparity between the benign parts of his impressions recorded along the way and his unvarnished onslaught in the 'Remarks.' Here, the Ottoman world is comparable to 'Europe in the darker ages' and praise for the construction of aqueducts 'belongs not to the Turks, but to the ancient Greeks' (I, 183). Fond of antiquity, Frankland tries to discover the infrastructure behind Istanbul's water supply but can only find one of 'the great cisterns of Constantinople' (I, 210). Since this subject buttresses his fierce Philhellenism, he is eager to include it in his account; but without being able to detect all the cisterns Andréossy mentions, Frankland simply resorts to quoting from the Frenchman's book: 'I shall merely note the three first that he describes, as being sufficient for my purpose' (I, 210). The quoted passages gloss over his archaeological shortcomings and put him in a position of putative authority over the territories he had traversed:

78 Andreossy, *Konstantinopel und der Bosporus von Thrazien*, p. 5 [my translation].

79 Ibid., 32, note no. 1 [my translation].

80 Ibid., 9.

> The traveller will not fail to observe, that these great national works were raised, not by the Turks, but by the Greeks; and that the barbarians (although in some instances they have had the good sense to follow up the ancient system of conducting water to the capital,) have in general let these magnificent monuments of a polite age and people fall into ruin […]. (I, 213)

Frankland conjures up images of omnipresent decay under the auspices of Islam and the Ottomans, thereby precluding cultural cross-fertilisation as well as unravelling global civility. Yet his drastic judgment in this passage is based not on personal experience but on episodes gleaned from the Comte's text. Here, citationality engenders authority and is put to political ends in this case. But most importantly, this passage also demonstrates how discursive systems evolve through the incorporation of apparently authoritative material and then develop into dominant paradigms, the textual constituents of which refer to each other rather than their subject-matter. Frankland's account illuminates this complex socio-cultural process for what Said has called modern Orientalism at the same time as it contributes to its development.

Writing with usurped authority on the remains of an infrastructure one fails to detect is one thing; commenting on Ottoman women is another, much more controversial, undertaking. But Frankland, who 'had a keen eye for prettiness in a girl'[81], tries his hand in this field, too. In keeping with the overall pattern of his account, his representations of Ottoman women are divided and indicate his penchant for witnessing colourful oriental scenes. Because of his 'fond[ness] for sketching Turkish ladies'[82] he had some face to face encounters with them, which he wilfully ignores in his 'Remarks and Notes' in favour of Andréossy's limited insights on the fair sex. Hence, once again textual evidence divorced from his experiences takes precedence over what he saw, felt and recorded in Ottoman lands and largely effaces his selective civility towards the Turks.

During his stay in Istanbul, however, Frankland is a keen observer of women and reflects on the propriety of conversing with them, 'knowing that it is not customary in the East to speak to females in public' (I, 140). Shortly after his arrival, he might still have entertained some hopes of getting access to spaces normally closed to (male) outsiders and is unusually self-critical when he writes that Ottoman women are 'by no means the encaged and watched

81 Schiffer, *Oriental Panorama*, 374.

82 Ibid.

captives which we Europeans are apt to imagine them' (I, 146). Later on, he is more realistic and outlines the gender-specific determinants governing the exploration of the 'domestic life' of the Ottomans:

> [O]f this we must for ever remain in ignorance: for such is the inviolable sanctity of the harem, and such the mystery that envelopes all that passes within its walls, that no traveller, with the exception of Lady M. W. Montague and Lady Hester Stanhope, has had opportunities of exploring its recesses, and becoming acquainted with the life and manners of its inmates. In short, all that we see of the Turks is their out-of-door existence. (I, 181)

Socially determined and culturally relative spaces do not meet with Frankland's disapproval here and his assessment is clearly aware of its own limitations. In this case, he neither resorts to hearsay nor exploits widely circulated stereotypes, but demonstrates that encounters with Ottoman society and its representatives could lead to balanced judgments as long as political agendas had no role to play in his adventures.

In the absence of Istanbul's attractions and repulsions both his benign cosmopolitan self and the experiential treasures accumulated in the Ottoman realm vanish into thin air. In the passages added after his journey proper, his section on 'Women in Turkey' (I, 196-98) is devoid of any personal insights and solely consists of quotations and observations from Andréossy's account. Whilst these are comprehensive, they are not his own: incorporating them thus creates a representational level that is divorced from Frankland's experience at the same time as it allows him to exploit the content of the Comte's book to disenfranchise the Ottomans discursively. The Captain's way of representing Ottoman women in the 'Remarks and Notes', which he considers more authoritative than the narrative passages of his *Travels*, thus contributes to the genesis of a consolidated knowledge-power base from which armchair travellers, politicians and colonial authorities can judge the Islamic world in Britain' imperial nineteenth century.

