

# German Orientalism in the Age of Confessional Consolidation: Jacob Andreae's *Thirteen Sermons on the Turk*, 1568

SUSAN R. BOETTCHER

In 1566, Ottoman armies penetrated the Holy Roman Empire, reaching the fortress of Szigetvár in a campaign to conquer that part of Hungary still under Habsburg control after 1533.<sup>1</sup> Numerous reports from Nuremberg, a traditional center of German printing for information on “the Turk,”<sup>2</sup> recounted massacres, burnings, and the constant advance of the armies under the flags of Suleiman the Magnificent himself.<sup>3</sup> Abandoned corpses on the battlefields stank so badly that they periodically forced even the Turks to retreat.<sup>4</sup> The Ottoman practice of burning the food of resistant communities occasioned anxious comment in an age of scarcity; moreover, the Turks ruthlessly eviscerated local children.<sup>5</sup> Suleiman executed generals who failed to achieve military objectives, which shocked contemporary German reporters.<sup>6</sup> After a sixteen-day siege, Ottoman armies 100,000 strong took sparsely defended Szigetvár (recently renovated by the Italian architect Mirandola) with its 2,500 men under the command of Miklós Zrínyi. Forced to the innermost tower of the bastion on 5 September, Zrínyi ordered a hopeless charge on the assailers rather than surrender. He survived bullet wounds and an arrow to the head—until the Janissaries brought him to their Aga for execution. The Ottoman advance ended at Szigetvár: Suleiman died in his tent during the battle, some said of a stroke brought on by frustration with the slow progress of the siege. Overextended, the Ottoman armies retreated. Nonetheless, the Ottoman Empire held Szigetvár until 1664.<sup>7</sup>

In 1568, Jacob Andreae (1528–90) commented on these events to his congregation at the Universitätskirche St. Georg (now the Stiftskirche) in Tübingen, preaching a series of sermons through Lent and into Eastertide and publishing them in a quarto volume. From Andreae’s viewpoint, the Ottoman advance augured more than a defensive crisis, the acute phase of which had indeed ended by 1568.<sup>8</sup> He feared that Is-

lam’s proximity threatened his congregation’s very souls. To enlighten his audience about this threat, Andreae transmitted ostensibly reliable information intended to instruct them about Islam as a religion beyond general perceptions of Turkish rapacity. By constructing knowledge about the Turks, Andreae participated in the intellectual tradition of Orientalism. This concept, now inseparably associated with Edward Said’s influential book, defines the Orient as “an idea [with] a history and a tradition of thought, imagery, and vocabulary that have given it reality and presence in and for the West.” Said proposed a consistency in such ideas about the Orient independent of their correspondence to the “real” Orient.<sup>9</sup>

Theoretical work so seminal as to be read constantly over a quarter-century must nonetheless occasionally show its age. Said’s focus on post-eighteenth-century European colonial powers relegated constructions of Islam dating from the genesis of the Muslim-Christian encounter to the status of a prelude to imperialist attitudes, without considering in detail the characteristics of local orientalisms or the contemporary relevance of their outcomes.<sup>10</sup> Luther is named as the cultural successor of Bede.<sup>11</sup> Said groups “Christians” together, ignoring the effect of political relationships between Catholics and Protestants on the problem of Islam for the Holy Roman Empire. To re-examine this moment in Said’s argument, the first part of this essay explores the medieval tradition (as mediated by Andreae) in dialogue with Said’s political and cultural preconditions for Orientalism. Andreae’s construction of Islam for sixteenth-century Lutherans both relied on and reformulated older knowledge about the Turks. The reconditioning of medieval constructions of Islam in Lutheran Germany produced one novelty: an apocalyptic emphasis.<sup>12</sup>

The religious ideas that fostered apocalyptic expectations, however, did not emerge spontaneously or from a

vacuum. In order to understand Andreae's sermons, then, it will be necessary to consider their political and intellectual contexts. The perceived Central European balance of power, debates over defense against the Turks in the Reichstag, and the Reformation reception of medieval knowledge of the Turks suggest that early modern German Orientalism depended on a series of particular local contexts and relationships.<sup>13</sup> Andreae's condescending tone and dismissals of Islam are consonant with Said's description of Orientalism in later periods. Andreae's instrumentalization of this knowledge, however, differs. Said suggests that Orientalism functions, indeed has always functioned, as a tool for Western cultural, political, and economic domination of the East.<sup>14</sup> Andreae's Orientalism, in contrast, functioned as a disciplining tool for his own audience—a means to define the contours of the history and politics of the evangelical, confessional, and religious world in later Reformation Germany.<sup>15</sup>

### I. Orientalism from Below? Religious Superiority in an Age of Military Inferiority

Szigetvár's fall created vulnerability in Habsburg defenses and provoked much comment, but hindsight suggests the encounter constituted a minor episode in a string of Ottoman-Habsburg border skirmishes.<sup>16</sup> It was overshadowed by the 1568 Peace of Adrianople, which transformed open campaigns into *Kleinkrieg*.<sup>17</sup> Neither are Andreae's *Türkenpredigten*<sup>18</sup> a central work in his own oeuvre. Reactions to conditions on the imperial borders in the later Reformation, however, highlight a fundamental issue affecting the application of Said's paradigm to early modern German knowledge of the Turk. Said postulated the Western perception of the Orient as a colonized subject constructed by a colonizer highly superior in force and political control. "In a quite constant way," Said writes, "Orientalism depends for its strategy on this flexible *positional* superiority, which puts the Westerner in a whole series of possible relationships with the Orient without ever losing him the relative upper hand." As a consequence, the primary dynamic of Said's Orientalism as a patronizing style of thinking about the East taking place in the West is one of moral and political condescension. Said bolsters this contention by asking rhetorically, "And why should it have been otherwise, especially during the period of extraordinary European ascendancy from the late Renaissance to the present?"<sup>19</sup>

Perhaps this comment stemmed from vague usage of the term "late Renaissance" on the part of a modern specialist. But Germans around 1500 hardly felt politically or militarily superior to the Ottomans—on the contrary, in varying degrees, they were terrified. The

