

Afkar: The Undergraduate Journal of Middle East Studies 4, no. 1 (Fall 2022): 20-30.

Ottoman Conflicts: Depiction vs. Description in the Battles of Lepanto and Mohacs

MAEVE SILK, Georgetown University

Abstract:

This article examines various artistic and written depictions and descriptions of the Battles of Lepanto and Mohacs. Considering a wide variety of sources from multiple perspectives within and outside of the Ottoman Empire, it analyzes consistencies and inconsistencies found within the different primary and secondary sources. The article also uses methods of art history survey to investigate visual works representing competing forces, studying both the imagery of the works and the context of their creation. In all, this investigation considers the ways in which the various elements and biases of these visual and written retellings are illustrative of the sociopolitical position of their authors or artists, as well as larger trends within the time period and regions. The article concludes that religious tension and state power were among the most common forces influencing these descriptions and artistic works.

Keywords: Ottoman Empire, Battle of Lepanto, Battle of Mohacs, Art History, Literature

Background

Oftentimes, modern historians are reliant on a few existing primary and secondary sources to understand important events from the past. While in most cases written documents, such as letters or official government documentation, serve as sources for these points of information, art depicting these events can also provide significant insight to aid in their study. Throughout the reign of the Ottoman Empire, art creation was widespread. Contact with other cultures through trade led to adoption and experimentation with different styles. Ottoman painters, for instance, developed their practice by incorporating multiple Western conventions into their painting.¹ In addition, in the European nations who participated in cross-cultural trade with the Ottomans, the influence of Islamic styles of art and architecture is seen to span across centuries.² While much of this Islamic art was decorative or religious in nature, it also did not shy away from depictions of leaders, political events, and, in particular significance to this discussion, military conflicts. Examining the combination of works created by Ottoman artists and European artists in tandem with written sources from both sides of these clashes creates an interesting mechanism for their historical study. Discrepancies between these mediums point to clear areas of contention, while commonalities can provide deeper support for certain interpretations of events. In what follows, I will examine artistic depictions and written descriptions of two of those key conflicts between the Ottomans and European nations, the Battles of Lepanto and Mohacs, and consider how these sources do not serve as unbiased retellings, but instead work together to illustrate themes of larger political agendas and religious viewpoints of the societies in which they were created.

The Battle of Lepanto

Fought in 1571, the Battle of Lepanto represented a key point of victory for European Christians and marked a significant moment in the gradual downfall of the Ottoman Empire. A.C. Hess writes that many historians believe the outcome at Lepanto “not only settled the old struggle that had broken out between Muslims and Christians after the fall of the Roman Empire [but] also began an epoch in which the Mediterranean no longer occupied a central position in the events that would mould Europe,” as authority over the key territory was returned to Europeans from the Ottoman Empire.³ After the Great Siege of Malta in 1565, powerful Christian European nations recognized the need for unification in their opposition to the Ottomans, despite existing divisions between them. Losing Lepanto would be particularly devastating to crusading European forces, as its location represented a “key bastion facing the East.”⁴ The European army, which included navies from members of the Holy League under the direction of Pope Pius V, was outfitted with larger firepower of 1,334 guns; meanwhile, the Ottomans had only 741. The Europeans surpassed the Ottomans in numbers as well.⁵ During the attack, a massive fleet of European soldiers boarded and attacked the Ottomans' galleys from their ships until the Ottomans were forced to abandon their attack, losing key sea trade access, suffering large numbers of casualties, and ceding access to the territory of Lepanto to the Venetians. Adding insult to injury, Ottoman commander Müezzinzade Ali Pasha was killed, and his head was carried on a spike by the Spanish forces. The Ottomans' naval difficulties led to the destruction of many ships in their fleet and were to a large extent responsible for their defeat.⁶

