

# The Christian Perception of Islam in the Late Middle Ages and in the Reformation

Thomas Kaufmann

## RESÜMEE

Das 15. und 16. Jahrhundert waren durch die äußere Bedrohung durch das Osmanische Reich in mentalitätsgeschichtlicher Hinsicht mannigfach verbunden. Dies kam auch darin zum Ausdruck, dass sich die Reformatoren einige mittelalterliche Texte zur Wahrnehmung des Islam (Georg von Ungarn, Robert v. Kettons Übersetzung des Koran u.a.) aneigneten, sie erneut oder erstmals publizierten, aber auch zum Zweck der binnenchristlichen Polemik aktualisierten. Die Muster in der Wahrnehmung der „türkischen Religion“ pluralisierten sich; neben traditionell häresiologischen spielten Wahrnehmungsweisen eine verstärkte Rolle, die die „Unwahrheit“ des Islam anhand des Koran selbst zu erweisen versuchten. Die Turkisierung der innerchristlichen Gegner trug dazu bei, religionskulturelle Wissensbestände über die fremde Religion präsent zu halten und zu popularisieren.

It has become increasingly commonplace to conceptually oppose “the Islamic world” with “the European world.” While this dichotomous semantic configuration has its immediate origin in recent Western perceptions of militant Islamic fundamentalism, it is rooted in a history that goes back much farther than the current debates. It was in direct historical connection with the fall of Constantinople in 1453<sup>1</sup> that the later Pope Pius II coined the phrase “Europa, id est patria,” thus underscoring the prevalence of the con-

1 See D. Mertens, “Europa id est patria, domus propria, sedes noster ...” Zu Funktionen und Überlieferungen lateinischer Türkenreden im 15. Jahrhundert, in: F.R. Erkens (ed.), *Europa und die osmanische Expansion im ausgehenden Mittelalter*, Berlin 1997, pp. 39–58; J. Helmrath, Pius II. und die Türken, in: B. Guthmüller/W. Kühlmann (eds), *Europa und die Türken in der Renaissance*, Tübingen 2000, pp. 79–138; J. Helmrath, Enea Silvio Piccolomini (Pius II.) – ein Humanist als Vater des Europagedankens?, in: R. Hohls/I. Schröder/H. Siegrist (eds), *Europa und die Europäer: Festschrift für Hartmut Kaelble*, Stuttgart 2005, pp. 361–9. The reflections concerning the Turks and the Christian commandment to do battle with them which the Pope engaged in his *Commentarii rerum memorabilium quae temporibus suis contigerunt* (critical ed. A. van Heck, Vatican City, 1984) are readily available

cept of Europe as the last remaining homeland of Christians in the ideological defense against the Ottomans. The recent conceptual configuration of a “European” versus an “Islamic” world therefore clearly developed out of the intellectual struggle of “Christianity” against the Ottoman super power. The experience of an external threat also fundamentally linked the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.<sup>2</sup>

At the same time, the anxiety about the Ottomans distinguished the epoch from the preceding early and high medieval history of relations between *christianitas* and the “Islamic World,” a history strongly influenced by processes of mutual perception and labelling that involved a plurality of actors, including the Muslim world (itself to be differentiated), the Catholic Church, Lutheran Reformers, and the Reformed churches. This paper will focus on Lutheran modes of perception of Islam in the late Middle Ages and the Reformation<sup>3</sup> within the noted complex multilateral relationship. Lutheran modes of perception were shaped, I will argue, by the steadily increasing experience of an external

in German translation in: E.S. Piccolomini, *Commentarii: Ich war Pius II: Memoiren eines Renaissancepapstes*, selected and trans. by G. Stölzl, Augsburg 2008, pp. 76–80 (Book 2; esp. re the Council of Mantua).

- 2 K.-P. Matschke, *Das Kreuz und der Halbmond: Die Geschichte der Türkenkriege*, Düsseldorf et al. 2004, esp. pp. 76–104; instructive as a counter perspective to the too strongly Christian view on the European Middle Ages in its effort to treat the three major religions equally, although the argument is not fully persuasive in my opinion, is the recent publication: M. Borgolte, *Christen, Juden, Muselmanen: Die Erben der Antike und der Aufstieg des Mittelalter 300–1400 n. Chr.*, Munich 2006; on the relationship of the Ottoman Empire to all the Christian states see esp.: G. Poumarède, *Pour en finir avec la Croisade: Mythes et réalités de la lutte contre les Turcs aux XVIe et XVIIe siècles*, Paris 2004; H. Schilling, *Konfessionalisierung und Staatsinteressen: Internationale Beziehungen 1559–1660*, Paderborn et al. 2007, pp. 201–15; C. Kafedar, *The Ottomans and Europe*, in: T.A. Brady/H. A. Oberman/J.M. Tracy (eds), *Handbook of European History: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation, 1400–1600*, vol. 1, Leiden et al. 1994, pp. 594–636.
- 3 The arguments developed in this contribution are closely related to reflections in my recent monograph: T. Kaufmann, “Türckenbüchlein”: Zur christlichen Wahrnehmung “türkischer Religion” in Spätmittelalter und Reformation, Göttingen 2008. Further sources and bibliographic details are referenced in the bibliography included there. The abbreviations I have used follow the list of abbreviations in the encyclopaedia: *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (RGG), 4th ed. Tübingen 1998–2007; “MF” refers to the collection of sixteenth-century pamphlets edited by Joachim Köhler. The lively debates on continuity and rupture have rarely tackled the Turkish question, especially not where the writing of church history is concerned. See, e.g., B. Hamm, *Von der spätmittelalterlichen reformatio zur Reformation: Der Prozess normativer Zentrierung von Religion und Gesellschaft in Deutschland*, in: ARG 84, 1993, pp. 7–82; B. Hamm, *The Reformation of Faith in the Context of Late Medieval Theology and Piety: Essays*, ed. R.J. Bast, Leiden et al. 2005; B. Hamm, *Die Emergenz der Reformation*, in: B. Hamm/M. Welker, *Die Reformation: Potenziale der Freiheit*, Tübingen 2008, pp. 1–27; a less interesting position concerning the eventfulness of the Reformation is taken by V. Leppin, *Die Wittenberger Reformation und der Prozess der Transformation kultureller zu institutionellen Polaritäten*, Stuttgart/Leipzig 2008; see also: T.A. Brady (ed.), assisted by E. Müller-Luckner, *Die deutsche Reformation zwischen Spätmittelalter und früher Neuzeit*, München 2001; H. Schilling, *Reformation: Umbruch oder Gipfelpunkt einer Temps des Réformes?*, in: B. Moeller (ed.), *Die frühe Reformation in Deutschland als Umbruch*, Gütersloh 1998, pp. 13–34 (reprinted in: *ibid.*, *Ausgewählte Abhandlungen zur europäischen Reformations- und Konfessionsgeschichte*, ed. L. Schorn-Schütte/O. Mörke, Berlin 2002, pp. 11–31; T. Kaufmann, *Die Reformation als Epoche?*, in: *Verkündigung und Forschung* 47 (2002), pp. 49–63; S. Ehrenpreis/U. Lotz-Heumann, *Reformation und konfessionelles Zeitalter*, Darmstadt 2002, pp. 17–29. The fact that the category of the Reformation, which was and is central in the context of German history, becomes relativized and marginalized to a greater extent within the horizon of European and global historical scholarship perspectives (see, e.g.: C. Fasolt, *Europäische Geschichte, zweiter Akt: Die Reformation*, in: T.A. Brady (ed., cited above), pp. 231–50; see also: R. Dürr/G. Engel/J. Süßmann (eds), *Eigene und fremde frühe Neuzeiten: Genese und Geltung eines Epochenbegriffs*, Munich 2003), lies in the choice of “perspective” but not in the “nature of things,” however it is styled. I have most recently presented my view on these matters in my book: *Geschichte der Reformation*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Frankfurt a. M. 2010.

threat to Europe that I mentioned above. The labelling of others, whether they were Reformed, Catholic, or Muslim, cannot be understood except against the background of the Ottoman political threat, which allowed for a range of possible political reactions and alliances. Options included, for instance, uniting with the Catholics against the Muslims or siding with the Muslims against the Catholics.