1453 conquest of Constantinople stunned and alarmed inhabitants of German lands as it did Christian Europe generally, even if scholarly consensus now sees this fear as a popular rather than elite phenomenon.<sup>20</sup> Incipient Ottoman decline after the mid-sixteenth century notwithstanding,<sup>21</sup> Ottoman armies presented a significant threat through 1683, when the Turks threatened Vienna.<sup>22</sup> Even though the advance of the Ottomans through southeastern Europe toward Germany began only in the fourteenth century, by the sixteenth century no Central European ruler in living memory had ever experienced a peaceful Islam or Ottoman Empire. Perhaps in response to contemporary circumstance, aspects of Latin Christianity's response to ninth-century Muslim advances took firm root in the nascent historical writing of Germany.<sup>23</sup>

In this context of insecurity, Habsburg military inferiority made the Ottoman Empire a feared adversary to be placated with tribute and countered with force.<sup>24</sup> In 1562, the year of the last Habsburg-Ottoman peace treaty before Szigetvár, Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand I agreed to a yearly tribute of thirty thousand ducats and renounced claims to Transylvania.<sup>25</sup> Besides the problem of territorial and religious encroachment on Habsburg borders, the strength of the Ottoman Empire as de facto participant in the European state system contributed an additional factor to calculations of the European balance of power.<sup>26</sup> When Italian cities turned to the Ottomans for help against Venice and France,<sup>27</sup> Hungarian king Jan Zápolya became Suleiman's vassal after 1526 to protect his claim to the Hungarian throne from Ferdinand, or Francis I of France pursued Ottoman alliances to thwart the ties between Papacy and Holy Roman Empire, the Ottomans became unpredictable political opponents of the Habsburgs.<sup>28</sup> In these contexts, Central Europeans who faced Ottoman armies or read about their deeds cannot be described as having the upper hand in any practical sense. Islam was more than a "lasting trauma."<sup>29</sup> It was an ongoing political problem at best, a concrete threat at worst.

Despite escalating anxieties, however, local perceptions of risk varied. A history of reluctant support for unified defense after 1453 was exacerbated by the Reformation. Few evangelical estates were directly threatened by the Ottomans, though they were obliged by the imperial constitution to come to the emperor's aid nonetheless. Before 1555, Protestant territories threatened to withhold aid to stave off enforcement of the 1521 Edict of Worms, which justified their invasion by the Catholic estates (as it did in the Schmalkaldic War of 1546–7). Reluctant cooperation continued after the Peace of Augsburg. Thus religious controversy and the Turks occupied every sixteenth-century imperial diet.<sup>30</sup> In light of this pattern, Stephen Fischer-Galati argues

that the Turkish threat guaranteed the survival of the evangelical cause in Germany because the emperor and Catholic estates, with borders under direct onslaught, depended on the evangelical estates for financial and military support.<sup>31</sup> Winfried Schulze makes the opposite case, suggesting that after 1556 the emperor was always able to manipulate the estates to provide the concessions he wanted.<sup>32</sup> Both views stress that religious conflicts complicated defense finance. In 1566, months before Szigetvár, Ferdinand's proclamation of the Reichstag broached the need for levies to repel Ottoman encroachment. He coupled the political problem with a spiritual issue: the need to aid "countless thousands of Christians who have been killed, ... mercilessly captured and dragged away or else brought into terrible animal servitude, lost their body and estate, and (which is likely the most deplorable and pitiful) been robbed of the salvation of their poor souls and eternal salvation through inhumane pressure and force to deny and fall away from our true Christian faith."<sup>33</sup> The estates feigned willingness to accede to his requests, if pressing matters of religion and the *Landesfrieden* were addressed first.<sup>34</sup>

The readiness of the estates to delay assistance strategically underlines the relevance of the Catholic/evangelical split in early modern Germany for understanding the rationale behind the construction of knowledge of the Turks. Andreae argues early in his sermons that the horrors of Islam should be preached precisely to those not immediately threatened by the Turk. Otherwise, they would be likely to discount the threat as negligible and shirk their responsibility to help their neighbors (26–7). At the same time, cultural explanations of the reasons for the Turkish advance also augmented the hesitance of Protestants to come to Catholic aid. As Andreae writes, "many believe that the Turk is the divine rod, awakened and bound to punish us for our sinful lives" (22). Protestants were inclined to identify sinfulness directly with Catholicism, so why should Protestant powers rush to save their Catholic brothers if rescue interfered with divine punishment?

Just as the Reformation complicated the political responses to the Ottomans, it added subtle wrinkles to the textual construction of the Turk. Gregory Miller argues that despite some similarities, Catholic and evangelical authors of literature on the Turks emphasized different subjects. Catholic authors emphasized military struggle against the Turk, while Lutheran authors focused more heavily on eschatological and spiritual struggles.<sup>35</sup> Such information complicates the "representative tropes" of Said's Orientalism, which has always been most convincing in its textual readings,<sup>36</sup> perhaps because texts are representations, irrespective of content. Still, most early modern German information about Islam can be

traced through textual traditions. Despite abundant contact along the Habsburg-Ottoman border, inaccurate or sensational information about Islam and the Turks was standard in German-speaking regions.<sup>37</sup> Few authors had personal knowledge of the Turks. Those not writing about current events appropriated knowledge from older texts. In this way, tendentious or inaccurate information about Islam from the Latin Middle Ages was transmitted through the Reformation and beyond.