The Battle of Lepanto: Literary Depictions

One description of the Battle of Lepanto can be found in *The Turkish History* by Richard Knolles, which was first published in 1603. It is one of the first significant accounts of the Ottoman Empire in the English language. Interestingly, Knolles initially refers to Lepanto as the “ancient city of Naupactum,” adding later in a note that the same city is also referred to as Lepanto.⁷ By leading with the ancient Venetian name for the city, Knolles affirms that he is writing for a European, rather than Ottoman audience, which would have known the city by its Turkish name of Inebahti or Aynabhti. This sets the stage for his later description and justification of the outcome of the Battle of Lepanto. In his actual description of the battle, Knolles describes it as “a right horrible spectacle to see” with the “sea stained with blood, and covered with dead bodies, weapons, and the fragments of the broken bodies.”⁸ Knolles utilizes this gory imagery to emphasize the brutality of the battle and the difficulty faced by European soldiers. He goes on to discuss the outcome and effects of the battle in more detail, writing that “besides the great number of them that were slain, and beaten into the sea; many of the Turks were blinded with feare, casting away their weapons” and throwing “themselves headlong into the sea.”⁹ By highlighting both the large number of the Turkish soldiers and their alleged cowardice, Knolles affirms the prevailing opinions of his European audience, supporting the belief in both the significant strength and superiority of character of the European Christians over the Ottoman Muslims.

Another interesting literary source is a poem written by King James VI of Scotland during his reign, which served as his reaction to and memorialization of the Battle of Lepanto. Written in the wake of the battle in 1585 and published in 1591, King James VI’s *The Lepanto* adopts the structure of a narrative poem describing epic heroism and recounting the Battle of Lepanto from start to

finish. Solely portraying the battle as a Christian victory, King James begins by describing the battle as a “bloodie” and “[long] doubtsome fight, with slaughter huge/And wounded manifold,”¹⁰ continuing the trend of European authors emphasizing the battle’s length and gore. Additionally, King James makes a special effort in his introductory stanza to justify the Europeans’ role in the battle, writing that “The Turke had conquest Cyprus Ile/And all their lands that lay/Without the bounds of Italie,”¹¹ emphasizing the belief that the territory rightfully belonged to the Italians. In his descriptions of the troops arriving at Lepanto from European countries such as Spain, Italy, and France, King James focuses on their large numbers, in “thousands” of soldiers, and their impressive attributes, including “glistring armes” which no “match to them could mak.”¹² Furthermore, he also weighs in on the motivation of Christian European soldiers, describing many of them as “voluntaires of conscience” who “would no wages haue.”¹³ In contrast to his lengthy meditation on the superior armament and character of the Christian soldiers, King James only describes the Muslim Ottoman army the following way: “Then SELYM sent a nauie out/Who wanderd without rest/Whill time into LEPANTOES gulfe/they all their Ankers kest.”¹⁴ This reinforces his goal of depicting the battle as a great Christian victory.

In his description of the battle itself, King James makes countless references to the Christian God “[weighing] in Heauen, The Christian faults with faithlesse Turkes”¹⁵ in order to help the allegedly outnumbered Europeans prevail against the Ottoman empire. This narrative choice serves to further hone in on the miraculous nature of the event’s outcome. King James goes on to describe the European soldiers in battle, writing that “Soldats neuer ceast/To kill, or wound at least”¹⁶ despite their “small Artillerie.”¹⁷ Throughout his poem, King

James, at times contradicting himself, describes the Europeans as being at once both the underdogs, and the more valiant soldiers. In this way, King James manages to entertain his readers and affirm the European understanding of the Battle of Lepanto as a victory for both Christian countries and God.

The Battle of Lepanto: Visual Depictions

In addition to the literary sources considered above, The Battle of Lepanto is also widely depicted in works of art. Through their iconography, these works tend to frame the battle as a religious conflict rather than a geopolitical or territorial one. One example of such famous portrayals of the battle are Giorgio Vasari's *Lepanto Frescoes*,¹⁸ which depict the battle in numerous scenes. Painted in the immediate aftermath of the battle in 1572-73 and displayed in the Vatican, these paintings emphasize the link between Christian victory and religion, while also focusing on the combat logistics of the massive naval battle. The artist, Giorgio Vasari, an Italian painter who had previously embarked on numerous projects for Catholic churches across Italy, was commissioned by the Vatican to create a representation of the victory at Lepanto. Before beginning the painting process, Vasari worked diligently to learn about the events of the battle, hiring eyewitnesses of the battle to share their accounts with him and studying "prints, maps and commemorative medals."¹⁹ Vasari's *Lepanto Frescoes* are imbued with Christian iconography, emphasizing the divine significance of the battle. In his fresco *Cosigning of the Papal Battle Standard to Don Giovanni of Austria* (1572)²⁰ Vasari documents the Pope's blessing of the Christian commander through the exchange of his standard. Although the design of the standard contains some inaccuracies,²¹ the dramatized scene, featuring a large, rapt crowd and angels overseeing the ritual, continues the theme of underscoring the