By contrast, Andréossy's judgments are much more benign than Frankland's and he respects the Ottoman Empire as political entity in its own right. In the introduction to his book, he dispels popular myths about the Ottomans and views their civilisation comparatively: 'It would be unjust to believe that the Turks belong to the group of people commonly called barbarians; one misjudges them by either looking at them only from afar or evaluating them ac-

cording to one's own standards.'[83] And Unlike Frankland, he does not idealise Greek culture for its past glory but explains Ottoman models of empire-building by including subject peoples into clearly-defined hierarchies: 'When the Turks destroyed the Greek Empire they spared its inhabitants, preserved them and assigned them the second rank.'[84] Never would the Ottomans have achieved glory and prosperity in a long-lasting empire, he goes on, had haphazard despotism been the guiding principle of their governments.[85]

These remarks, then, illustrate how Frankland's ideological agenda bent available knowledge to political exigencies. Unbalanced by face-to-face encounters with the Ottomans, his fierce Philhellenism retrospectively distorts the selected aspects of Ottoman culture his cosmopolitan self had previously enjoyed, especially in the capital. There, he had to contain his fascination with the city's exterior beauty – '[I] must pause, lest I should appear too enthusiastic. Go, reader, and see!' (I, 154) – and forcefully expressed his regard for 'the finest panoramic view in the world (I, 155).' Whilst maintaining the startling and oft-cited contrast between picturesque beauty and filthy interior, his later additions represent a reversal of emphasis:

> The streets are full of filth, and heaps of carrion; from time to time the stranger lights upon some marble palace or mausoleum, surrounded by the black and miserable remains of whole districts destroyed by those continual fires, which lighted either by the rage of conflicting parties, or by the carelessness of the predestinarian Mussulmans, so frequently lay waste the capital of Constantine. (I, 208)

The Captain here chooses to make himself blind to his own account of the Ottoman capital and conjures up both received wisdom and deeply entrenched stereotypes. He marks his civil European identity off from the apparently retrograde world of Islam by charging it with carelessness, fatalism and ignorance.[86] Hence, in the 'Remarks and Notes' global civility's inclusive vision gives way to Orientalist prejudices. The ensuing tensions between Frankland's adventures recorded along the way and his retrospective additions thus bear witness to both an emerging network of Orientalist citationality and the ways in which severed emotional ties can give rise to wilful misrepresentations

83 *Andréossy, Konstantinopel und der Bosporus von Thrazien*, 32 [my translation].

84 *Ibid., 32 [my translation].*

85 Ibid., *31*

86 Schiffer, *Oriental Panorama*, 165.

as soon as political agendas disrupt experiential connections. Unfortunately, however, this is not the only way in which Frankland integrates Orientalist structures into his account.

Fearless Englishmen, Intrepid Britons: Anecdotes and Silenced Histories

In addition to quoting extensively from Comte Andreossy's book, Frankland incorporates what he calls anecdotes into his *Travels*. They, too, contribute to Orientalism's evolvement as domineering paradigm whilst reflecting larger shifts within East-West relations and the cultural and commercial traffic at their heart. For centuries, British identity, as well as the goods, commodities and institutions on which it depended, emerged from interaction with the Islamic world. And given the reenactive nature of Middle Eastern travel, successive generations of travellers added layer upon layer to its palimpsestic history. In Frankland's anecdotes we can find prime examples of how these intertwined histories are being reinterpreted when accumulated knowledge, political change and global civility's increasing ambivalence form a complex texture that the British used to fashion themselves as fully-fledged imperial power in the course of nineteenth century. In the Captain's anecdotes, two particular areas – horsemanship and seafaring – are reflective of Britain's metamorphosis from envious epigone to paradigmatic icon in imperial matters.

Horses were an indispensable part in this national transformation and Frankland seemed to have indulged in equitation, too.[87] On a daytrip in Istanbul, he records a fine meadow to which 'all the horses of the Sultan are brought in great state' on a particular day of the month. '[O]ccasionally' he adds, 'the favourite ladies of the Imperial harem are conveyed hither' and 'the eunuchs of the seraglio are posted on horseback all around on the hills, to keep off the gaze of intrusive eyes' (I, 149). Since he is frequently keen on witnessing examples of oriental otherness, both exotic women and strong horses might have aroused the desire to add his pair of intrusive eyes to the scene. However, apparently aware of who is calling the shots in the imperial centre, he concentrates on equestrian matters and tells his audience that the 'eunuchs are noted for […]their skill in horsemanship, and in the use of their weapons' (I, 149). In so doing, he is able to indulge in his penchant for exotic stories and at the same time appeals to the equestrian proclivities of his English readers.