These varying options were in turn related to different semantic strategies of dealing with the Other. The spectrum of terms used to mark “Islam“ in late medieval and early modern German and Latin texts is relatively broad. On the one hand, heresiological terms such as “lex” (law), “secta” (sect), or “haeresis” (heresy) are common, often in combination with adjectives like “mahometisch,” “sarazenisch,” or “heidnisch” (heathen). On the other hand, the pejorative term “superstitio” (superstition) or the neutral concepts “fides” (faith) or “religio” (religion) can be found to mark “Islam,” although both usually are used to name Christianity or the Christian faith as the single and true “religion” or “faith.” Concerning the followers of “foreign religion,” the terms “Heiden” (heathen), “Sarazenen” (Saracens), “Ismaelitae” (Ismaelites), “Agareni” (sons of Hagar), “Mahumetismae,” or “Muselmanen” are customary. These terms have been common since early and/or high medieval times. From the fifteenth century onwards, the phrases “turci” (Turks, Ottomans) or “türkische Religion” (“Turkish religion”) dominate all other terms. The epistemic view cast on “Islam” vacillates between the heresiological stance, commonly accepted since Johannes Damascenus, and the late medieval perspective developed by Roger Bacon and Vinzenz de Beauvais, who dealt with “Islam” as a “foreign religion” such as paganism or Judaism. Martin Luther’s terminology, which will be the main focus of this paper, has to be interpreted against the background of this previous tradition. He speaks of the “religion of the Turks and Muhammad,” a religion far more brilliant than “ours” in respect of ceremonies and manners. Moreover, he states that “Christian religion” differs from “Turkish” or “papal” religion in that the latter have to do with moral attitudes and “good works” while true Christian religion is focused on faith alone. “Religion” is thus used to announce the *genus proximum* of Christendom and Islam while the *differentia specifica* is expressed by “national,” “ethnographic,” or “nominal” (e.g., Mahometic) predicates.

## I.

For reasons not elaborated here, the Reformation can be seen as the most profound rupture experienced within the Latin European history of Christianity. Here, I would like to look into the question if and to what extent the continuous “threat” posed by the Ottomans is connected to the evolution of a fundamental rift in Christianity within Europe. In view of ritual practices, one continuity from the fifteenth to the sixteenth centuries cannot be overlooked: The tolling of the Turks’ Bell, introduced in 1456 by Pope Cal-

lixtus III<sup>4</sup> and made mandatory by Imperial law in 1523,<sup>5</sup> was taken up by the Protestant Church Order.<sup>6</sup> Consequently, the Turks' Bell remained in use, although Jakob Andreae of the Tübingen collegiate church protested: "[...] I hold it that this Turks' Bell has power/ to chime as well for weather and for death/ for the greater part [of people] use it for their idolatrous prayer [...] / the other part have their mockery/ and all devotion ceases with the bell. But dear friends, besides the Turks' Bell/ we have to ring/ another storm bell in our heart/ namely true repentance."<sup>7</sup>

But the continuity from the fifteenth into the sixteenth century would be underestimated in its complexity if one followed the line of the Andreae quotation and assumed a continuity of cultural practices that was purely external. In the late sixteenth century, no lesser instance of Lutheran orthodoxy than the Faculty of Theology of Wittenberg advocated common prayer with the Papists against the "hereditary arch enemy of common Christianity," the Turk – at least when such a prayer was not connected with the grace of indulgence and with the invocation of saints on the side of the Catholics.<sup>8</sup> Community with members of the Roman Church, for which an analogy is hard to find in the confessional era, was regarded as possible – in prayer against the common enemy. A further note of caution against the idea of a *merely external continuity* between the fifteenth and

- 4 See L. Freiherr von Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste im Zeitalter der Renaissance bis zur Wahl Pius II*, vol. 1, 12<sup>th</sup> unrevised edition, Freiburg/B. et al. 1955, pp. 721–3, including footnote 1.
- 5 On the mandate of the 1523 regiment of the Holy Roman Empire, see: DRTA J.R. 3, p. 58, pp. 21–23. The mandate stipulated the midday "sonder glocke geleut" (special ringing of the bells); it admonished Christians to prayer, which would achieve military victory as well as fend off God's wrath. For the broader context, see: K. Schreiner, *Kriege im Namen Gottes, Jesu und Mariä. Heilige Abwehrkämpfe gegen die Türken im späten Mittelalter und in der Frühen Neuzeit*, in: K. Schreiner (ed.), *Heilige Kriege: Religiöse Begründungen militärischer Gewaltanwendung: Judentum, Christentum und Islam im Vergleich*, Munich 2008, pp. 151–92.
- 6 The midday tolling, which occurred daily from 1457 onwards, was intended as a reminder to pray for help against the Turks and is found in numerous Protestant church orders; see P. Graff, *Geschichte der Auflösung der alten gottesdienstlichen Formen in der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands*, Waltrop 1999 [reprint of the 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Göttingen 1937], pp. 226–7; E.W. Zeeden, *Katholische Überlieferungen in den lutherischen Kirchenordnungen des 16. Jahrhunderts*, in: *ibid.*, *Konfessionsbildung: Studien zur Reformation, Gegenreformation und katholischen Reform*, Stuttgart 1985, pp. 113–91, here: p. 159; see, e.g., the church order of Osterode (Herzogtum Preußen, 1576), in: E. Sehling (ed.), *Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts*, vol. 4, Aalen 1970 [reprint of first edition, Leipzig 1911], p. 151; or that of Danzig (1612), in: *loc cit.*, p. 203.
- 7 "[...] ich halt dass diese Türkenglocke ebenso ein große Kraft hab/ als zum Wetter- oder Totenläuten dann der großer Teil braucht es zu seinem abgöttischen Gebet [...] / der ander Teil hat sein Gespött/ und gehet also fast alle Andacht mit der Glocken aus. Wir müssen aber liebe Freund/ neben dieser Türkenglocken ein andere Sturmlocken unseres Herzens/nämlich ein wahrhaftige Reue." J. Andreae, *Dreyzehnen Predigen vom Türcken: In wölchem gehandelt würdt von seins Regiments Ursprung, Glauben und Religion ...*, Tübingen, Morhart 1569; VD 16 S 2614; Ex. MF Bibl. Palat. E 543/544, p. 370; to Andreae's Turkish sermons, see S. Raeder, *Die Türkenpredigten des Jakob Andreae*, in: M. Brecht (ed.), *Theologen und Theologie an der Universität Tübingen*, Tübingen 1977, pp. 96–122; S.R. Boettcher, *German Orientalism in the Age of Confessional Consolidation: Jacob Andreae's Thirteen Sermons on the Turk, 1568*, in: *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 24/2 (2004), pp. 101–14; for the historical context see T. Kaufmann, "Türckenbüchlein" (as in note 3), pp. 118–9.
- 8 *Consilia Theologica Wittebergensia/ des ist Wittenbergische Geistliche Ratschläge*, Frankfurt a. M. J.A. Endter, W. D. J. E. 1664, Teil 2, Tit VI, Nr. 4 ("Ob Lutheraner mit den Papisten in einer Kirche wieder den Türcken beten können?"), Wittenberg, 2.1.1640, pp. 172–3, here: p. 172). On the context of confessional and religio-cultural cohabitation and its limits, see: T. Kaufmann, *Religions- und konfessionskulturelle Konflikte in der Nachbarschaft. Einige Beobachtungen zum 16. und 17. Jahrhundert*, in: G. Pfeleiderer/E.W. Stegemann (eds), *Religion und Respekt: Beiträge zu einem spannungsreichen Verhältnis*, Zürich 2006, pp. 139–72, in particular p. 170.