religious nature of the conflict, as seen in written sources.

In Vasari's next fresco, *Confrontation of the Christian and Turkish Fleet*,²² the battle is portrayed in more detail but religious iconography and stylized images still dominate. Ships in the background seemingly stretch into the horizon, consistently with the written reports that the Battle of Lepanto was a naval battle with an unprecedentedly high number of ships. Furthermore, Vasari also correctly depicts the orientation of the ships, which were "stationed far enough apart to ensure they did not drift into each other, and within each unit the galleys were chained together, forcing the enemy to sail around them rather than cut through their midst."²³ The terrain in the landscape background is also accurate, as Vasari based it on map prints of the area by cartographers and reports of the battle.²⁴ However, Vasari's agenda is not only to show the layout of the battle; he also includes fantastic elements, such as personifications of the members of the Holy League and a skeleton representing death.²⁵ Through these additions, Vasari reaffirms the European belief in the high number of Ottoman casualties achieved by the formidable Christian European forces.

Another depiction of the Battle of Lepanto can be found in the *Allegory of the Battle of Lepanto* by Paolo Caliari detto Paolo Veronese (1588).²⁶ Veronese was a Venetian painter, famous for his work in local churches and a fresco series which praised the city of Venice displayed in the Ducal Palace.²⁷ Just like Vasari's frescoes, this work portrays the Battle of Lepanto as a grand Christian victory attained with divine assistance.²⁸ Centering on Venice's role in the battle, the artist represents the venetian fleet by "a woman dressed in white, introduced to the Virgin by Saint Justina and Saint Mark, while Saint Peter and Saint Roch are on the left."²⁹ This emphasis on Venice is consistent with the historical significance of the city of Lepanto, which was a part of

Venice before it fell to the Ottomans. It is also undoubtedly influenced by the painter's personal background as an Italian painter whose oeuvre is dominated by Christian subject matter. Such influence is evidenced, for instance, in Calliari's use of light to depict European forces as having the support of God. Contrasting sections of light and darkness extend down from the cloud which houses religious figures: "the bright, beneficent rays [...] single out the victors' ships while dark shadows seem to inexorably torment the ships of the 'enemies.'"³⁰ By drawing on Christian iconography and incorporating Catholic figures, Veronese's portrayal of the battle centers itself on Lepanto's cultural significance rather than its militaristic details.

Martin Rota's engravings display a more factual and less religiously motivated portrayal of the Battle of Lepanto.³¹ In *View of the Battle of Lepanto* (1572),³² the entirety of the battle is portrayed from an expansive, heightened, and greatly detailed view. The engraving depicts countless naval ships, infantry struggles, weaponry, and ocean debris from the destruction of galleys that are all consistent with the events of the battle. Although there are a few more stylized elements emphasizing the magnitude of the battle, including billows of smoke from cannons and classical gods and mythical figures in the corners, the core image of the battle itself remains true to the written reports and relatively unbiased in its view. Rota's other engraving relating to the Battle of Lepanto, *Allegory of the Battle of Lepanto*,³³ created in 1571, provides a slightly more political take on the conflict. Instead of showcasing an accurate portrait of the battle itself, *Allegory of the Battle of Lepanto* shows a caged Turk being attacked by a variety of animals, including a lion and an eagle, traditional evangelical symbols in Catholicism. Though humorous, the message of this emblematic work is clear: the Turks suffered a great loss to the European armies

at Lepanto. The work refrains from moralizing or including a direct depiction of divine intervention and focuses more on reporting the battle's outcome than memorializing its victory. Rather than serving as pieces of an ivory tower commemorating glorious religious or military victory, Rota's engravings, which circulated more widely as prints, were able to spread a factual story about the Battle of Lepanto to a wide audience across Christendom.