87 Ibid., 374.

Equestrian culture has not only been an integral constituent of English identity from the early modern period onwards, it is also inextricably intertwined with 'international contact and exotic appropriation.'[88] Frankland relies on this essentially cross-cultural history, but exploits it in order to reinforce his country's collective imperial identity by weaving it into the anecdote of an Englishman who suddenly finds himself in the very meadow our naval officer has already mentioned:

> One of the eunuchs soon came up with him, and fired his pistol without effect; upon which the Englishman, before his adversary had time to draw his sabre, hit him over the face with the butt end of his whip, and brought him to the ground, not waiting to receive the second pursuer, who, seeing how his comrade had fared, reined in his Arab steed, and left the field of battle to the intrepid Briton. (I, 150)

Based on a story told by his landlord, Frankland enthusiastically reports the anonymous hero's success in foreign territory. Yet this is not merely an innocent anecdote or an outré digression, since its incorporation into the *Travels* reflects shifts in English domestic affairs as well as transformations on a global level. In the above passage the 'Englishman' becomes an 'intrepid Briton' and this choice of words is revealing: 'During the eighteenth century, people in the British Isles came to identify themselves as Britons as opposed to English, Irish, Scots or Welsh, largely through a consciousness of their shared differences from the French and other Europeans'[89] on the one hand and extra-European peoples on the other. Hence, after successfully outrunning the two Oriental adversaries, Frankland's hero is not English anymore, but British. And in his day and age the British had acquired an empire that was to grow even more powerful in the course of the nineteenth century. This anecdote, then, both encapsulates and mirrors transcultural processes of identity formation, which are either reduced to simplistic and straightforward narratives of British greatness or muted by reactionary voices and proponents of empire.

But what is even more significant is the Briton's ability to outrun the two skilled horsemen in their own territory, thus demonstrating the superiority of his culture in general and British horsemanship in particular. However,

88 Maclean, *Looking East*, 208; and Donna Landry, *Noble Brutes: How Eastern Horses Transformed English Culture* (Baltimore, Md. & London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009), 108.

89 Landry, *Noble Brutes*, 2.

before Britain emerged as global power her subjects first looked and then travelled east in order to observe the well-established and powerful empire of the Ottomans at work. Indeed, English identities largely depended on interaction with the Islamic world whose goods proved integral to their historical trajectory:

> From the 1650s onward, the East increasingly became for the English upper classes a source of absolutely essential ingredients with which to concoct an identity that would advertize their cultural superiority at home as well as abroad. Horses were a crucial part of this phenomenon, as the English vied for position in the global marketplace.'[90]

As multi-layered and historically contingent amalgam Englishness is not a self-evident historical category. It has to be contextualised within the nation's diplomatic, mercantile and cultural relations of the Early Modern and Enlightenment periods in order to map the structural and contextual changes at its heart in the so-called imperial nineteenth century, to which Frankland's equestrian anecdote undoubtedly belongs. The intrepid Englishmen as its protagonist is reliant upon skills, resources and animals that his country could only nationalise, and eventually proudly emulate, because of the import of Middle Eastern horses into the British Isles. When viewed in isolation, this little story is indicative of apparently clear-cut historical transparency. But as soon as it is divested of patriotic overtones the interactional, cooperative and improvisational aspects of British history in the pre-imperial era confirm that horsemanship in Britain would be unthinkable without her longstanding involvement in the Islamic world.

The commodity and cultural exchanges at the heart of this involvement depended on trade routes and means of transportation, of course. Both overland and sea routes were fraught with hazards, but 'commercial success abroad ensured by a dominance of naval power'[91] contributed to Britain's reputation as prosperous seafaring nation. As Captain of the Royal Navy, Frankland embodies this ideal both in his biography as widely travelled Englishman and in his interpretation of incidents at sea. Immediately before reaching Smyrna (Izmir) on his return journey along the eastern Mediterranean seaboard, he

90 Ibid., 85.

91 Suvir Kaul, Poems of Nation, Anthems of Empire: English Verse in the Long Eighteenth Century (Charlottesville & London: University Press of Virginia, 2000), 1.

proudly relates how swiftly his sea-tested countrymen of the ship 'Helme' rescue three sailors from an 'Austrian brig-of-war,' who had fallen overboard:

> I believe all three of the poor Austrians (or Venetians) would have been drowned; for such was the confusion created on board their vessel, and such the time taken to get their boat into the water and clear of the brig, that the Englishmen reached the struggling swimmers long before their countrymen were near them, and rescued them from their apparent fate. (I, 244)

In similar fashion to his equestrian anecdote, Frankland emphasises English heroism in this passage at the same time as he obfuscates the cooperative and interlocking aspects of encounters at sea. In so doing, he conceals the sea's 'protean'[92] nature as an 'in-between space of transformation and change where nothing is ever fixed but everything always in flux.'[93] But instead of elemental and cultural fluidity, as well as the improvisational encounters they gave rise to, British superiority appears as both unquestioned and ahistorically self-evident in this situation. It thus points to the emergence of a consolidated knowledge-power base on which those who were a 'polite and commercial people'[94] in the eighteenth century erected their global, and often unvarnished, dominance in the nineteenth.