the sixteenth centuries is sounded by the fact that when Luther wrote a prophetic saying of the fifteenth century on the wall of his study with chalk, he quoted the Logion of Johann Hilten: “Anno millesimo sexcentesimo veniet turcus, totam germaniam devastaturus.”<sup>9</sup>

## II.

In view of the Turkish question, the internal coherence between the sixteenth and the fifteenth centuries becomes especially evident at the level of tradition, reception, and distribution of relevant texts and value patterns. Luther opens the line of pre-Reformation scripts on Turks when he re-edited the *Libellus de ritu et moribus turcorum* of a certain former Transylvanian by the name of Georgius de Hungaria in early 1530, immediately after the siege of Vienna.<sup>10</sup> He justified the publication of this text, which had first been published in Rome around 1470,<sup>11</sup> by arguing that it was related to the “religio” and the “mores” of the “mahometistae” in a more thorough and impartial way than two other texts which were known to him at that time: the *Confutatio Alcorani* by the Dominican Ricoldo de Montecrucis from the thirteenth century and the fifteenth-century *Cribatio Alcorani* by Nicholas of Kues.<sup>12</sup>

- 9 Luther, Weimarer Ausgabe (WA) 48, notes to p. 284 on pp. 133–4,4d; see J. Ficker, Eine Inschrift Luthers im Lutherhaus, in: Theologische Studien und Kritiken 107 (1936), pp. 65–68; according to a witness from the late sixteenth century, the inscription could be found on the wall “behind his Bible, written with his own hand, not long before his death. A tablet was specially made which one could push back to reveal his handwriting.” Qtd. in WA 48, notes to p. 133; in the logion transmitted by the Franciscan Johann Hilten, as he was imprisoned in Eidenach, the Turks were expected to conquer Germany (or Italy, according to a variation of the text transmission) in 1600; on this point see: T. Kaufmann, Konfession und Kultur. Lutherischer Protestantismus in der 2. Hälfte des Reformationsjahrhunderts, Tübingen 2006, pp. 435–41 et passim (see Hilten); also see my supporting material in: T. Kaufmann, “Türckenbüchlein” (as in note 3), pp. 193–4, 223–8, 230.
- 10 WA 30 II, pp. 205–8 (edition with Luther’s preface); an edition of the German translation of the preface by Sebastian Franck with idiosyncratic interpolations can be found as a reprint in: C. Göllner (ed.), Chronica und Beschreibung der Türkei: Mit einer Vorred D. Martini Lutheri, Cologne, Vienna 1983, pp. 1–8; on Franck’s translation, see C. Dejung, Sebastian Franck, Sämtliche Werke, vol. 1: Frühe Schriften: Kommentar, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt 2005, pp. 407–12; a “dogmatically correct” Lutheran translation of the preface was added by Justus Jonas to his translation of Paolo Giovio’s Turcicarum rerum commentarius (see T. Kaufmann, “Türckenbüchlein” (as in note 3), p. 123 (footnote 36)): Ursprung des Türkischen Reichs / bis auf den itzigen Solymam / durch D. Paulum Jovium ... verdeutschet durch Justum Jonam [no place, no date]; VD 16 G 2051; Ex. SUB Göttingen 8 H Turc 715(2), U3r-X4v; at the beginning of January 1530, Luther announced the publication of the Latin edition, see WA Briefwechsel 5, pp. 215,5–7; see also: J. Ehmann, Luther, Türken und Islam: Eine Untersuchung zum Türken- und Islambild Martin Luthers (1515–1546), Gütersloh 2008, pp. 324–7; on Luther’s Turkish circulation see also: A.S. Francisco, Martin Luther and Islam: A Study in Sixteenth-Century Polemics and Apologetics, Leiden/Boston 2007.
- 11 Concerning the history and the history of the text, consult as a seminal study: R. Klockow (ed.), Georgus de Hungaria, Tractatus de moribus, conditionibus et nequicia Turcorum: Traktat über die Sitten, die Lebensverhältnisse und die Arglist der Türken, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Cologne et al. 1994; on the printing occasioned by Luther (Wittenberg, Johannes Lufft, 1530; Ex. SUB Göttingen 80 H Turc 103) see loc. cit., p. 67, no. 8.
- 12 On Ricoldus’s writings (and Luther’s later edition of Ricoldus): J. Ehmann (ed.), Ricoldus de Montecrucis Confutatio Alcorani (1300): Martin Luthers Verlegung des Alcoran (1542). Annotated Latin-German edition, Würzburg/Altenberge 1999; for an excellent bilingual edition of Nicholas of Kues’s writings, see: L. Hagemann (ed.), Nikolaus von Kues, Sichtung des Korans, vols. 1–3, Hamburg 1989–1993; further references to recent research

In fact, Georgius rendered insights into the conditions in Turkey and the territories occupied by the Turks which were drawn from life. For when he was a youth, he had been taken captive by the Turks in Mühlbach in 1438,<sup>13</sup> and for two decades he had lived as a slave with various Turkish masters, had learned the language of the country and gained deeper insights into the life world of the Turks than any Westerner before him. Georgius describes the charm of worshipping, the impressive discipline of the women living in polygamous marriages, the rituals of everyday life, the shining brightness of the *praxis pietatis*, the dances of the Dervishes, the great architecture of the mosques, but also the misery of the Christian slaves, who were kept like cattle or humiliated as objects of sexual lust.<sup>14</sup> Georgius succeeded in fleeing to Rome, where he found peace of mind by joining the order of the Dominicans. He had written his memoirs while awaiting an Ottoman invasion of Italy, which was acutely feared to take place between summer 1480 and spring 1481. His intention was to communicate to his fellow Christians some insights into the power of fascination of the other religious culture, as he himself had at times surrendered to the fascination of “Turkish religion” and had converted to it. In the face of the Ottoman occupation, he wanted to protect Christians from a fall into apostasy as he himself had experienced it.<sup>15</sup> However, as he made clear to his readers again and again: the fascination of “Turkish religion” came from the devil, the master of beautiful illusions.<sup>16</sup> As an *expers*, somebody who related on the ground of his own *experiential*,<sup>17</sup> Georgius was accorded a greater reliability by Luther than the scholarly confutatores of the Qur’an, who judged solely on the basis of questionable written sources and rumors.<sup>18</sup> Georgius’s script belongs to the best-known pre-Reformation texts on Turks in general. Until 1514, it had also been reprinted in Urach, Cologne, and Paris – seven times in

on Nicholas of Kues’s perception of Islam can be found in: T. Kaufmann, “Türckenbüchlein” (as in note 3), p. 134, footnote 102.