Before the Reformation, the most important body of information on the Koran was a collection of Iberian Christian apologetics called the Cluniac corpus or *Corpus Toletanum*.<sup>38</sup> It included the *Liber legis Saracenorum quem Alcoran vocant*, a twelfth-century Latin paraphrase translation of the Koran by Robert of Ketton with interlinear glosses from other authors. Intended as a tool for Christian mission, it rearranged the material and divided the suras against Muslim custom.<sup>39</sup> Mark of Toledo's literal translation never gained significant notice (only six manuscripts survive, and it was not printed), and Thomas Burman has argued recently that Ketton's paraphrase was prepared in consultation with Arab commentaries.<sup>40</sup> Other important medieval authors on Islam for Central Europeans included Riccoldo da Monte Croce and Nicholas of Cusa, both of whom influenced Martin Luther.<sup>41</sup>

The Reformation thus absorbed much of the medieval tradition on Islam, even if Lutheran authors were reluctant to trust medieval Catholic sources.<sup>42</sup> The central scholarly tool for Islam study in early modern Germany was the widespread 1543 Latin translation of the Koran prepared by Theodore Bibliander. Bibliander's translation was merely a minor emendation of Ketton and the Cluniac corpus created out of Bibliander's curiosity about the text from excerpts in Christian apologetics. Bibliander could read Arabic and used a Koran manuscript from the Basel university library with which to compare his Latin text, but was not capable of correcting or even noticing many of Ketton's errors.<sup>43</sup> Johann Albrecht von Widmannstetter refined this partial translation in the same year.<sup>44</sup> Widmannstetter smoothed out Bibliander's Latin but added a quadruplex division of the text inherited from a Spanish commentator, Juan Andrés.<sup>45</sup> Guillaume Postel also devoted a sixth of his *De orbis terrae concordia* of 1543 to new, independent translations of Koranic verses, but his organization of the material was also dependent on Andrés.<sup>46</sup> Such information, despite its flaws, was far from uncontroversial; the city of Zürich threatened to suppress the Bibliander translation as a text dangerous to Christian religion, and Postel's work ended up on the *Index librorum prohibitorum*.

Apart from such “scholarly” information about Islam, the most informative and popular text about the Turks in circulation in early modern Germany was Georgius de Hungaria’s *Tractatus de moribus, conditionibus et nequicia turcorum* (1481), the work of a twenty-year captive of the Turks, which was freely translated and excerpted into German by Martin Luther and Sebastian Franck in 1530.<sup>47</sup> Despite detailed ethnographic passages, as Silke Falkner has noted, the text is dominated by tropes that shape its content, particularly the attempt to scandalize the reader through scopophilic titillation.<sup>48</sup> It is also occupied with the relationship drawn between the persecutions of the Turks and the Apocalypse—an intensifying motif of Christian literature after the mid-fifteenth century. Georgius writes in the third chapter, “Much, indeed almost everything that occurs or accidentally happens to us in these times, admonishes us to watchfulness and teaches us to fear the end of the world, since we are certain that we are those to whom the end of the ages has come ... But among all these signs that cruel beast, I mean the sect of the Turks, should cause great attention.”<sup>49</sup> A later text, Bartholomäus Georgevic’s *De captivitate suae apud Turcas* (1544), similarly emphasized the relationship of the Turks to the Apocalypse and served as the source for further books of prophecy.<sup>50</sup> Since the fall of Constantinople, identified as the fourth great kingdom of the history of salvation, Central Europeans commonly identified the Ottoman Empire with kingdom of the Antichrist presaged in the Book of Revelations.<sup>51</sup> The viewpoints of such texts inevitably colored the information available even to those Habsburg diplomats who actively dealt with the Ottomans or traveled to Constantinople.<sup>52</sup>

The coupling of salacious descriptions of Turkish cruelty and apocalyptic themes was hardly coincidental, and went beyond Huizinga’s description of the medieval worldview in *Herfsttij der middeleeuwen*. This relationship should be seen as the rhetorical response to the geopolitical realities of the age: though Central Europeans were militarily inferior to their Ottoman neighbors, they could nonetheless assure themselves of their own religious superiority. Christianity’s status as the sole salutary religion obviated needs for any information to challenge perceptions of the Turk. In fact, in the context of assumptions about the growing power of the Antichrist and his activities in the Last Days, emphasis on the cruelty, immorality, uncontrolled sexuality, and rapacity of the Turks had to be tied intimately to a feeling of religious superiority, or it might have caused feelings of despair.

But had not God promised to save his people at the end of all days? The activities of the Antichrist, like the

ravages of the Turks, were cruel and unbearable, but tribulation was to be rewarded with human salvation. As Georgius promised at the end of his text, compensation for faithfulness to Christianity despite present and future indignities at the hands of the Turk was beyond human understanding:

What do we reckon should be said about the abundance of the reward? Is it not just that rest be recompensed according to labor, joy according to pain and glory according to humiliation? So let us believe firmly and nevermore doubt this most holy religion, that the just and eternal Judge in his severe Last Judgment will promise eternal solace for infinite labor, the refreshment of eternal joy for the pain of such constant suffering, the consolation of glory without end in return for immeasurable ignominy and opprobrium.<sup>53</sup>

This connection between fear of the Turks and the ultimate defeat of the Antichrist, which fed consciousness of religious, if not military, superiority, among Christians. It was reflected in several early modern German literary genres. Print culture was bound from the beginning with the Turkish threat: Johannes Gutenberg’s first publication was an indulgence letter of thirty lines for those who fought the Turk.<sup>54</sup>

Although the body of literature on the Turk generated during the German Reformation mostly drew upon and reshaped familiar information about Islam from the Middle Ages, it incorporated a much stronger and more sustained emphasis on the relevance of the Turks to apocalyptic schemes. This strand was inherited by Luther from Georgius, but it coincided with his own prioritization of eschatological interpretive contexts, a preoccupation that intensified as he aged.<sup>55</sup> Martin Luther’s pronouncements typically cleared the path for both imitators and opponents.<sup>56</sup> If some medieval commentators styled Islam as a Christian heresy, Lutheran authors elevated it to the status of a false religion.<sup>57</sup> Gone was the need that gave rise to the Ketton “Koran,” to use the text as a tool of mission or controversialism; Lutheran authors no longer expected to pursue the conversion of Muslims with its aid. Instead, they read Bibliander’s translation in conjunction with Revelations as a way of understanding their own age, which was saturated by encounters with the Antichrist. Volker Leppin’s research on sixteenth-century apocalyptic pamphlet literature underlines that apocalyptic discourse was largely localized among Lutherans.<sup>58</sup>