In these stories, then, the ingredients that went into the formation of empire appear as essentially British because Frankland's emphasis on the achievements of 'intrepid Britons' divests them of their origins in liminal, and often little-explored, spaces. But in light of the maritime vicissitudes to which seamen, diplomats and merchants in pre-imperial times were exposed, nineteenth century assertions of British imperial dominance look less clear-cut. According to Alison Games, English identities were made, not born,[95] in cross-cultural contexts, turning many commercial, diplomatic and adventurous travellers from the British Isles into early modern cosmopolitans.[96] There

92 Bernhard Klein & Gesa Mackenthun, 'Introduction: The Sea is History,' in Klein & Mackenthun, eds., *Sea Changes: Historicizing the Ocean* (New York & London: Routledge, 2004), 1-12, here 9.

93 Ibid., p. 3

94 Paul Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People: England, 1727-1783* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 2.

95 Alison, Games, *The Web of Empire: English Cosmopolitans in an Age of Expansion, 1560-1660* (Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 9.

96 Ibid., 10.

was a 'steady stream of travel accounts, promotional literature, and histories that English printers produced for an interested market,'[97] which represented, fuelled and shaped both attitudes to cultural difference and imperial fantasies. However, both the obfuscation and dehistoricisation of cultural origins in the formative phases of the British Empire have a long-standing history themselves. When the seamen in Frankland's story reach those in distress 'long before their [Austrian] countrymen,' they rule, in James Thomson's words, the waves. In his jingoistic ode 'Rule, Britania' (1740), he too divests imperial ambitions of their historical contexts and projects Britain's emerging global reach onto the seas as both self-evident and divinely ordained mission:

> When Britain first, at heaven's command,
> Arose from out the azure main;
> This was the charter of the land,
> And guardian angels sung this strain:
> "Rule Britannia, rule the waves;
> Britons never will be slaves."[98]

Thomson and his ode ignore Britain's cultural imports in the Early Modern period and imply that future missions enjoy divine protection. This vision of self-sufficient national greatness is insular in both senses of the word: on the one hand, it suggests that Britain's status as an island nation sets it apart from others, primarily its European competitors; on the other, it denies the country's cultural indebtedness to the polities that had realised imperial ambitions long before the British were able to do so. Indeed, at first they were latecomers to empire and their pre-imperial '[c]osmopolitanism facilitated survival and success overseas, and thus emerged in part as a series of learned behaviours. It was often a posture derived from weakness, and central to English expansion when the kingdom itself was weak.'[99] Unaware of this little acknowledged strand of history, Frankland perpetuates the obfuscatory stance expressed in Thomson's ode, and in so doing mutes the cross-cultural past before his country rose to global prominence. Thus, when the English seamen in Frankland's account set out to rescue the Austrians, the Islamic Levant, as well as the mul-

97 Ibid., 9

98 James Thomson, *The Works of James Thomson: Volume the Third. Containing, Sophonisba, Agamemnon, and Alfred* (London: A. Miller, 1750), 253.

99 Games, *The Web of Empire*, 10.

ticultural Mediterranean, merely serve as backdrop against which the Captain defines himself and his identity in ahistorical fashion.

3. The Charms of a vagrant Life? Captain Frankland in Greater Syria

After leaving Istanbul, our naval officer criss-crosses the eastern Mediterranean, calling at Tenedos, the Troad, Smyrna (Izmir), Napoli di Romania (Nafplio), Athens and Cyprus before reaching 'Baruti, or Bairout' (I, 325) in August 1827. Unlike the journey through the Balkans and his stay in Istanbul, Frankland's journey in Greater Syria largely comes without English company, except for 'old Ponto, an English pointer' (I, 345). His journey *from* the Ottoman capital offers thus more immediate impressions than his journey *to* it, a fact already signalled by his visit to the Turkish Bath, or Hamam, in Smyrna.[100] Although direct experiences of Ottoman social practices in the Hamam temporarily suspend his prejudices, they do not trigger a comprehensive unlearning of cultural privilege in Frankland's case. In the bath, a 'savage-looking and naked tormentor', who is a 'garlick-breathing Moslem', starts tormenting 'your delicate European skin' (I, 251). Surprisingly, at the end of the process the traveller 'feels quite restored to vigour and elasticity, and there is a *satinny* smoothness of his skin, to which before he was a stranger' (I, 253). But instead of revising his cultural compass after this adventure, Frankland sticks to the representational inventory he has furnished us with up to now, namely divided and ambivalent impressions of the Ottoman dominions. Unfortunately, his rambles in Syria conform to this pattern, too.