13 For the biographical details, see R. Klockow (ed.), *Georgius de Hungaria* (as in note 11), pp. 11–29.

14 See R. Klockow (ed.), *Georgius de Hungaria* (as in note 11), pp. 179–85, 200–9, 230–6, 280–6.

15 At the beginning of his poem, the writer from Siebenbürgen refers to a lapse of faith: “[...] et in meipso expertus didici [i.e., that the Muslims convert captive Christians to Islam], qui cum multo mentis gaudio expectabam mortem pro fide Christi subire [i.e., at the defence of Mühlbach]; et tamen [...] de igne semivivus extractus et vite redditus per successum temporis detentus in manibus eorum veneno erroris eorum quasi infectus de fide Christi non modicum dubitavi et, nisi misericordia dei mihi affuisset et me custodisset, turpiter eam negassem.” R. Klockow (ed.), *Georgius de Hungaria* (as in note 11), p. 146. The newly won freedom, which he achieved when he was allowed to leave his land with the help of a charter made out in the name of the Sultan (littera imperiali auctoritate confecta; see pp. 206–7), made him a “verum etiam illius cruentissime secte diabolica infectione absolutus liber” (loc. cit., p. 410). For evidence which speaks for Georgius’s temporary affiliation with the Order of the Dervish, see R. Klockow, loc. cit., pp. 21–22.

16 “Nam tanta est potentia diaboli in eis [i.e., the Muslim ascetics], ut videantur potius diaboli incarnati quam homines.” R. Klockow (ed.), *Georgius de Hungaria* (as in note 11), p. 272; see p. 270; p. 284, where Georgius ascribes to the Turks Paul’s proverb about the devil changing into an angel of light (2 Corinth. 11, 14). In this respect, Luther is fully dependent on Georgius’s view, see for example WA 30 II, p. 186, 31–34; p. 187, 1–17; pp. 205, 29–206, 2.

17 See phrases such as “in me ipso expertus” (R. Klockow (ed.), *Georgius de Hungaria* (as in note 11), p. 146); “do-centur experiential” (loc. cit., p. 148); “expertam in me ipso” (ibid.), as well as the final aphorism that one should “in rerum humanarum dubiis” give more credence to the greater experience (“maiori experientie fides”) than to those who usually report on the Turks (loc. cit., p. 406).

18 WA 30 II, p. 205, 4–28.

total.<sup>19</sup> And with Luther's edition of 1530, a history of circulation began that dwarfed all earlier distribution. Luther's edition was the basis for a translation by Sebastian Franck and more than a dozen complete editions as well as countless Latin and German partial printings of "Turks' booklets" of all kinds.<sup>20</sup> Additionally, Franck's partly very idiosyncratic translation<sup>21</sup> is the first explicit source of his spiritualism<sup>22</sup> and his distancing from the emerging reformatory town and territorial churchdoms which he saw as "Turkish," albeit cloaked in the Christian faith.<sup>23</sup> No sixteenth-century text had a stronger impact on the image of Turks in the Old Empire than this tract. Publishing the *Tractatus of Georgius*, however, meant that Luther and Franck published a text containing, from a theological point of view, numerous offensive issues connected with the traditional old faith, such as the doctrine of the sacraments, the veneration of saints, and the so-called "religious piety of achievement" in general. But in the face of the magnitude of the dangers Luther saw in Vienna, these deficits obviously seemed comparatively harmless to him. In his *Heerpredigt wider die Türken* for example, which Luther had published at the end of the year 1529, about two months after the unsuccessful termination of the Ottoman siege of Vienna, he wrote that his "dear Germans, the lazy sods," wanted, now that the danger was over, "to carouse and live well in all their security"; "ha, the Turk has run away and is now gone," they thought, but in this way they underestimated the real threat.<sup>24</sup> Therefore, Luther used the new edition of the Transylvanian's tract to draw polemic capital from his account. The reason the Papists had written so little on the religion and worship of the Turks, he boldly claimed, was because papism would have broken down had it really confronted the religion of the Turks.<sup>25</sup> Especially when

19 On further printings from (1481, Rome) up to 1514 Paris, see R. Klockow (ed.), *Georgius de Hungaria* (as in note 11), pp. 60–66, no. 1–7.

20 A seminal work: C. Dejung, *Kommentar* (as in note 10), pp. 335–513; new edition in: S. Franck, *Sämtliche Werke: Kritische Ausgabe mit Kommentar*, vol. 1: *Frühe Schriften*, ed. P.K. Knauer, Berne 1993, pp. 236–327; regarding the printings, see VD 16 G1377–G1388; T. Kaufmann, "Türckenbüchlein" (as in note 3), pp. 160–1 (footnote 202), as well as the still very helpful bibliography by C. Göllner, *Die europäischen Türkendrucke des XVI. Jahrhunderts*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Bucharest/Baden-Baden 1961–1968: vol. 1: MDI–MDL, 1961; vol. 2: MDLI–MDC, 1968; vol. 3: *Die Türkenfrage in der öffentlichen Meinung Europas im 16. Jahrhundert*, Bucharest/Baden-Baden 1979; new printing, vols. 1–3, Baden-Baden 1994.

21 See in addition to C. Dejung, *Kommentar* (as in note 10): S.C. Williams, "Türkenchronik": *Ausdeutende Übersetzung: Georgs von Ungarn "Tractatus de moribus, conditionibus et nequicia Turcorum"* in der Verdeutschung Sebastian Francks, in: D. Huschenbett/J. Margetts (eds), *Reisen und Welterfahrung in der deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters*, Würzburg 1991, p. 185–95.

22 This was already clearly perceived by Alfred Hegler, who introduced the spiritualism concept which Ernst Troeltsch made widely influential, in his standard work on Franck: A. Hegler, *Geist und Schrift bei Sebastian Franck: Eine Studie zur Geschichte des Spiritualismus in der Reformationszeit*, Freiburg/B. 1892, esp. pp. 48–50.

23 See, e.g., S. Franck, in: C. Göllner (ed.), *Chronica* (as in note 10), p. 89; S. Franck, *Werke*, vol. 1, footnote 20, p. 314,3–4. et passim.

24 WA 30 II, p. 160,17–21.

25 "Ego [i.e., Luther] plane credo nullum Papistam, monachum, clerum et eorum fidei sotium, si inter Turcos triduo agerent, in sua fide mansurum. Loquor de iis, qui serio fidem Papae volunt et optimi inter eos sunt. Caetera turba et maior eorum pars, praesertim Itali, quia porci sunt de grege Epicuri, nihil prorsus credentis, securi sunt ab omni haeresi et errore fortesque et invicti in sua fide Epicurea tam contra Christum quam contra Mahometum et contra ipsum suum met Papam. [...] Itaque pro Apologia quadam Evangelii nostri simul hunc librum [i.e., *Georgius's*] edimus. Nunc enim video, quid causae fuerit, quod a Papistis sic occuleretur religio Turcica, Cur

it came to external rituals, the institution of monks, asceticism, negative views, Lent, in short, the whole beautiful ritual appearance of “Turkish religion,” the papal religion, in Luther’s view, was infinitely inferior to that of the Turks. In consequence, Georgius’s description of the external cult of the Turks became a profound apology for the Gospel (*apologia quadam evangelii nostri*).<sup>26</sup> For it is quite evident, Luther claims, that the *religio Christi* is something completely separate from rituals and customs. To Luther, therefore, the completely different character of the *religio* or the *fides Christi*, as set against “Turkish religion” and its highest thinkable degree of ceremonial orthopraxy, is obvious. To a Christian, it makes no difference to do justice to God through external ceremonies, customs, and laws (*ceremoniae, mores et leges*); law and order do not contribute to justice and the forgiveness of sins.<sup>27</sup> According to Luther, “Christian religion” becomes distinctive in its reflection in “Turkish religion.”