The Battle of Mohacs

Many of the written, literary, and artistic depictions of the Battle of Mohacs are markedly different in tone and style than those of the Battle of Lepanto. Still, the language and content choices of these depictions reinforce similar political and religious agendas, although with slightly different techniques. The Battle of the Mohacs occurred in 1526 and was fought between the Ottomans and the Hungarians. This decisive victory for the Ottomans became their gateway into Hungary and further European conquests. The Ottoman forces - traveling from Constantinople - included sipahis, or cavalry forces, and Janissaries, and were for more numerous than the Hungarian forces. The Ottomans utilized cannons and handguns, but many soldiers also wielded bows and arrows.³⁴ The Habsburg forces, on the other hand, led by King Louis II, were comprised of "a mixed army of cavalry and infantry (about sixteen thousand and ten thousand men, respectively) armed with handguns, pikes, and large shields of the Bohemian type."³⁵ When the two forces met, the Ottomans quickly gained advantage through the actions of the Janissaries, who prevented the Hungarians from gaining access to the Ottoman cannons.³⁶ This battle emblemized the downfall of the Hungarian kingdom, best exemplified by the death of King Louis II of Hungary, which occurred during the conflict. These events also paved the way for later Ottoman victories

throughout Hungary, as Suleyman and his army headed towards Buda, which was later captured in 1541.

The Battle of Mohacs: Literary Depictions

Eyewitness accounts of the Battle of Mohacs provide insight into some of the key points and characteristics of the battle, while also describing its atmosphere and offering reactions. Suleyman discussed the conflict in his own diary, writing that there was a “massacre of prisoners” by the Ottomans in the wake of the battle, and that on the day that the battle concluded, the “rain fell in torrents.”³⁷ These are interesting details of the events which are not portrayed in the historical visual depictions. Furthermore, these admissions show that, in his records, Suleyman does not shy away from discussing cruel behavior of the Ottomans during battle, which are typically not shown in Turkish depictions of events. After the conclusion of the battle, Suleyman writes: “Rest at Mohacs; 20,000 Hungarian infantry and 4,000 of their cavalry buried.”³⁸ In Suleyman’s description there is a clear focus on the positive outcome of the battle.

Another witness to the Battle of Mohacs was the German Johannes Cuspinianus, who focused his discussion of the conflict on his criticism of Hungarian forces in his 1526 text *Rousing speech to the Holy Roman Empire’s princes and dignitaries, that they should launch a war against the Ottomans*.³⁹ Cuspinianus, who was employed as an envoy by Habsburg leadership during his lifetime, describes the Hungarian soldiers at the battle as an “indolent” and “dozing” group of “imbeciles” containing “no steady men.”⁴⁰ This view of the Hungarian soldiers seems to directly contradict a more romantic view of the Hungarian defeat and the Ottoman blame in later Hungarian historical understanding and art. However, this opinion about Hungarian deficiencies was not widespread; Stephen Brodarics directly disputes it in his

work *The True Story of the Battle of Mohacs Between the Hungarians and the Ottoman Emperor Sulieman*, published in 1527. In this treatise, Brodarics, who was the Hungarian Royal Chancellor at the time, reminds Cuspinianus that the “Hungarians had defended Christian society for the last five hundred years with their own blood” and posits that the soldiers, though defeated, fought valiantly.⁴¹ As an eyewitness to the battle, Brodarics was able to provide much detail about the conflict. He wrote that “the battle took place on a plain area” and that “an elevation was in front of the Hungarian army” nearby “a small village with a church.”⁴² This description of the landscape does not completely align with the paintings of the battle, which show colorful landscapes with rolling hills and varying topography while providing no indication of a village anywhere nearby.