However, at the end of his time in Syria, Frankland's account radiates with representational benevolence and adopts a comparative cultural perspective. Before heading to Egypt, the Captain tells us that the 'charm of the vagrant kind of life which [he] led in Syria, is inconceivable:'

> My wants were but few, and easily supplied; my bed was the ground, my covering a cloak, and my canopy the heavens; in such a climate I could desire no better. Yet I sometimes felt that solitude was very painful. (II, 177)

100 David Urquhart, Frankland's contemporary and a former Philhellene, who found himself increasingly attracted to Ottoman culture, introduced the Hamam into England in the mid-nineteenth century. Compare his: *The Turkish Bath, with a View to its Introduction into the British Dominions* (London: Bryce, 1856).

As Donna Landry has shown, Frankland's 'pleasure and pain were deeply interfused,'[101] and thus integral to his experience. In keeping with this pattern, the above passage 'dramati[ses] hardships'[102] at the same time as it registers the delightful aspects of the traveller's adventures in the east. Essential to these is, according to Frankland, the absence of all that is known and familiar:

> Of civilization I had seen enough. In the capitals of Europe, the manners of the world only differ by slight, and almost imperceptible degrees. He that has seen London, Paris, and Vienna, Rome, Naples, and Petersburgh, will find, that in all these cities, man is nearly the same creature of art, and living under the same common rule of the European compact. In the East, all is widely different from the West; and here the European traveller finds a new mine to explore. (II, 178/179)

In this perspective, geographical difference breeds cultural difference, and the further a traveller travels, the more he can learn. Whilst Frankland may have a point here, his 'new mine' is not really new. As we have already seen, Henry Blount had the same objective three centuries earlier; but in contrast to Frankland's lukewarm insights, Blount's achievements were truly ground-breaking for both travel and travel-writing. Hence, Frankland's claim to novelty is caught up in the same 'dialectic of novelty and repetition'[103] that has governed Oriental travel since antiquity. And what is more, given his ambivalent attitude to the Islamic world so far, the above passages invite further scrutiny – an undertaking that demands following in his footsteps in Ottoman Syria.

Upon disembarkation, Frankland is surprised 'to find the little town of Baruti, and its environs, so beautiful' and exclaims: 'So here I am in Syria!' (I, 325/326). Conspicuously articulated upon arrival on the Levantine littoral, this exclamation, one might think, suggests a new beginning, or chapter, in his comprehensive account. Indeed, at first the Captain is favourably impressed by Beirut, in which '[e]ach house is like a castle, built of solid stone masonry' (I, 327). Not only is this spot '*doubly* classical' (I, 328) by virtue of both its antique heritage and Richard Cœur de Lion's presence here during the crusades, it also challenges Frankland's preconceived ideas on Syria:

101 Landry, 'Saddle Time', 445.

102 Ibid.

103 Ibid., 441

> The vegetation was surprisingly verdant and vigorous, and my imagination, which had previously recoiled with horror from the idea of Syrian sands and deserts, was delighted with the reality which here presented itself of smiling valleys, and huge rocks crowned with the sweetest smelling and most lovely-looking evergreens. (I, 331)

This passage is a striking example of how sensory experiences can dismantle popular myths about the east. It demonstrates how deeply ingrained simplistic representations of the Islamic world really are and draws attention to their trans-historical constancy. In Frankland's case at least, not all is sand and desert in the Levant, but the trope has nevertheless determined the region's history down to the present day. Its merits as well as its ethno-religiously diverse history do not serve 'as models for desirable futures'[104] but are overlooked by the orientalising gaze of those who are unaware of the origins of western modernity in the Islamic east.

Frankland, too, is unaware of the intertwined histories between east and west, but his account nonetheless registers the plethora of communities under the Ottoman umbrella in Syria. Its inhabitants consist of

> Turks, Metooalis, Arabs of the Christian communion, Greeks, Jews, Druses, Ansyrians, or Ansari, and many other tribes. The Turks are numerically inferior to the Arabs; but they hold the sea-ports and fortresses, and govern more by fomenting the disunion of the various tribes than by force. (II, 169)

According to the Captain, an Ottoman actualisation of the ancient *divide et impera* is at the heart of the empire's policies in Syria. What he overlooks, however, is that the Ottomans left local customs largely intact and respected established traditions without too much interference from the imperial centre.[105] Unfortunately, Frankland's sense of cultural superiority prevents him from fine-tuning his receptivity towards his surroundings whereas one of his predecessors was aware of some intricate details of the country's multi-cultural texture. As early as 1669, one T. B. had already informed his readers that Christians could collect certain taxes from Muslims.[106] A local 'captain' invited him and his fellow-travellers to dine at 'a Village, called *Upshara*': 'This man is a *Maronite*, and takes *Caffar* or Toll of the Turks, which pass that way with

104 MacLean, 'Strolling in Syria,' 416.

105 Ibid., 421.

106 Ibid.

their Sheep and Oxen; he hath a hundred Souldiers under his command, who are all Christian.'[107] Of course, knowledge of such details depends on the traveller's readiness to interact with the locals. Frankland, by contrast, does not shed his European self, with his account merely enumerating various communities, as well as offering conjectural explanations of inter-communal arrangements. Measuring his *Travels* against earlier accounts thus reveals that global civility cracks as European cultures become less receptive to alterity in the process of asserting and consolidating their imperial ambitions in the nineteenth century. In so doing, they change the representational dynamics between travellers and their oriental host cultures, which once served as imperial role models at the same time as they presented themselves as insurmountable political entities.