To Luther, the catechetical *elementaria* of Christian faith, namely the second article, have to be inculcated, in contrast to “Turkish religion.” Through the faith in Christ, the resurrected son of God, who died because of human sins, every Christian will be protected against Satan. In this spirit, Luther comments in his *Heerpredigt*:

*[...] with this article, our faith is separated from all other beliefs on earth, for the Jews do not have this, neither have the Turks and Saracens, also no Papist or false Christian ... therefore, if you come to Turkey, where you can have no preachers nor books, there speak to yourself, either in bed or at work, be it with words or in thought, your Our Father, the faith, and the Ten Commandments, and when you come to this article (i.e. the second), then press your thumb on one finger or otherwise give a sign with your hand or your foot, so that you remember this article well and keep it in mind.*<sup>28</sup>

1529, the year of the most massive military advances of the Turks, was also the year in which the Lutheran catechism was written<sup>29</sup> – hardly an only external chronological coincidence.

solum turpia ipsorum narrarint, Scilicet quod senserunt, id quod res est, si ad disputandum de religione veniatur, totus Papatus cum omnibus suis caderet nec possent fidem suam tueri et fidem Mahometi confutare [...].’ WA 30 II, p. 206,15–22; p. 207,3–8.

26 WA 30 II, p. 207,3–4. (qtd. above in note 25).

27 “Cum enim in vicino nunc Turcam et suam religionem habeamus, monendi sunt nostri, ne specie religionis illorum et facie morum commoti aut vilitate nostrae fidei ac morum diffinitate offensi negent Christum suum et Mohemetum sequantur. Sed discant religionem Christi aliud esse quam caeremonias et mores Atque Fidem Christi prorsus nihil discernere, utrae caeremonie, mores et leges sint meliores aut deteriores, Sed omnes in unam massam confusas dictat ad iustitiam nec esse satis nec eis esse opus.” WA 30 II, p. 207,24–31.

28 “[...] durch diesen Artikel wird unser Glaube gesondert von allen andern Glauben auf Erden, denn die Juden haben des nicht, die Türken und Sarazener auch nicht, dazu kein Papist noch falscher Christ... darum, wo du in die Türkei kommst, da du keine Prediger noch Bücher haben kannst, da erzähle bei dir selbst, es sei im Bette oder in der Arbeit, es sei mit Worten oder Gedanken, dein Vaterunser, den Glauben und die Zehen Gebot, und wenn du auf diesen Artikel [i.e., the second] kömmt, so drucke mit dem Daumen auf einen Finger oder gib dir sonst etwa ein Zeichen mit der Hand oder Fuß, auf dass du diesen Artikel dir wohl einbildest und merklich machest.” WA 30 II, p. 186,15–24.

29 For the context see: M. Brecht, *Martin Luther: Zweiter Band: Ordnung und Abgrenzung der Reformation*, Stuttgart 1986, pp. 267–85; G. Strauss, *Luther’s House of Learning: Indoctrination of the Young in the German Reformation*,



In the face of fear of Ottoman invasion, Luther instrumentalized the Transylvanian's *Tractatus* in order to distinguish his apologetic theological idea of *religio Christiana* in the context of catechetical preparation, as anti-Roman. This has to be seen in the framework of a publication campaign of the Wittenberg theologians which began immediately after the siege of Vienna. It was motivated by news they had received about the Franciscan prophet Johann Hilten after their return from the Marburg Colloquy.<sup>30</sup> Now, they also wanted to make their interpretation of the "little horn" (Daniel 7) with regard to the Turks known to the public. This interpretation was shared by Melancthon, Jonas, and Luther.<sup>31</sup> For now, they had found a description of the Turks in the Holy Scripture, and, at the same time, they had found the exegetic support for the certainty of the Turks' military victory over *christianitas*. It was additionally confirmed by the prophetic testimony of Hilten. With Luther's introduction to the book of Daniel,<sup>32</sup> this historical theological concept of interpretation, which coincided with several pre-Reformation prophetic traditions – especially those which were compiled in Lichtenbergers *Prognosticatio*<sup>33</sup> –, was implemented into the basic eschatological knowledge of Lutheran confessional culture.<sup>34</sup>

### III.

The perception of Islam as a Christian heresy, however, which had been accepted since Johannes Damascenus,<sup>35</sup> remained valid next to the perception of Islam presented in

mation, Baltimore/London 1978; R.J. Bast, *Honor your Fathers: Catechisms and the Emergence of a Patriarchal Ideology in Germany, 1400–1600*, Leiden et al. 1997; G. Bode, *Instruction of the Christian Faith by Lutherans after Luther*, in: R. Kolb (ed.), *Lutheran Ecclesiastical Culture, 1550–1675*, Leiden/Boston 2008, pp. 159–204; T. Kaufmann, *Das Bekenntnis im Luthertum des konfessionellen Zeitalters*, in: ZThK 105 (2008), pp. 281–314, esp. pp. 294–301.

30 See G. May, *Marburger Religionsgespräch*, in: TRE 22 (1992), pp. 75–79.

31 Justus Jonas [Philipp Melancthon], *Das siebend Capitel Danielis/von des Türcken Gottes lesterung und schrecklicher morderey mit Unterricht Justi Jonae*, Wittenberg, Hans Lufft [1530]; re the printing: H.-J. Köhler, *Bibliographie der Flugschriften des 16. Jahrhunderts Teil I*, vol. 2, Tübingen 1992, pp. 139–40, no. 1789; Ex. MF 481 no. 1291; see T. Kaufmann, "Türckenbüchlein" (as in note 3), pp. 192–4 (footnote 264); instructive: A. Seifert, *Der Rückzug der biblischen Prophetie von der neueren Geschichte: Studien zur Geschichte der Reichstheologie des frühneuzeitlichen deutschen Protestantismus*, Cologne/Vienna 1990, pp. 11–20.

32 WA Deutsche Bibel 11/2, pp. 1–181.

33 Johannes Lichtenberger, *Prognosticatio super magna illa saturni ac Iovis coniunctiæ* [Cologne, Peter Quentel], 1526; VD 16 L1592; H.-J. Köhler, *Bibliographie* (as in note 31), vol. 2, p. 304, Nr. 2135; Ex. MF 1642f Nr. 4217; German ed. Wittenberg, Hans Lufft 1527; VD 16 L1597; Ex. MF 982f Nr. 2309; ed. of Luther's preface: WA 23, p. 7–21; on this point, see: D. Kurze, *Johannes Lichtenberger* [† 1503]: *Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Prophetie und Astrologie*, Lübeck, Hamburg 1960; H. Talkenberger, *Sintflut: Prophetie und Zeitgeschehen in Texten und Holzschnitten astrologischer Flugschriften 1488–1528*, Tübingen 1990; T. Kaufmann, "Türckenbüchlein" (as in note 3), esp. pp. 195–6.

34 For my view on this matter, which clearly diverges from, e.g., Kolb's primarily theological-historical and doxographic approach (see Introduction, in: R. Kolb, *Lutheran Ecclesiastical Culture* (as in note 29), pp. 1–14, esp. pp. 5–8), see T. Kaufmann, *Konfession und Kultur* (as in note 9), esp. pp. 14–16.