As news of the outcome of the Battle of Mohacs gradually spread throughout Europe, descriptions of the battle turned more and more dire. In a letter written on September 18, 1526, to the secretary of Henry VIII - Sir Brian Tuke - British Bishop John Hacket describes the first news of the Battle of Mohacs. Hacket writes that, according to a witness to that battle who was now “at Francf[urt],” on August 29 “the Turk had defeated the King, who escaped with only four men.”⁴³ At this point, the news of King Louis II’s death had not yet been confirmed, but reports of the battle were already focused on emphasizing the dramatic loss of life amidst European soldiers and dangers posed by the advancing Ottomans. Two days later, Francis I, the King of France at the time, wrote to King Henry VIII that during the battle, Suleyman “had in his army 300,000 men, and sent forward to the first engagement 70,000 men” as well as “30,000 horses.”⁴⁴ These figures, while perhaps not completely accurate, underscore the role that the massive size of the Ottoman army played in its success. (It is noteworthy that the

significant use of horses by the Ottomans is also present in visual depictions of the battle.) Francis I then goes on to describe the battle in more detail, writing that the “Turks began the attack, and met with a rather hot reception. When they came near the Turkish guns they divided into wings. For a whole hour the firing was furious, and the Hungarians were routed, with great slaughter of bishops, lords, and great men.”⁴⁵ This description of the battle recognizes that it was not a landslide victory for the Ottomans, while simultaneously framing the massacre of Hungarians by the Turks as an evil act. Francis I then concludes by explaining that, after winning the battle, “the Turks refreshed themselves three days, and then went about carrying rapine and slaughter” as they continued to move through Hungary into Europe.⁴⁶ Here we are able to see yet again a desire to excite paranoia around what Suleyman’s victory at the Battle of Mohacs meant for the security of the rest of Europe.

The Battle of Mohacs: Visual Depictions

In the sixteenth century, Turkish miniatures were utilized to commemorate significant military conflicts such as the Battle of Mohacs and focused more on political than religious power. As seen in *The Battle of Mohacs*, a Turkish miniature from Seyyid Loqman’s *Hunername II* created in 1589,⁴⁷ these miniatures, like the other works discussed in this article, referenced the size and grandeur of the military. The horses and armor portrayed in the painting are consistent with the dress of Ottoman soldiers during this battle, and the spear-like weapons depicted are an accurate portrayal of those used by the Ottomans in the Battle of Mohacs.⁴⁸ Perhaps the most notable figure in the painting, the Sultan, speaks to the painting’s larger agenda. The sultan is comparatively larger in size than others in the scene and occupies the center of the image. Ceremonial guards surround the Sultan, who is sitting in an elegant, courtly stance.⁴⁹ This is markedly different from the

European depictions of the victory at the Battle of Lepanto, which prefer to spotlight religious figures and symbols over political leaders. This theme is further reinforced by the miniature’s presence in *Hunername II*, a book dedicated to cataloging the accomplishments of Ottoman rulers, one of many in this genre.

A similar depiction of the Battle of Mohacs is found in *Suleiman I as Victor over Hungarians at Battle of Mohacs*, another Turkish miniature painted during the sixteenth century in the wake of the eponymous battle.⁵⁰ This painting does not picture Suleyman as prominently as *The Battle of Mohacs*. Here, he is the same size as the warriors in his army, with the same register, and is only visible in the center of the crowd of soldiers. Indeed, he can only be located after a close inspection of the scene.

Although this miniature celebrates a stunning victory for the Ottomans, it does not disregard the casualties of the battle. At the bottom of the battle landscape, a few horses can be seen kneeling with their erstwhile Ottoman riders lying on the ground next to them, evidently dead. Although the few dead soldiers shown constitute a minor detail and are nowhere near proportional to the actual casualties of the battle, their inclusion in this victory painting is intriguing. Such an element is not as clearly visible in the other Turkish miniature or victory paintings of Lepanto, or many of the Ottoman descriptions of the battle, both of which focus more on the Ottomans’ successes in battle to the exclusion of their own casualties.