Given Frankland's limited cross-cultural receptivity, what do we make of his emphatic rejection of civilisation? It is very well possible that he inserted it in a moment rife with nostalgia after his return to England. On the road, however, he hardly ever tires of emphasising key elements of his English identity. Where Blount readily 'pu[t] off the old man'[108] and was somewhat critical 'of the professional clergymen, whatever his nation or sect,'[109] Frankland insistently fashions himself as Christian Englishman when neither a party of fellow travellers nor the Frank establishment in Istanbul can filter his immediate experiences of the territory he traverses. Without these safeguards to fall back upon, his Englishness seems to have been his sheet anchor vis-à-vis Syria and its inhabitants. According to Frankland, '*rational Protestants*' should bring 'education' to this part of the world, since it provides the only hope 'of dispelling the Cimmerian darkness which overshadows the minds of these benighted people' (II, 20). A little further on, he spots some Arab Christians in a village called Akoura. Here he tells his readers that he 'did feel a great degree of pleasure upon beholding, in a Mussulman country, the supremacy of the Christian power' (II, 39). Even the trope of 'Syrian sands and deserts' resurfaces later on, albeit in a figurative sense. After a prolonged trip to Damascus – a city that is 'from without indeed beautiful; but within, it is like all

107 T.B., 'A Journey to Jerusalem: Or, The Travels of Fourteen Englishmen to Jerusalem, in the Year 1669,' in *Two Journeys to Jerusalem…Collected by R.B.* (London, 1759), 70-93, here 72.

108 Blount, Voyage, 4.

109 MacLean, *The Rise of Oriental Travel*, 169.

other Oriental cities, mean and shabby (II, 100-101) – via Mount Lebanon, Frankland seems to have been rather fond of civilisation:

> I know not what the traveller in Syria would do were it not for the Frank convents, which, like so many Oases in the Desert, are scattered about this country. They are become the deposits of the Christian virtues, and are so many rallying points of civilization. (II, 122).

Like William Biddulph long before him (1600-12), Frankland enjoyed meeting other Christians in the Levant.[110] For him, they are a decisive factor to the region's well-being and serve as crucial points of contact for exhausted European travellers. But in light of these remarks Frankland's rejection of civilisation's comforts appears frivolous and his rambles in Syria must have been more exhausting than anticipated.

Contrary to his professed rejection of European amenities, Frankland readily jumps at every opportunity to enjoy them, especially when English company is on offer, too. The extent to which he missed 'all sorts of English comforts and luxuries, from which [he] had been so long estranged' (II, 137) becomes apparent when he receives an invitation to visit the famous traveller Lady Hester Stanhope near Sidon in November 1827.

Stanhope, the daughter of an English aristocrat, had already been living among the local population for some years when Frankland came to stay with her for a few days. 'She was dressed *a l'Arabe*' (II, 137) – a practice cultural critics have called ethnomasquerade[111] – and the Captain tells his readers that she 'has laid out large sums of money upon this place, and has indeed contrived to make a little paradise in the desert' (II, 138). In this case, he portrays civility in the Ottoman realm in favorable fashion but only because two English citizens of the same social class meet in an artificially created setting adapted to their needs. Their encounter does not transcend cultural boundaries and represents a decontextualised instance of English conviviality in foreign territory, with soupçons of local life merely lending colour the scene. It thus exploits Ottoman Syria as a projection screen onto which both travellers project their

110 Ibid., 78.

111 Kader Konuk, 'Ethnomasquerade in Ottoman-European Encounters: Reenacting Lady Mary Wortley Montagu,' *Criticism: A Quarterly for Literature and the Arts* 46: 3 (2004), 393-414, here 393: 'Ethnomaquerade is defined here as the performance of an ethnic identity through the mimicking of clothes, gestures, appearance, language, cultural codes, or other components of identity formation.'

orientalist desires. Whilst Stanhope is ready to live among Arabs, she does not share their lifestyles; instead she created her own exotic micro-cosmos from her personal wealth. Frankland, on the other hand, finds unexpected English company and can boast of having met an illustrious contemporary in foreign lands. But what is more, their interaction depends on the exclusion of the local population. Even when Stanhope informs Frankland that 'at this moment two great Mahometan visitors [are] under her roof' he 'never sees them by any accident' (II, 142). An offer of personal protection by one of them, which Frankland declines, is transacted through their mutual host rather than personal contact. In Frankland's version of Lady Hester's Arabic abode, then, the Arabs are excluded – or enveloped in the unspoken, as Pierre Macherey would say[112] – in order to allow him to enjoy *intra*-cultural traffic in a cross-cultural context.