35 J. Damascène, *Écrits sur l'Islam, présentation, commentaires et traduction* par R. Laymon Le Coz, Paris 1992; R. Gleil/A.T. Khoury (eds), *Schriften zum Islam/Johannes Damszenus und Theodor Abn-Qurra, Kommentierte griechisch-deutsche Textausgabe*, Würzburg 1995; compare D. Sakas, *The Arab Character of the Christian Dispu-*

Georgius's *Tractatus*, which has not quite correctly been called "ethnographical" by researchers. The earlier interpretation had been perpetuated by Petrus Venerabilis,<sup>36</sup> Nicholas of Kues, Ricoldus, Enea Silvio Piccolomini, and many other influential authors, as well as by a convert treatise like that of Juan Andres,<sup>37</sup> which was published in Latin translation by the Lutheran Johann Lauterbach.<sup>38</sup> Andres's treatise found a compact contemporary elaboration in Bernhard von Luxemburg's *Catalogus haereticorum* of 1522, in which "Mahometus" was listed immediately after "Lutherani."<sup>39</sup> The condemnation of Islam in the first article of the *Confessio Augustana*,<sup>40</sup> which, concerning the trinity, mentions the Mahometists in the same breath as the heretics of the old faith,<sup>41</sup> stands in line with a broad stream of ecclesiastical historical tradition, which also shows an after-effect in the relevant *Turcica* of early modern Protestantism. Different from the type of perception represented by the Transylvanian Georgius, which was shaped by his own experiences and was thus "expertogen,"<sup>42</sup> the tradition of interpretation of Islam as heretic refers mainly to historical knowledge about Muhammad's beginnings. This mode

tation with Islam: The Case of John of Damascus (ca. 655–ca. 749), in: F. Niewöhner/B. Lewis (eds), *Religionsgespräche im Mittelalter*, Wiesbaden 1992, pp. 185–205; S. Schreiner, *Der Islam als politisches und theologisches Problem der Christen und die Anfänge christlich-antislamischer Polemik*, in: H. Schmid/A. Renz/J. Sperber/D. Terzi (eds), *Identität durch Abgrenzung? Wechselseitige Abgrenzungen in Christentum und Islam*, Regensburg 2007, pp. 119–38, esp. pp. 132–6.

- 36 See R. Gleis (ed.), *Petrus Venerabilis: Die Schriften zum Islam*, Altenberge 1985; J. Kritzeck, *Peter the Venerable and Islam*, Princeton 1964; see M.R. Menocal, *Die Palme im Westen: Muslime, Juden und Christen im alten Andalusien*, Berlin 2003, pp. 245–9; on the heresiological discourse in connection with Islam in Western theology of the twelfth century, see J.V. Tolan, *Saracens: Islam in the Medieval European Imagination*, New York/Chichester 2002, pp. 135–69; J. Martinez/O. de la Cruz/C. Ferrero/N. Petrus, *Die lateinischen Koran-Übersetzungen in Spanien*, in: M. Lutz-Bachmann/A. Fidora (eds), *Juden, Christen und Muslime: Religionsdialoge im Mittelalter*, Darmstadt 2004, pp. 27–39.
- 37 See H. Bobzin, *Bemerkungen zu Juan Andrés und seinem Buch Confusión de la secta mahometica* (Valencia 1515), in: M. Forstner (ed.), *Festgabe für Hans-Rudolf Singer*, Frankfurt a. M. et al. 1991, pp. 529–48.
- 38 J. Lauterbach, *De bello contra turcas suscipiendo ... Confusio sectae Mahometanae ab eodem latinitate donata*, Leipzig. A. Lamberg 1595; VD 16 L754; Ex. SuB Göttingen 8 Hist 629; Göllner, *Turcica*, vol. 2, footnote 20, p. 537 Nr. 2043; regarding the printings beginning in 1594 see H. Bobzin, *Bemerkungen* (as in note 37), p. 532, footnote 13.
- 39 *Catalogus hereticorum omnium pene, qui ad haec usque tempore passim literarum monumentis proditi sunt, illorum nomina, errores, et tempora ...*, Editio secunda [Cologne, Eucharius Cervicornus], 1523; VD 16 B1986; Ex. SuB Göttingen 8 HEE 794/3, J 7 r/v.
- 40 *Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*, 9th ed. Göttingen 1982, p. 51.5. Islam is predominantly considered the incarnation of antitrinitarianism, see W. Maurer, *Historischer Kommentar zur Confessio Augustana*, vol. 1: *Einleitung und Ordnungsfragen*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Gütersloh 1979, p. 66 footnote 10.
- 41 On the antitrinitarianism during the Reformation see primarily: G.H. Williams, *The Radical Reformation*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Kirksville 2000, pp. 945–8, *passim*; R. Dan/A. Pirnát (eds), *Antitrinitarianism in the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century*, Budapest et al. 1982; M. Balázs, *Early Transylvanian Antitrinitarianism (1566–1571): From Servet to Palaologos*, Baden-Baden 1996; C.J. Burchill, *The Heidelberg Antitrinitarians: Johann Silvan, Adam Neuser, Matthais Vehe, Jacob Suter, Johann Hasler*, Baden-Baden 1989.
- 42 A. Höfert, *Den Feind beschreiben: "Türkengefahr" und europäisches Wissen über das Osmanische Reich 1450–1600*, Frankfurt a. M. et al. 2003. My critique of Höfert's methodology addresses on the one hand her practice of "fragmenting" integral sources, of which she primarily examines those parts which are interesting for ethnography, and on the other hand the inherent modernization-theory perspective, which distinguishes "new" ethnographic modes of perception from traditional heresiological ones, only the former of which are ascribed by Höfert with significance for the future. In my opinion, the perceptual approaches are inextricably bound up with one another in many sources.

of perception dealt with “Mahometism” and less with the actual religion of the Ottoman superpower, that is, “Turkish religion,” which was strongly associated with the Ottoman military threat.

In addition, there is a third mode of perception of foreign religion that I would like to call hermeneutic dogmatic. It concentrated mainly on the discussion of the Holy Scripture of the Turks and the doctrines inherent in it. In 1530, Luther had still met this kind of dispute with skepticism, and in the *Cribratio* by Nicholas of Kues and in Ricoldus’s *Confutatio*, he had seen nothing but polemic distortions. In Luther’s opinion, they were not able to convince anybody, as they ignored the “bona” contained in the Qur’an.<sup>43</sup> Twelve years later, after Luther had had the opportunity to inspect a manuscript of the Latin translation of the Qur’an by Robert von Ketton, he began to translate Ricoldus’s script, thus advocating the very procedure that he had earlier rejected.<sup>44</sup> Luther’s translation of Ricoldus<sup>45</sup> can be interpreted as a publicist activity in support of the 1543 Qur’an edition by Bibliander. The resistance of the Basel council to printing the book had been finally wrestled down by the votes of Luther and Melanchthon.<sup>46</sup> It was the conviction of the Wittenberg theologians that nothing else could better impede the advance of “Turkish religion” than the distribution of this “cursed, infamous, desperate book full of lies, fables, and all kinds of atrocities,”<sup>47</sup> i.e., the Qur’an. Here, they had won out against the traditional view not to publish, at any cost, heretic texts.

During the sixteenth century, the three volumes of the Basel edition served as the authoritative thesaurus, offering almost all the knowledge on the subject that was available in the Occident. Besides the text of the Qur’an itself, it also contained a small anthology of the most important texts collected in the *Corpus Toletanum*, as well as some more up-to-date writings on the religion of Muhammad. Protestantism continued to perceive the Qur’an in the same way as practiced by Ricoldus, Nicholas of Kues, and others, but at the same time sublimated the polemical apologetic approach by taking individual doctrines and dogmatic statements from it, enriching them with other historical cultural knowledge on

43 See above, note 12.

44 See most recently J. Ehmann, Luther, Türken und Islam (as in note 10), pp. 75–93, 445–66.

45 See J. Ehmann (ed.), Ricoldus de Montecrucis (as in note 12); Luther’s 1542 translation, entitled “Verlegung des Alcoran Bruder Richardi Prediger Ordens” is published in: WA 53, pp. 272–396; see also H. Bobzin, “Aber itzt ... hab ich den Alcoran gesehn Latinisch ...” Gedanken Martin Luthers zum Islam, in: H. Medick/P. Schmidt (eds), Luther zwischen den Kulturen, Göttingen 2004, pp. 260–76; H. Bobzin, Der Koran im Zeitalter der Reformation, Beirut 1995, pp. 95–152.