This focus on Christian superiority in the age of military vulnerability is the most important element for understanding the construction of knowledge of the Turks in Andreae’s sermons, though not the only one. It is impossible here to treat all the themes in texts now

designated *Turvica*.<sup>59</sup> German readers consumed songs, ballads, and poems,<sup>60</sup> travel reports,<sup>61</sup> current events and news literature,<sup>62</sup> documents relating to diplomacy and commerce,<sup>63</sup> indulgences and indulgence preaching,<sup>64</sup> and naturally, theological writings. In addition to its threatening motifs, this literature also included sexual and exotic themes that attracted or entertained—a matter with implications for understanding what Germans knew about Turks that cannot be explored here.<sup>65</sup>

The material presented above creates tension in applying some of Said's claims: Andreae's sermons were written when the Orient was actually superior to the Occident, and if Orientalism as a hermeneutic concept is "concerned to explore the problems of subjectivity and authenticity among cultures or groups excluded from power," perhaps studies of this phase of Orientalism should consider more fully the Ottoman perspective on Germans.<sup>66</sup> The continual mood of decadence in describing the Turks, with the exception of sexual decadence, is not present in a literature that remarks in awe on Turkish strength.<sup>67</sup> On the other hand, Said's suggestion that the tropes of Orientalism are consistent certainly applies. Everything Andreae says about the content of Islam repeats information from the Middle Ages, not surprisingly, since his major sources, Luther, Franck and Bibliander, did so as well. The construction of knowledge of the Orient, if not undertaken from the point of view of a politically colonizing power, still operated as a function of feelings of religious superiority based on the immanent end of time—which would deliver final victory into the hands not of the sultan, but of his Christian opponents.

More importantly, however, the outcomes of Lutheran Orientalism are ultimately quite different from those Said emphasizes, because the differing political position of Lutheran Germans with respect to the Orient affected the uses of the discourse. Construction of knowledge about the Turk by Lutherans simply could not support nonexistent attempts to dominate Islam. Instead, it was the tool of an inner campaign to discipline Christian lives. Andreae as sermon author made the same intellectual connections as Georgius, or for that matter Luther, between information about the Turks, especially Turkish atrocities, and the impending Last Days. His discussion of the End Times, however, forced him to examine signs of the end in contemporary circumstances, so that his construction of Islam became an opportunity to construct a geography of contemporary religion as well. To understand the rhetorical outcomes of this differing focus, we turn to Andreae's sermons, and first, to his presentation of Islam.<sup>68</sup>

## II. Islam, Apocalypticism, and the Superiority of Evangelical Teaching

Andreae, the author of over two hundred surviving printed works, was a theology professor at the University of Tübingen after 1561. He held the offices of university provost and chancellor. He is known for voluminous printed sermons on Lutheran teachings, participation in the development of the Württemberg church ordinance, contributions to theological controversies plaguing Lutheranism after 1548, and most notably, for his role in the Formula and Book of Concord.<sup>69</sup> Although his *Thirteen Sermons on the Turk* went into a second edition, probably fewer than a thousand copies were printed, so they did not make him famous. Still, in the sermons we see a number of motives and motifs that offer insights into Andreae's fundamental assumptions about Islam and the Turks. Rhetorically, he moves from a discussion of the tribulations caused by the Turks to a theological discussion of Islam (based on the *Bibliander Koran*) that stretches over several sermons.

Andreae's contribution to the corpus of sermons on the Turk stands close to the beginning of the genre.<sup>70</sup> As was typical of many of his statements, both programmatic and occasional, Luther's own writing on the topic was decisively influential. Particularly in two texts of 1529 that responded to the Ottoman siege of Vienna, *Vom Kriege widder den Türcken* and *Heerpredigt widder den Türcken*, Luther laid out themes that Andreae later assumed for his own purposes, themes also present in comparable sermon cycles of the period. The idea of consulting the Koran for information about Islam was taken up from Luther and Bibliander, for example, along with much of the information about the Turk that Andreae transmitted to his audience. At least at first, it seems as if Andreae will try to make his presentation of Islam as precise as he can; for instance, he informs the congregation that Arabic names have been corrupted in the German language in speaking of "Muhamed, whom we call Mahometh" (71).<sup>71</sup>

Despite this detailed beginning, the sermons are permeated with tension between the importance of presenting accurate information that enhances Andreae's authority as a preacher and ongoing implications (usually interjected when a factual matter cannot be satisfactorily resolved from Andreae's sources) that beyond a certain point, this detail would be irrelevant to his arguments. In line with the apocalyptic statements to come later, knowledge about the Turks is relevant primarily for understanding the Christian present. (This theme appears even more distinctly in Andreae's attempt to establish a biblical heritage for Muhammad, discussed below.) Andreae wants to understand Islam correctly,

and like a humanist he turns *ad fontes*: the Bibliander Koran. Still, like Luther and Bibliander, Andreae is no slavish follower of his (limited) sources; while his first three sermons offer frequent references to suras, they are often inexact, re-paraphrases or translations from Latin into German of already-paraphrased texts. In his introduction, though, he emphasizes that he has taken an unusual step to make sure that his knowledge about Islam is correct. In order to argue correctly about Islam, he must establish somehow that he is in possession of the true Koran. He went about this in the following way:

so that no one has any doubt in the Turkish al-Koran and also so that we are sure that we have the true, undoubted Turkish al-Koran, so that we can deal with its refutation more effectively, and so that we do not attribute anything to the Turks other than what their al-Koran demonstrates, I did not neglect via middlemen ... to learn from the imprisoned Turks what their religion and belief might be nowadays, by taking the most important parts from the al-Koran that we have translated in print and writing them down to ask what they thought of this or that article, keeping them ignorant of what our al-Koran says. I compared those answers with our al-Koran, and found that their answers completely squared with the al-Koran. († iv)<sup>v</sup>–†† [i]<sup>v</sup>)

Andreae represents himself as at pains to give his congregation knowledge about Islam, some of which he obtained not from the Koran, but from contemporary histories of the Turk. This statement serves his own authority as a speaker and thus enhances his ability to criticize Islam.