Outside this paradisiacal spot, however, Frankland has to put up with both the locals and other travellers. Surprisingly, on his return journey from Damascus to Beirut he approaches two merchants staying in the same khan as he:

> My neighbours were two Turkish merchants from Aleppo, – I was very civil to them, and gave them coffee and arrack. The muleteers and camel-drivers made a great noise all night, and the fleas, as usual, prevented my sleeping much. (II, 113)

Noisy caravan attendants, 'filthy khans' and 'flea-infested camps'[113] are integral constituents of oriental travel in those days. The extraordinary aspect here is, of course, Frankland's unconditional civility towards the merchants. As they find themselves bound to the same destination, both parties choose to travel together from here. After more drinks and nights on the road, leave-taking is imminent. The two merchants

> made great professions of regard for me, as they had received civilities at my hands on the route, and said, that for the sake of our companionship, they would make me a present of [a turban], or of any thing else I might choose to select out of their bales, upon our arrival at Bairout. However, I never saw any more either of them or of their goods, their recollection of me failing

112 Pierre Macherey, *A Theory of Literary Production*, transl. by Geoffrey Wall (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978), 85.

113 Landry, 'Saddle Time,' 445.

> when they no longer drank my coffee and arrack. (II, 118/119) [emphasis in original]

In this situation, he experiences how civility can be revoked from both sides of the encounter and that Europeans do not have a monopoly on granting it, especially as Turks are entitled to call the shots in their own empire. Episodes such as this one may have confirmed some of Frankland's prejudices, which is why towards the end of his Levantine journey he draws a rather disappointing conclusion on interacting with the locals: 'I have only found one honest man in the country, and that is my own servant' (II, 162). But even Jiaccomo, whom he hardly ever mentions, cannot be admitted unconditionally to the realm of the faithful: he was an 'honest fellow', but our naval officer is quick to add 'for an Arab' (II, 172).

But not all is doom and gloom in Greater Syria. Just as both his journey through the Balkans and his stay in Istanbul have their pleasant sides, the eastern Mediterranean is not devoid of attractions. Whilst dealing with the locals is a necessary evil for our class-conscious naval officer,[114] he nevertheless enjoys the scenic charms and beautiful views on offer in the Levant. For example, close contiguity with 'camels and their savage-looking drivers' (II, 104/105)[115] in the crowded streets of Damascus does not go down well with him. But as soon as spatial conditions allow for distanced aesthetic contemplation both camels and conductors blend in with their surroundings and evoke standardised tropes by which Frankland judges the Orient.

Whilst still in the Syrian capital, Frankland comes across another caravan that he describes as follows: 'The grouping of these huge unwieldy beasts, and their drivers occupied in unloading them, was highly picturesque and Oriental' (I, 112). However, this one is less annoying by virtue of the author's distance from it. And further on in his journey, Frankland finds the views not merely satisfactory but 'complete:'

114 Compare II, 163: 'Whatsoever enjoyment you may derive from visiting the East, it is poisoned by the continual attempts, on the part of the native population, to extort money from you, in all dealings which it may be your misfortune to have with them.'

115 This is not the only instance of Frankland expressing his contempt for camels and their conductors. See also II, 84: 'We met a large caravan of camels, with their savage-looking Bedouin conductors.'

> The sea was on our right hand, and the mountains, with their picturesque Arab towns and vineyards, on our left. Camels and Arabs, beach and fishing-boats completed the scene. (II, 134)

He appears to be taking stock in this situation of the components determining oriental picturesqueness. Unfortunately, this idiosyncratic way of both exploring and representing the Islamic world often reduces its population, as well as its flora and fauna, to a backdrop against which he either defines himself or that he judges according to its degree of perfection. In such a climate, even-handed and mutually improving encounters are difficult to sustain and become situationally contingent. Hence, Frankland's ambivalent, and sometimes schizophrenic, attitude to Islam and the Ottomans maps the transition from global civility to imperialism that took place from the late eighteenth century onwards.