46 Luther’s and Melanchthon’s side-by-side texts are found in: CR 5, Nr. 2616, together with E.L. Enders, Martin Luthers Briefwechsel, vol. 14, Leipzig 1912, Nr. 3142a, p. 259f; MBW 3, Nr. 2973; WA 53, pp. 561–72; WA Briefwechsel 10, Nr. 3802 (Luther to the Council of Basel 27 October 1542), pp. 161–3; reply, dated 8 December 1542, WA Briefwechsel 10, Nr. 3823, pp. 217–9; a seminal work, also on all issues concerning the Basel edition of the Qur’an: H. Bobzin, Der Koran (as in note 45), pp. 159–275; instructive concerning Bullinger: H.-M. Kirn, Humanismus, Reformation und Antijudaismus. Der Schweizer Theologe Theodor Bibliander (1504/09–1564), in: A. Detmers / J. M. Lange van Ravenswaay (eds), Bundeseinheit und Gottesvolk: Reformierter Protestantismus und Judentum im Europa des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts, Wuppertal 2005, pp. 39–58.

47 WA Briefwechsel 10, p. 162,35–36. In a polished rhetorical move, Luther implies that it was not mean or base competition among the printers in Basel but rather honorable religious attitudes which motivated the Council to initially ban printing.

Islam and confronting them with Christian doctrines, in order to rebut them according to every principle of philosophical and Christian reason. The most consistent systemization of the hermeneutic-dogmatic approach to the Qur'an in the sense of the Protestant scriptures principle goes back to the Württemberg theologian Lucas I. Osiander. His 1570 *Report/ on Turkish Beliefs/ Taken from the Turkish Alcoran*<sup>48</sup> drew on the outcome of Muhammad's claim to recognize the prophets of the Judeo-Christian tradition as his predecessors. From his own premises, Osiander claimed, the Qur'an has to concede that it can be measured against the Christian Bible. Since Muhammad himself had, for example, recognized and accepted the Pentateuch as "God's word in his conscience,"<sup>49</sup> all relevant doctrinal propositions of the Qur'an should therefore be measured, according to Lutheran scripture, against the Bible and against the Biblical truths that had entered the Qur'an. Under the condition that the Bible was a document of revelation – which was recognized by the Qur'an, albeit with the claim to overcome it –, the doctrinal comparative method of Osiander follows an intrinsic apologetic plausibility.

Based on this principle, Osiander could clearly surpass medieval tendencies to controversy by criticizing the lack of exculpation doctrine<sup>50</sup> and guiding the discussion of "Turkish religion" along the same methodological standards that shaped the intra-Christian controversies. Osiander aimed at profiling the Lutheran controversies about the Qur'an against anti-Islamic polemics from the Roman side and, at the same time, at becoming independent of the "expert knowledge" of "ethnographs," former slaves and travelers like Georgius de Hungaria.

#### IV.

By way of conclusion, let me highlight five points:

1. The Protestant Reformers appropriated pre-Reformation modes and traditions of knowledge and perception of the "Turkish religion" with the utmost impartiality if they could be integrated into their specific set of interests.

48 L. Osiander, Bericht/Was der Turcken glaub sey/gezogen auß dem Türckischen Alcoran/sampt desselbigen Widerlegung..., Tübingen, Ulrich Morhart W., 1570; VD 16 O 1182; Ex. MF 1839f Nr. 3046; see re Lukas Osiander (1534–1604), who worked in Stuttgart as court priest and consistorial councillor from 1569, H. Fischer, Osiander, Lukas, in: RGG, vol. 6, 4th ed. 2003, col. 720–1; DBETH, vol. 2, 2005, pp. 1013–4; to Lukas Osiander in debate, in particular, with members of the Societas Jesu, see K. Bremer, Religionsstreitigkeiten: Volkssprachliche Kontroversen zwischen Altgläubigen und evangelischen Theologen im 16. Jahrhundert, Tübingen 2005, throughout; see also T. Kaufmann, Konfession und Kultur (as in note 9), see v. in the index.

49 L. Osiander, Bericht (as in note 48), p. 5.

50 Osiander commented on the quintessence of the difference between Muslim and Christian understanding of faith: "Dann wann Mahomet von dem Glauben an Gott sagt so meint er anderst nicht/dann daß man glauben soll/daß ein einiger Gott sey/der den frommen des ewig leben und Paradiß/den bösen aber das höllisch Fewr gebe/Wie aber Gott umm Christi willen uns gnädig werde/davon weist und lehret er kein einig Wort. Und wann er schon sagt/man soll Christo glauben/so meinest er doch nichts anders [...] dann allein/man soll glauben/daß Christus ein fürtrefflicher Prophet sey gewesen [...]". L. Osiander, Bericht (as in note 48), pp. 86–87.

2. In order to interpret the respective motives behind a relevant textual appropriation, an analysis of the specific historical micro-contexts of the publication strategies is essential. The series of military successes by Suleiman, namely the conquest of Belgrade (1521), the taking of Rhodos (1522), and finally – enormously exaggerated in publications<sup>51</sup> – the battle of Mohács (1526), were exploited in propaganda by the old faith, as a consequence of the rumor that Luther had allegedly denied any right to defend Europe against the Turks. Furthermore, hope existed for the Turks in the radical milieu of the Reform movement, which grew in an uncontrollable way.<sup>52</sup> Müntzer had banked on the support of the Ottomans in his struggle against the princes.<sup>53</sup> His heir, Hans Hut,<sup>54</sup> and Hut's heir, Augustin Bader,<sup>55</sup> nursed this chiliastic hope beyond the Peasants' War within the scattered smallest groups of apocalyptic Anabaptism in Upper Germany. The small group of the righteous would unite with the Turks to finish the rule of the godless and to usher in the Millennial Empire of Christ. By incorporating and distributing pre-Reformation literature on the Turks, the Wittenberg Reformation placed itself within the tradition of the Latin European *christianitas*. It did that in double dissociation both from the old faith and from the radical reformatory challenge.

3. The Protestant Reformers did not invent the strategy of disputing a rejected spiritual or religious tradition by publishing its core texts. In his foreword to his edition of the Qur'an, Bibliander legitimized his undertaking<sup>56</sup> by reaching far back into history: to resolutions of *consilia* of the Old Church making it mandatory for clerics to deal with heresies in order to refute them; to Petrus Venerabilis, who, when sending Robert of Ketton's translation of the Qur'an to Bernard of Clairvaux, had called for writing against the "Muhammadan heresy" in full knowledge of its Holy Scripture. Bibliander also referred to the model of the Humanists who were dealing with sources of pagan religious history and to Reuchlin's defense of the Talmud in order to refute Judaism.<sup>57</sup> Consequently, what the Reformers did in relation to "heresy" was not qualitatively "new," but new in regard to quantity, in going beyond limits. For not only scholars, but every Christian who

51 See primarily C. Göllner, *Turcica*, vol. 1 (as in note 20), pp. 131–150, Nr. 233–275.

52 See T. Kaufmann, "Türckenbüchlein" (as in note 3), pp. 47–54.

53 Müntzer had allowed Turks as well an access to faith and had expected the Ottomans to usher in the initiation of apocalyptical "change." See primarily: G. Franz (ed.), *Thomas Müntzer: Schriften und Briefe*, Gütersloh 1968, p. 505, 1–4; p. 430, 31–432, 3; p. 314, 5–6; see as well D. Fauth, *Das Türkenbild bei Thomas Müntzer*, in: *Berliner Theologische Zeitschrift* 11 (1994), pp. 2–12; on Müntzer see primarily G. Seebaß, *Müntzer, Thomas*, in: *TRE* 23 (1994), pp. 414–36.