Similarly to *The Battle of Mohacs*, *Suleiman I as Victor over Hungarians at Battle of Mohacs* features a relatively accurate depiction of Ottoman dress and weaponry during the battle, including cannons, swords, uniforms, and armor. A hallmark of Turkish miniature battle-paintings from the sixteenth century is their “preference for illustrating chronicles and histories in a factual manner,” including details such as accurate “costume and

uniforms” and “armies ... drawn up in serried ranks.”⁵¹ However, both *The Battle of Mohacs and Suleiman I as Victor over Hungarians at Battle of Mohacs* also include purely stylistic elements, such as horses shown in fantastical colors and aesthetic landscape elements. The stylized rolling hills, rather than explicitly referencing the difficulty of the battle terrain, instead envisage the vast landscape of the battle and speak to the far distances the Ottomans traveled to reach it. These characteristics of Turkish miniature paintings speak to their role both as decorations and as historical records, while also glorifying the military power of Suleyman and the Ottoman forces.

A later depiction of the Battle of Mohacs speaks to the Hungarian perspective on the conflict, diverging sharply from the Ottoman miniature painting. Hungarian artist Bertalan Székely’s *The Battle of Mohács* (1862) provides a romanticized view of the tragedy centuries after it was experienced. This painting differs from the other artworks discussed in this article because it was created centuries after the battle occurred and because it represents the viewpoint of the conflict’s loser rather than victor. These distinctions give us additional insight into how perspectives on the battle developed over time. In the foreground of the painting,⁵² slain Hungarian soldiers lay dead, while hordes of Ottoman troops celebrate in the distance. Other details including the “dirty and dangerous marsh, the clouded sky, the fire in the background, all express the hopeless situation of the country” and underscore the human cost of the battle.⁵³ Rather than trying to frame the conflict as a success, *The Battle of Mohács* emphasizes the ways in which the battle was a failure for the Hungarian military. The piece features depictions of armor, weaponry, and horse usage, which are historically accurate to a certain extent, even if the painting focuses on Western style arms much more than those of the Ottomans. *The Battle of Mohács* does, however, effectively

capture the overwhelming number of troops involved in the conflict. While the romantic, neoclassical style of the painting and elements such as its highlighted foliage can be attributed to a rise in Enlightenment-era history painting during the nineteenth century, the difference in tone between *The Battle of Mohács* and the victory paintings remains stark. The continuous representations of the Battle of Mohacs many years after the conflict speak to the battle’s impact on collective cultural memory and the rivalry’s continued relevance.

Conclusion

Ultimately, the variance between the depictions and descriptions of the Battle of Lepanto and the Battle of Mohacs speaks to the political and religious motivations behind their creation. From paintings to poems, artistic and literary adaptations of the battles illustrate not only the realities of the conflicts, but also capture other significant details, such as the battle’s emotional atmosphere, the public reactions it elicited, and its meaning in relation to broader historical context - something that often escapes the eyewitness accounts.

First- and second-hand accounts of the battles typically hold a bias based on the reporters’ religious and ethnic background. In the case of the Battle of Lepanto, European artists and writers primarily evaluated their victory in terms of Christianity, deploying religious imagery and language in their attempts to justify not just their participation in the battle, but also their religious superiority over the Muslims. With the Battle of the Mohacs, however, there was a much larger concern for state power, whether that included showcasing images of the Ottoman army’s battle prestige or discussing the geopolitical anxieties caused by their victory at Mohacs. It is also important to note that the two battles took place under different historical contexts, with Lepanto standing as a reconquest of previously held territory and

Mohacs constituting an entirely new conquest. Such differing circumstances and motivations influenced the nature of subsequent depictions and were responsible for many of these key differences in representation.

Although not all of these sources can serve as accurate historical representations of the events of these battles, they can nevertheless illustrate contemporary reactions, anxieties, and consequences. Comparing and contrasting a variety of eyewitness accounts, artworks, and literary sources allows for a deeper understanding of what occurred in Lepanto and Mohacs. As more works are translated across languages and analyzed in relation to each other, future research has the potential to unveil even more of these connections and dissonances.