4. What about the multi-cultural Mediterranean, then?

Captain Frankland is indeed less receptive to the Muslim world than some of his predecessors. Where Blount admired the ingeniously crafted empire of the Ottomans in the seventeenth century and Abbott emphatically asserted that the Arabs '*are not* treacherous'[116] in the eighteenth, the imperial nineteenth century changes Europe's relationship with the East fundamentally and lastingly. Frankland is on the cusp of this transformation, since his account both openly displays western arrogance and bespeaks a sense of entitlement at the same time as it retains traces of civility and notions of enlightened cosmopolitanism. Though these are few and far between in the *Travels*, they nonetheless exist and allow us to plumb the breadth and depth of modern Orientalism's rise to epistemological prominence. According to Frankland, the traveller

> will do well to learn a few Arabic or Turkish phrases of civility and salutation; always remembering that civility costs nothing, and that the Orientals are scrupulous observers of this sort of etiquette, and are favourably impressed by any stranger, who is gracious in his manner and kind in his speech. (II, 180)

116 Henry Abbott, *A Trip…Across the Grand Desart of Arabia* (Calcutta: Joseph Cooper, 1789), 12.

It is somewhat ironic that Frankland does not practice what he preaches, but civility nevertheless found its way into his account, albeit only as atrophic discursive remnant. In later decades, and especially at the beginning of the twentieth century, comparable remarks become marginal and are relegated to a distant past of cross-cultural cooperation. The most influential study on this topic to date – Edward Said's *Orientalism* – impressively retraces this development.

Nonetheless, in Frankland's account the Mediterranean is still represented as multi-cultural and hybrid contact zone. Despite indications of Europe's increased presence and dominance there,[117] our naval officer furnishes us with pieces of information that illuminate the cultural, mercantile and religious cross-fertilisation of past centuries.[118] On Frankland's return journey through the Mediterranean, during which he calls at Cyprus, Alexandria, Malta and Italy, he experiences first-hand the coeval presence of East and West, Christianity and Islam, as well as the intermingling of civilisations, that engendered what he himself calls 'the European compact' (II, 178). His consolidated European sense of self notwithstanding, both the fluidity of identities and the interconnectedness of cultures creep into the picture as he sails homeward. At sea, terrestrial patterns of behaviour are interrupted by its fluidity and one comes to understand radical interconnections[119] that not only defy straightforward categorisations but also resist attempts at taming them. Even as European powers increasingly assert their cultural and political dominance in Frankland's day, the sea's elemental waywardness safeguards its role as transcultural locus of cooperation, exchange and resistance to dominance.

In Malta, for instance, Frankland is confronted with a wide variety of impressions, traditions and peoples. He is thus implicated in a multi-cultural context, which can neither be subjected to Eurocentric claims to hegemony nor allows for simplistic narratives of cultural unity or purity. When some fellow officers from the Russian navy invite him aboard their flagship, he attends 'an honour which had not been conferred on any occasion since the

117 Compare: II, 140-141.

118 Daniel J. Vitkus explores this part of British history in *Turning Turk. English Theatre and the Multicultural Mediterranean, 1570-1630* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003), 23: 'English contact with the Mediterranean continually challenged the borders of English culture, and English representations of its diversity and instability continually confront and express that challenge.'

119 Caroline Rooney, 'What is the Oceanic?' **Angelaki** 12:2 (August 2007), 19 –32, here 30.

days of Peter the Great', namely 'the presentation of the flag of St. George' (II, 210). Other British officers join him in the ceremony, which is celebrated with gunfire, flag-waving and naval camaraderie. This *intra*-European spectacle in international waters is followed by a remark on the local population, which seems to exemplify even more insistently that both sea and shore are loci where cultures meet, mingle, clash or merge into new constellations: 'The Maltese speak a dialect of Arabic, and still wear the long red cap or tarboosh of their ancestors of the Desert. Their history is involved in the impenetrable mist of remote antiquity' (II, 214). According to Frankland, Malta's culture is a hybrid confluence of eastern and western habits, practices and qualities. And not only do the Maltese retain their ancestors' language and sartorial items, their origins seem to lie in the east, or in the 'Desert' to be precise. Hence, both sea and desert are thus not 'outside or beyond history'[120]. They are rather transnational zones of interaction, with the one being always in flux, and the other acting as historical repository storing up 'the rubbish of centuries'[121] in A. W. Kinglake's words. Accordingly, Europeans going east enter a world of the past, in which Malta was a Christian outpost in the Islamic Mediterranean, and experience how things used to be.[122] Unfortunately, Frankland's pronounced European identity prevents him from properly connecting to the territories he traverses, without tipping over into the hegemonic discourse of the age of high imperialism, however. His *Travels to and from Constantinople* thus demonstrate that 'contrasting representational strands can coexist within a single text'[123] and help us to map the historical trajectory of both global civility and orientalism at a crucial historical juncture in Euro-Islamic relations.

120 Klein & Mackenthun, 'Introduction: The Sea is History,' 2.

121 A. W. Kinglake, *Eothen* (London: George Newnes, 1898), 22.

122 MacLean, 'Strolling in Syria,' 417.

123 Andrew Hammond, 'Typologies of the East: On Distinguishing Balkanism and Orientalism,' in Keith Hanley & Greg Kucich eds., *Nineteenth Century Worlds: Global Formations Past and Present* (Oxford: Routledge, 2008), 129-146, here 134.