54 Seminal text: G. Seebaß, *Müntzers Erbe: Werk, Leben und Theologie des Hans Hut*, Gütersloh 2002, in particular pp. 216–20.

55 A. Schubert, *Täuferturn und Kabbalah: Augustin Bader und die Grenzen der Radikalen Reformation*, Gütersloh 2008.

56 *Machumetis Saracenorum Principis: Eiusque Successorum Vitae, Ac doctrina, Ipseque Alcoran . . . Hic adiunctae sunt Confutationes multorum . . .*, [Basel, Joh. Oporin], 1543; VD 16 K 258475; Ex. HAB Wolfenbüttel T 624 Helmst 2o(1), a1v; a4r; a5rf.

57 See the following on this point: H. Petersen, *Jacobus Hoogstraeten gegen Johannes Reuchlin: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Antijudaismus im 16. Jahrhundert*, Mainz 1995; A. Herzog/J. H. Schoeps with the co-operation of S. Rohde (eds), *Reuchlin und die Juden*, Sigmaringen 1993; D. Hocke/B. Roeck (eds), *Die Welt im Augenspiegel: Johannes Reuchlin und seine Zeit*, Stuttgart 2002.

was able to read should basically be enabled to make his own judgment and to prepare for a personally decisive rejection of “Turkish religion.” In view of the dreaded Ottoman conquest of Europe, which was believed to be inevitable, the numerous Turkish sermons published mainly by Protestants in the late sixteenth century delivered basic information on “Turkish religion” with the intention of making Christians keep their faith.<sup>58</sup> The fact that a text like the *Tractatus* of Georgius de Hungaria was mainly distributed by Protestant print presses and especially in the peoples’ language, and that the Qur’an translation by Robert of Ketton, initiated by the Cluniac abbot Petrus Venerabilis, ended with an index of banned books,<sup>59</sup> was due to tendencies of dealing with foreign knowledge that finally separated the confessions. The assertive dynamics of the Reformation were also due to the fact that it seemingly succeeded in overcoming those conditions which Luther saw characterized by the fact that “priests, monks, and laymen are more hostile among themselves than Turks and Christians.”<sup>60</sup>

4. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, perspectives on “Turkish religion” became more varied. Traditional perceptions such as heresiology did not simply die; newer so-called ethnographic views were added. Other new approaches to the Qur’an like the hermeneutic apologetic one were methodologically improved and placed on a fundament of source editions. The pluralization of perspectives and the co-existence of persistence and innovation in modes of perception played a part in determining the handling of “Turkish religion.” The Reformation was part of these complex cultural and intellectual historical developments; it even played a decisive role in the pluralization of perspectives by “Turkicizing” the confessional adversary.<sup>61</sup> In publications of the Reformation period, this “Turkicization” began early and dominated mutual patterns of evaluation by both Roman Catholics and Lutherans: The Lutherans charged the “Papists” with hypocrisy based on works’ righteousness, which in the Lutheran view put the Papists far behind the achievements of the Muslims. And the Catholics saw in the Lutherans a sexual abandon ultimately introduced by the Wittenberg monk, a rebellious iconoclasm, and a readiness for physical militancy, which they could elsewhere only identify among the Turks. The Lutherans, finally, criticized certain doctrinal peculiarities of the Reformed churches as “Turkish” not only with regard to Christology and the doctrine of the holy trinity, but also concerning the question of imagery and other issues. In the face of the intensity of

58 The reformatory theologoumenon of the priesthood of all believers, which annulled the dichotomy between clerici and laici, presented the pre-condition for this intensification of publishing in the dissemination of cultural religious knowledge of “Turkish religion.” Regarding this point see: Thomas Kaufmann, *Das Priestertum der Glaubenden. Vorläufige Beobachtungen zur Rolle der Laien in der frühreformatorischen Publizistik anhand einiger Wittenberger und Baseler Beispiele*, in: H. Kühne (ed.), *Festschrift Siegfried Bräuer, Mühlhausen 2010* (forthcoming); H. Goertz, *Allgemeines Priestertum und ordiniertes Amt bei Luther*, Marburg 1997; most recently: T.J. Wengert, *Priesthood, Pastors, Bishops: Public Ministry for the Reformation and Today*, Minneapolis 2008.

59 See F.H. Reusch, *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher*, vol. 1, Bonn 1883, new printing Aalen 1967, p. 137 footnote 3.

60 “Pfaffen, Mönich, Laien untereinander feinder worden seien dann Türken und Christen.” WA 6, p. 354, 11–12.

61 See on this point T. Kaufmann, “Türckenbüchlein” (as in note 3), pp. 42–47, 174–94.

these mutual strategies to “turkicize,” the evocation of the so-called “Christian occident” has to be exposed as an ideological chimera.<sup>62</sup>

5. The cultural coherence between the fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries is manifold and cannot be overlooked.<sup>63</sup> However, this cultural coherence does not exist despite, but precisely because of, the rupture that the Papal Church caused by banning Luther and by Luther’s reactive excommunication of the Papal Church.<sup>64</sup> This was because this rupture forced those who aimed at a reformation of the church (in the sense of the Wittenberg theologians) to revise the tradition of the Latin European *christianitas* in particular and to annex those issues which they were willing to accept as valid as their heritage. In this sense, the Reformation also became a decisive instance of mediation between the Middle Ages and the Confessional Era, and up to modern times.

The fact that the historical magnitude of the rupture which tore apart occidental Christianity following 1520 began to take effect exactly during the period that the Ottomans threatened Europe as never before – in the third decade of the sixteenth century – is anything but a coincidental synchronicity. Without the Turks, the Reformation would hardly have survived. It was Suleiman’s pressure on the Habsburg Empire that forced Charles V and Ferdinand to accept compromises towards the Imperial Protestant princes which ultimately saved the Reformation politically.<sup>65</sup> Without the military successes of the Ottomans over *christianitas*, which were seen as a punishment by God, Reformation theology and its fundamental criticism of the existing church institutions would not have fallen on as fertile ground as they did. Furthermore, without the successes of the Turks, the need to catechize to every Christian human being what it means to be a Christian and thus protect him from the seductions of “Turkish religion” would have been less pressing. In this sense, it might be no exaggeration to argue in an historically exhaustive and deeply ambitious sense: “Without the Turks, no Reformation.”

62 That the discourse on the Occident, especially against the background of its recent boom following World War II (see O. Köhler, *Abendland*, in: TRE, vol. 1, 1977, pp. 17–42, here: p. 19), requires urgent self-historization, can be seen in the revisionist debates of the German scholars of history after 1945 (see esp. W. Schulze, *Deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft nach 1945*, Munich 1989, pp. 211–20).

63 See on this point T. Kaufmann, *Konfession und Kultur* (as in note 9), pp. 7–14; T. Kaufmann, *Geschichte der Reformation* (as in note 3), pp. 62–92, et passim.

64 See T. Kaufmann, *Martin Luther*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Munich 2010, p. 53; T. Kaufmann, *Geschichte der Reformation* (as in note 3), pp. 226–99.

65 See S.A. Fischer-Galati, *Ottoman Imperialism and German Protestantism 1521–1555*, Cambridge 1959; W. Schulze, *Reich und Türkengefahr im späten 16. Jahrhundert*, Munich 1978; concerning the virulence of the Turkish question in political discourse of the Holy Roman Empire, see most recently: A. Schmidt, *Vaterlandsliebe und Religionskonflikt: Politische Diskurse im Alten Reich (1555–1648)*, Leiden et al. 2007, pp. 251–60.