In the late Reformation, the rhetorical struggle to resolve historical information that did not specifically relate to the Bible with information contained in biblical narratives was a characteristic feature of Lutheran historiography. In case after case, following the style of the influential *Chronica Carionis*, part of the mandatory curriculum of pastors trained at Wittenberg, the Bible determines the construction of the narrative but political (secular) histories supply the details.<sup>72</sup> David Chytraeus, a Lutheran theologian who wrote a work on how to read history roughly contemporary to Andreae's sermons, emphasizes that the Bible is the most ancient work of history and reveals the future order of that history. Still, the meaning of historical prophecies is not always found in the Bible itself but sometimes in political histories, so that even the history of non-Christians testifies to the trajectory of Christian history revealed in the Bible.<sup>73</sup>

This approach, adopted by Andreae as well, means that the discussion of the origins of Islam must be related first to the information found in the Old Testament, which naturally sets up the turn towards apoca-

lypticism that dominates the sermons. Andreae turns first to Daniel 7, a classic text of apocalyptic prophecy.<sup>74</sup> In conventional fashion, he identifies the four kingdoms with the Assyrians (the lion), the Medes and Persians (the bear), the Greeks (i.e., Alexander the Great; the leopard), and the Romans (the fourth animal with the ten horns, which stood for the many kingdoms resulting from its breakup; 45–8). Among these horns, Daniel's dream continued, a smaller horn emerged "with eyes like human eyes and a maw that spoke of great things."<sup>75</sup> This smaller horn, Andreae informed his congregation, was the kingdom of the Turks (54–5). This identification was not original to Andreae; it had been made very early on in the Reformation by Lutheran authors like Justus Jonas.<sup>76</sup> A programmatic booklet of 1537 by Johannes Brenz, a Reformer influential on Andreae's intellectual development, made the same identification, and clearly outlined the tasks of preaching in response to this identification: "Preachers are obliged to admonish princes and the emperor sincerely to exercise their offices and make opposition to the Turks with the sword, and should disregard the possibility that the Turks' might is stronger, and should follow God's order and command, set up resistance, and believe that God will help them fight against the murderous Turks."<sup>77</sup> Brenz's stress on the need to fight the Turk despite the hopelessness of the situation makes clear again the connection among the apocalyptic identification, the eschatological necessity of suffering, and the religious superiority of Christianity triumphant.

Setting this biblical and apocalyptic context for the Turks to emerge upon the world stage allows Andreae to follow all of the common medieval historical traditions relating to Muhammad and Islam.<sup>78</sup> Admittedly, he chooses more concrete relationships to Biblical events than the prophecies of Daniel; he speculates about the heritage of Muhammad's parents, writing:

Some say he came from Kore, the son or descendent of Esau, but others hold that he came from Cedio, who was of Ishmael's lineage. But not much relies on that, for it is a simple difference between Esau and Ishmael and neither was much better than the other. In the same way they are not agreed about his mother, for some claim she was a Jew, of the lineage of Jacob or Israel; others say she was an Ishmaelite. However it may be, they are supposed to be of Abraham's lineage, whether immediately from Ishmael or from Esau, whose descendants conquered and occupied Arabia. (71)

Again we see the tension between wanting to provide accurate information and pointing out that detailed accuracy is not crucial as long as the burden of the details offer the same impression: Muhammad's history is dirty.

Thus it is not much of a leap to assimilate the standard later medieval information about Muhammad. If Muhammad was “a fine handsome, lovely, good-looking person, brave in his affairs, of sharp understanding in worldly affairs, and also cheeky and saucy, who dared and completed his affairs courageously and unafraid” (73), his good qualities were surpassed by the errors he quickly fell into due to arrogance. He fell into the company of an Aryan or Nestorian monk, Sergius, and a number of Jewish businessmen, together with whom he composed the Koran (74).<sup>79</sup> When he married, his wife Hidigia (Khadija) was a much older woman drawn in by his charms, who strengthened his ego. She believed he was a holy man. “And because he suffered a physical illness,” Andreae continues,

namely the falling sickness, which came upon him often, and about which his wife was not a little upset, Sergius and Mahometh convinced the good old woman that when he fell, he was seeing a face of angels, and the Angel Gabriel came to him and revealed all sorts of secrets, whose glory he could not bear, and so must fall to the ground until the Angel Gabriel took leave of him. The good old woman believed all this and let herself be betrayed by the young man, in the false belief that she had a particular saint of God as her husband. (74–5)

The origins of the Koran, then, are found in Muhammad’s epilepsy and his wife’s infatuated foolishness.<sup>80</sup>

Next, Andreae turns to a scattered account of the *hegira*, which at least bears a partial relationship to the history as we are familiar with it today. After the death of Hidigia, he was given Aissa (Aisha), the daughter of Bubacer (Abu Bakr), as a wife. Bubacer is described as a great prince. Andreae informs his congregation that consequently,

Mahometh became more than a little proud, and because he was the son-in-law of a prince and had many mighty brothers-in-law who thought a great deal of him, he began to reveal his ambitions in matters of faith and religion more and more as time went on. And as he attracted a great following, so that the authorities of the city Mecca had cause to fear him, they tried to seize him and wanted to imprison him, but Mahometh was warned by his brother-in-law and friend to leave. Bubacer and his in-laws and his disciples followed him, as did a great company of spoiled folk, simply because they had no home because they had debts and had committed crimes. (75–6)

Andreae’s narrative attributes no power of any kind to Muhammad’s teachings or Islam as a religion. Muhammad’s military success and conquest of Mecca

are explained by a confusing medieval tale (reproduced from *Bibliander*),<sup>81</sup> about a Roman bureaucrat who failed to pay Arab mercenaries for their military services. These men joined Muhammad to take Mecca (79). The story of the origins of the Turks ends rather abruptly; after Muhammad’s descendants governed for five hundred years, they were succeeded by Otthomannus, from whom all the subsequent Turkish emperors were descended (80–1). Andreae is not cognizant of the Sunni/Shiite split or the historical claims typically made about it, which are in any case irrelevant to his rhetorical goals.