-
- [1] Richard Turnbull, "Wendy M.K. Shaw. Ottoman Painting: Reflections of Western Art from the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic. London and New York: I.B. Tauris, 2011. *Review of Middle East Studies (Tucson, Ariz.)* 48, no. 1-2 (2014): 106. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2151348100057128>.
- [2] Rosamond E. Mack, *Bazaar to Piazza: Islamic Trade and Italian Art, 1300-1600*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002. Print, 9.
- [3] Andrew C. Hess, "The Battle of Lepanto and Its Place in Mediterranean History." *Past & Present*, no. 57 (1972): 72.
- [4] Rick Scorza, *VASARI'S LEPANTO FRESCOES: "APPARATI", MEDALS, PRINTS AND THE CELEBRATION OF VICTORY*. *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes - JSTOR*, 142. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/i24394780>.
- [5] Gábor Ágoston, *The Last Muslim Conquest: The Ottoman Empire and Its Wars in Europe*, 243. Princeton University Press, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1b3qqdc.11>
- [6] Hess, 62.
- [7] Richard Knolles, 1550?-1610. *The Turkish History, from the Original of that Nation, to the Growth of the Ottoman Empire with the Lives and Conquests of their Princes and Emperors. / by Richard Knolles, Sometime Fellow of Lincoln-College in Oxford. with a Continuation to this Present Year. MDCLXXXVII. ; Whereunto is Added the Present State of the Ottoman Empire. by Sir Paul Rycaut, Late Consul of Smyrna* [General historie of the Turkes Present state of the Ottoman

- Empire. History of the Turkish empire from the year 1623 to the year 1677.]. London: 1687, 31. <https://www.proquest.com/books/turkish-history-original-that-nation-growth/docview/2240892942/se-2>.
- [8] Knolles, 883.
- [9] Knolles, 883.
- [10] THE LEPANTO OF IAMES THE SIXT, *King of Scotland*, 142-143.
- [11] THE LEPANTO OF IAMES THE SIXT, *King of Scotland*, 144-147.
- [12] THE LEPANTO OF IAMES THE SIXT, *King of Scotland*, 276-277.
- [13] THE LEPANTO OF IAMES THE SIXT, *King of Scotland*, 283-284.
- [14] THE LEPANTO OF IAMES THE SIXT, *King of Scotland*, 340-344.
- [15] THE LEPANTO OF IAMES THE SIXT, *King of Scotland*, 136-140.
- [16] THE LEPANTO OF IAMES THE SIXT, *King of Scotland*, 825.
- [17] THE LEPANTO OF IAMES THE SIXT, *King of Scotland*, 820.
- [18] Figure 1, *Lepanto Frescoes, Cosigning of the Papal Battle Standard to Don Giovanni of Austria* (Giorgio Vasari, 1572), and Figure 2, *Lepanto Frescoes, Confrontation of the Christian and Turkish Fleet* (Giorgio Vasari, 1572-73).
- [19] Scorza, 143.
- [20] Figure 1.
- [21] Scorza, 146.
- [22] Figure 2. Vasari, Giorgio. *Lepanto Frescoes, Confrontation of the Christian and Turkish Fleet, 1572-73*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/24395990.pdf>.
- [23] Scorza, 159.
- [24] Scorza, 159.
- [25] Scorza, 157.
- [26] Figure 3, *Allegory of the Battle of Lepanto* (Paolo Caliari Veronese 1588).
- [27] Richard Cocke. "Wit and Humour in the Work of Paolo Veronese." *Artibus et Historiae*, vol. 11, no. 21, IRSA s.c., 1990, pp. 125, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1483387>.
- [28] Figure 3.
- [29] Gallerie Dell'Accademia Di Venezia, "Allegory of the Battle of Lepanto: Gallerie Dell'accademia Di Venezia," <https://www.gallerieaccademia.it/en/allegory-battle-lepanto>.
- [30] Gallerie Dell'Accademia Di Venezia.
- [31] Figure 4, *View of the Battle of Lepanto*, (Martin Rota, 1572).
- [32] Figure 4.
- [33] Figure 5, *Allegory of the Battle of Lepanto*, (Martin Rota 1571).
- [34] Gábor Ágoston, "HABSBURGS AND OTTOMANS: Defense, Military Change and