Secure in the condescending and humiliating heritage he recounts for Muhammad and Islam—who triumphed, like the Antichrist, by ignoble deceptions—the Tübingen professor turns to a discussion of Islam as the faith of the Turks. This discussion is exclusively focused on excerpts from the Koran; Andreae does not, for example, present the five pillars as a structuring framework for the faith, though he is aware of all of them. By the time Andreae discusses the content of Islam, his intent is more than clear. Still, his presentation has deceptively enlightened features. Andreae points to places in which the testimony of the Koran is fully congruent with the Gospels. He finds that monotheism is a central feature of the Koran. It is represented in suras 11, 54, 68, 13, 14, 8, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, cited in that order. A correct Christology and teaching on the virgin birth can be found in suras 5, 3, 11, 12, 71, and 13. He encounters Paradise, the Last Judgment, and the Resurrection in suras 29, 21, and 79. In suras 93, 86, 66, 65, 95, 51, 67, and 78, Andreae discovers evidence that belief is necessary for salvation and that those who do not believe will be condemned (although he suggests that Muhammad stole this teaching from the heretic monk Sergius; 99–104).<sup>82</sup> Perhaps somewhat facetiously, Andreae claims that if the Muslims themselves read the Koran, they would see that it was filled with testimony to Christ’s divine nature and thus the rightness of Christianity (102). Still, and not surprisingly, Andreae concludes that the similarities of Christianity and Islam are more deceptive than anything else. The point of all the information about Islam, whether accurate or not, is not a sincere encomium to Islamic or Turkish virtue, as the sermon audience would have known from the beginning. Instead, as Andreae remarks, he wishes to show the “angelic appearance” of the Koran, which Muhammad, like Satan, adopted to blind and seduce naïve Christians from the truth (96).

For Andreae, the biggest problem with Islam is its denial of Christ’s divine nature.<sup>83</sup> He worries about the rationalistic objections that Islam presents to Christianity. Citing suras 47 and 49 as evidence of Muhammad’s

blasphemy on the matter of Christ's relationship to his father, God, Andreae mentions one of the "great things" Daniel says the "small horn" will discuss with its maw:

First, he [Muhammad] says, if God had a son, he would have to have a wife with whom he could have conceived such a son, but since that cannot be, it must follow too that God has no son. Additionally, Mahometh asks in the Koran why God does not also have daughters, if he has a son as the Christians say? Second, if God had a son to reign with him, a disagreement might arise between them as happens all the time on earth, that father and son do not remain united in their government, since the sons are after their fathers' blood, in order to reign alone. Third, if God had ever wanted to have a son, Mahometh says in his Koran, he would have taken the very best and most glorious in creation and not such a simple person as Christ was on earth, who was scorned and mocked, and the glory owing to God's son was not seen in him. (115)

The refutation of these errors takes Andreae almost thirty pages and offers a lesson in Lutheran Christology.

Despite the extensive detail presented here (used to attack Islam and sustain Lutheran counter-claims), only a third of the space in Andreae's sermons on the Turk concern a direct, concentrated examination of Islamic teachings and Ottoman history. Any Lutheran pastor who wished to preach on the Turks would have been confronted with a structural problem. Sermon texts followed a lectionary specifying particular readings on certain days, and these readings were of varying relevance to Andreae's chosen theme. While he always fills the pastoral obligation to proclaim the Gospel and explains it at least briefly, he frequently turns away to return to the Turks. By the middle of the fifth sermon, Andreae is devoting much more time to discussing the teachings of Christianity than the errors of Islam and the evils of the Turks. Only toward the end of the cycle, when discussing how the future demise of the Turks will be caused, does Andreae return to concrete details of Ottoman history. As soon as the Christian forces extinguish the Ottomans and wipe out Islam with divine assistance, the faithful can anticipate the Last Days. In Andreae's conclusion we again see the explicit connection between Turkish persecution and the end of human history. He stresses the reward to the steadfast for his congregation:

The faithful ... who have poured out their blood for the truth or were otherwise persecuted will be invited to the wedding of the Lamb. They will wear the silk of righteousness and serve the Lamb and see His countenance and His name will be on their fore-

heads, and there will be no night, and they will not need the light of the sun, for God will illuminate them and they will reign eternally. (477)

The common thrust of Andreae's sermons on the Turk is that understanding the reasons for the advance of Islam and the triumphs of the Ottomans is necessary in order to protect oneself from falling into sin and to recognize the signs of the Last Days. Precisely the recognition of those signs, and the confidence in divine salvation at the end of all time in return for the fear and suffering of the present, permit Andreae to answer rhetorically the actual military threat. Solid information about the Turk is important only to illuminate the rightness of Christianity. Details distracting from this picture are unimportant. Because of these priorities, the strange consequence results that the major implicit subject of almost five hundred pages of sermons "on the Turk" is really a number of themes in Christianity. It is to those themes and an exploration of their significance that we now turn.

### III. Orientalism as Confessional Self-Knowledge

After a certain point in the sermons, though the Turks continue to appear as the object of attack, they are clearly not Andreae's central concern. His criticism of the Turk quickly offers an opportunity for a particularly Lutheran attempt at confessionalization—the process by which Lutherans consolidated and extended their belief system and religious culture in competition with the other confessions in the later sixteenth century.<sup>84</sup> Recent secondary literature suggests that on the path from Reformation to Thirty Years War and from Renaissance monarchy to territorial state, social discipline from above and below and massive propaganda efforts supported the process of defining the boundaries between members of different faiths and denominations.<sup>85</sup> Relatively little research tells how or whether sermons and preaching facilitated this process of drawing boundaries. Andreae, as a prolific author of sermons on Lutheran teaching, was an active participant in Lutheran confessionalization. While boundary-drawing is clearly one of the activities that took place in confessional sermons, Andreae's *Türkenpredigten* suggest that the process by which the borders were marked is less immediately straightforward than usually recognized. It is not wrong to think of the sermons as creating a *Feindbild*, or image of the opponent, intended to support Lutheran confessional identity. The techniques for creating this image, however, were quite complex.

Andreae's argumentative move from criticizing Islam to admonishing Christians is rooted precisely in his evaluation of Muhammad. In fact, he claims, the situation at the time of the emergence of Islam was just like

the contemporary situation in Christianity—people were separated by their faiths (70–1). The self-appointed prophet, in his arrogance,

saw a great separation and split in faith, and that the people were totally strangled because of the manifold discord and quarrel which they had had among themselves for the sake of faith for many centuries. So Mahometh thought of a way and means by which one faith could be made from all of the conflicting faiths, with which Christians, Jews, and Gentiles might be satisfied. (73)

In this view, Islam is really not an independent faith but a conglomeration of Christian, Jewish, and pagan views that draws these faiths together through the Koran. Because Andreae understood the Koran as a polemical tool, he grasped its content primarily in terms of its challenge to Christianity and not on its own terms. This view of Islam became a bridge to a strongly polemical take on the complex, disunited situation that characterized contemporary Christianity.

Speaking positively about the other as a means of criticizing the self is a rhetorical strategy known in the West at least since Tacitus's *Germania*. It reappeared in some of the literature critical of Spanish conquest, like that by Bartolomé de las Casas. In this mode, occasional positive comments about the Turks offer Andreae an opportunity to speak negatively about the failings of Christians. In the same sections where he finds Christian teachings in the Koran, Andreae concedes admiration for Turkish piety. Turkish prisoners gave strong witness to their faith, which would not be true of Christians: "Such people, especially our soldiers, that could give the same account of the Christian faith, would be hard to find" (††[!]). Andreae speaks approvingly of fivefold daily prayer, the reverent attitudes of praying Turks, and Turkish washing (105–7). Turks are more like angels than people, he suggests:

The people are earnestly admonished to repentance through reading the Koran. Drinking is a scandalous, cursed vice among them. Because of it Mahometh completely forbade the drinking of wine, that they not fall into this vice, from which other vices grow. Whoredom and all lasciviousness is sincerely forbidden among them. Adultery is punished among them. They chop off the hand of a thief .... They admonish that true alms not be given in the presence of people, but rather secretly. All this and a great deal more is not only reported in the Koran, but many people who have been captive in Turkey testify that these matters are taken seriously and earnestly by the Turks.... Women go into the churches [!] and through the streets with covered faces, the same in houses, so that serving-men often do not recognize their mis-

tresses. (108–9)

In fact, Christian captives were so impressed by Turkish piety that they were tempted to convert. The threat of conversion through attraction to Islam was also a topos from the earliest travel literature; Georgius, for example, referred to the attractiveness of Islam and the dangers of conversation at length in order to amplify themes like Turkish cleanliness and rejection of pictorial representations of God (interestingly, well before the Reformation).<sup>86</sup> Like Georgius, Andreae found the possibility that Christians might convert to Islam reprehensible and sought to identify the seductions that tempted Christians to such a drastic step. He found the attraction quite easily, in the same place that he had put it before, in his genealogy of the origins of Islam: that is, in the attractions of a single faith created by strife and quarrel over the disunity of faith—a situation that Andreae knew intimately as an observer of the Reformation.

What was necessary, then, was unity of faith among Christians, but not at the price of meaningless compromise (136–7). In his seventh sermon, Andreae presents the argument that Turkish victories were a punishment for immorality, which consisted not only in open sinning but also in pretending to be doing the right thing when one was actually faking conviction (226). The solution to the problem with the Turks, then, would start with a Reformation at home. But the Church, in the condition that Andreae finds it, is far from united and far from error-free.

The easiest approach would be to begin pointing fingers at iniquities. While Andreae does not hesitate to locate sin in his environment, he does it in a complex way that instrumentalizes knowledge about the Turks in the service of his goals. Speaking well of the Turk allows him to criticize Christians. In turn, damning the Turk serves the same goal because it allows him to discover errors of Islam in contemporary heretical groups. Andreae claims, for example, that the presence of the Turks confirms the heresy of the Anabaptists, for the Turks cannot be understood without the help of the prophecies of Daniel. So anyone who (like the Anabaptists) teaches that the Old Testament is not necessary to Christianity must admit to having been proven wrong (56). His sermon on the doctrine of the Holy Trinity starts as a defense of Christianity against rationalistic arguments about the definition of monotheism by the Turks, but culminates in an attack on the Trinitarian errors of the Anabaptists and enthusiasts (134–79). Similarly, the sermon on true penitence begins as an explanation of why the Turks have been sent as a punishment for sin, but ends as a criticism of Catholic penitential practices (1–31). A sermon on idolatry is directed against the Muslim worship of Allah, but turns

to the problem of veneration of images and the “idolatrous” worship services of Catholics. “Papists” worship the consecrated host rather than properly celebrating the Lord’s Supper, and are thus worse than heathens or Jews in their “damned worship of a little piece of bread that they display as a God, carry around, worship and venerate” (289).

Because all these characterizations and stereotypes are used only in relationship to each other, however, the symbols they create or represent are unstable or at least very heavily conditioned. Andreae himself proposes the unstable relationship, saying that all of these groups are united in their belief that Jesus is the son of Mary, but agree about nothing else (95–6). For Andreae, Catholics are “brothers and sisters—are they not also all baptized in the name of Lord Jesus Christ?” (26) but also the source of Christian corruption and thus the reason for Turkish victories against Christian Europe (251–90). Like many sermon authors of his age, Andreae simultaneously identifies the Protestant Churches with the chosen people of Israel (whom he calls “Jews”) and criticizes real Jews for their unwillingness to recognize Christ (296).<sup>87</sup> In parallel with this judgment of the Jews, he says that Protestants have finally restored the Christian faith to its correct condition. Still, like the Israelites, they jeopardize their status by sinning and behaving wildly. Lutherans, he charges, deal complacently with their own salvation. As we have seen, though Muslims believe grave theological errors, they lead virtuous lives and give accurate witness to their faith. The arrangement of Andreae’s judgments of the different faiths in these sermons thus constitutes a conversation about their relative placement that operates with multivalent symbols.