- Shifts in Power.” *Turkish Studies Association Bulletin*, vol. 22, no. 1, Indiana University Press, 1998, pp. 163, https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/j.ctv1b3qqdc.9.pdf?ab_segments=0%2Fbasic_search_gsv2%2Fcontrol&refreqid=fastly-default%3A2a29d4779dd248559cfde2d0ed65a041.
- [35] Ágoston, 162.
- [36] Ágoston, 164.
- [37] Roger Bigelow Merriman, *Suleiman The Magnificent, 1520–1566*. Cambridge, MA and London, England: Harvard University Press, 2013, 92. <https://doi-org.proxy.library.georgetown.edu/10.4159/harvard.9780674421059>.
- [38] Merriman, 92.
- [39] Enikő Csukovits, *Hungary and the Hungarians: Western Europe’s View in the Middle Ages*, 61.
- [40] Csukovits, 61.
- [41] Orsolya Száraz, THE BASTION OF CHRISTENDOM. *Philobiblon*, 25(2), 2020, 289. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.26424/philobib.2020.25.2.06>.
- [42] Balázs Polgar. *The First and The Second “Battle of Mohács” (ad 1526, 1687)* *Archaeological Research and Perspectives*, 202. 2014.
- [43] 'Henry VIII: September 1526, 16-30', in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 4, 1524-1530*. Edited by J S Brewer. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1875. *British History Online*, accessed December 10, 2021, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/letters-papers-hen8/vol4>.
- [44] 'Henry VIII: September 1526, 16-30', in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 4, 1524-1530*.
- [45] 'Henry VIII: September 1526, 16-30', in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 4, 1524-1530*.
- [46] 'Henry VIII: September 1526, 16-30', in *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, Volume 4, 1524-1530*.
- [47] Figure 6, *The Battle of Mohacs*, a Turkish miniature from Seyyid Loqman’s *Hunername II* (1589).
- [48] Hanaa M. Adly, “*The Battle of Mohacs*” *Illustration: Window into Reality*. https://bcps.journals.ekb.eg/article_17761_ef3205bcf48c527f3ac35bf7be5c00d3.pdf.
- [49] Adly.
- [50] Figure 7, *Suleiman I as Victor over Hungarians at Battle of Mohacs*.
- [51] Titley, Norah M. “EARLY OTTOMAN MINIATURE PAINTING: TWO RECENTLY ACQUIRED MANUSCRIPTS IN THE BRITISH LIBRARY.” *The British Library Journal* 9, no. 2 (1983): 124. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42554184>.
- [52] Figure 8, *The Battle of Mohács* (Bertalan Székely, 1862)
- [53] Adly, 26.

Appendix

Figure 1. Vasari, Giorgio. *Lepanto Frescoes, Cosigning of the Papal Battle Standard to Don Giovanni of Austria*, 1572, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/24395990.pdf>.



Figure 2. Vasari, Giorgio. *Lepanto Frescoes, Confrontation of the Christian and Turkish Fleet*, 1572-73, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/24395990.pdf>.



A Giorgio Vasari's Confrontation of the Christian and Turkish Fleet at the End of Lepanto (1572-73).
 Engraving by the American School, San Diego

Figure 3. Veronese, Paolo Caliari. *Allegory of the Battle of Lepanto*, 1588, <https://www.gallerieaccademia.it/en/allegory-battle-lepanto>.



Figure 4. Rota, Martin. *View of the Battle of Lepanto*, 1572, https://collections.carli.illinois.edu/digital/collection/nby_dig/id/2686.



Figure 5. Rota, Martin. *Allegory of the Battle of Lepanto*, 1571, <https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/image/64330001>.



Figure 6. “*The Battle of Mohacs*,” a Turkish miniature from Seyyid Loqman’s *Hunername II*, 1589. In *Bridgeman Images: DeAgostini Library*, edited by Bridgeman Images. Bridgeman, 2014.



Figure 7. *Suleiman I as Victor over Hungarians at Battle of Mohacs*. p. 1, <https://jstor.org/stable/community.13880312>.



Figure 8. Székely, Bertalan. *The Battle of Mohács*, 1862, <https://en.mng.hu/artworks/the-battle-of-mohac>