The dualistic nature of these symbols finally works to place Andreae’s (Lutheran) Christianity in the putative center: Jews and Muslims are literalistic and rationalistic—they cannot free themselves from the dictates of the Law. Catholics in comparison are superstitious and irrational—they could not free themselves from idolatrous rituals and pointless works. Andreae’s Lutheranism, in contrast, occupies the moderate middle ground between these positions. Still, Lutherans’ behavior shows that they need correction and moral discipline. Moreover, Andreae’s dedication of the book to beleaguered Protestants on the Habsburg border, who are trapped between Islam and the Pope but nonetheless do not divert from the true will of God, seems implicitly to point a finger at his comfortable congregation. Andreae clearly pushes a confessional message in these sermons, but it is not a simple one. Given the political situation of the Protestants in relationship to the Holy Roman Empire’s ongoing defense against the Ottoman

Turks, perhaps it could not be.

#### IV. Conclusion

Andreae’s “Orientalism”—like that of many sources on which he based the construction of the Turk in his sermons—was, despite his efforts to inform his audience, and like all constructions of the “other,” an instrumentalization. It was constructed in the very specific local situation of the border conflict between the Ottoman Empire and the Habsburgs and the widening religious abyss between Catholics and Protestants. It drew upon the eschatological currents of the time to provide an explanation of Turkish victories. At the same time, it commented upon the contemporary religious scene. It placed Lutheran confessional identity in the comfortable rhetorical center of a confusing world of transgression. Andreae and his contemporaries fit only uncomfortably into the political preconditions of Said’s Orientalism, but their sense of innate superiority, though it came from other sources, would have been familiar to him nonetheless.

A closer examination of Andreae’s sermons shows a complex rhetorical pattern. Responding to the capture of Szigetvár was an opportunity to talk about the continued, frightening advance of the Turks. Dealing with Turks offered an opportunity to address the question of the Last Judgment, but discussing eschatological and apocalyptic themes around the Turks was also an opportunity to express the religious superiority of Lutheranism to Islam, which explained away the perplexing, disheartening advance of the infidels. While Andreae’s sermons provided information about the Turks to his audience, this preaching was directed at the very narrow goal of evaluating the valences of the contemporary religious world.

#### NOTES

Research for this essay was initiated with a grant from the Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel (2001) and a Maria Sibylla Merian Fellowship from the University of Erfurt (2002) for the study of preaching under confessionalization. It utilizes the collections at Wolfenbüttel (HAB) and the Forschungsbibliothek Gotha (FB Gotha). I extend thanks to these institutions for their invaluable assistance, and to Mitchell Lewis Hammond, John Marshall Frymire, and Robert J. Bast, who commented on an earlier version in a panel on confessional preaching at the 2002 Sixteenth Century Studies Conference (held in San Antonio, Texas).

<sup>1</sup>A fuller presentation of the incident including information from Turkish sources is found in Ferenc Majoros, *Das Osmanische Reich, 1300–1922. Die Geschichte einer Großmacht* (Graz/Vienna/Cologne: Verlag Styria, 1994), 244–8.

<sup>2</sup>Early modern “Turks” are properly termed “Ottomans,” but I follow the usage of the primary sources to describe six-

teenth-century attitudes toward them. Although Ottoman armies included non-Turkic people, this distinction carried no meaning in sixteenth-century Germany, where it was assumed that all Ottomans were Turks and hence Muslims. Similarly, German language referred indiscriminately to “der Türke” as an equivalent for “die Türken,” that is, as a singular aggregate for a group. On the prominence of Nuremberg, see comparative statistics in Gregory J. Miller, “Holy War and Holy Terror: Views of Islam in German Pamphlet Literature, 1520–1545” (PhD diss., Boston University, 1994), 83.

<sup>3</sup>Major contemporary reports in German included, in approximate chronological order of their appearance: Anon., *Neue Zeyttungen/ von dem 5. Tag Augusti/ diß 1566. Jars/ auß Wien/ Was sich vor der Vestung Statt unnd Schloß Jula [...] verlossen und zugetragen hat/ etc.* (Nuremberg: Hans Kholer, 1566) (Sign. FB Gotha=Pol 8° 2323/5 (8) Rara); Anon., *Zeitungen und bericht/ welcher gestalt die Röm. Kay. May. mit der Furstlichen durchleuchtigkeit/ Ertzhertzog Ferdinanden zu Osterreich [...] den Zwölften Augusti/ aus Wien/ wider den Türckischen Feind angezogen/ und was sich biß auf den 21. Augusti/ zugetragen* (Nuremberg: Geyßler, 1566) (Sign. FB Gotha=Pol 8° 2323/5 (9) Rara); Anon., *Neue Zeitungen welcher massen Herr Lazarus von Schwendi Ritter/ und der Röm. Kay. May. Obster im Zips/ die Türcken und Tartern/ zum andermal erlegt/ erschlagen/ etliche Schlösser erobert. Und was die Türcken gegen beyden Stetten unnd Vestungen Gula und Ziget/ weiter fürgenommen haben* (Nuremberg: Geyßler, 1566) (Sign. FB Gotha=Pol 8° 2323/5 (10) Rara); Anon., *Außzug etlicher Zeitungen/ was sich zum anfang des jetzigen Türckenkriegs/ an etlichen orten inn Ungern/ verlossen und zugetragen hat* (Nuremberg: Geyßler, 1566) (Sign. FB Gotha=Pol 8° 2323/5 (11) Rara); Anon., *Außzug etlicher Zeitungen/ von der Türcken Kriegshandlung vor Zigetb [...]* (Nuremberg: Geyßler, 1566) (Sign. FB Gotha= Pol 8° 2323/5 (12) Rara); Anon., *Warbaffter außzug und bericht/ was sich im Christlichen Kayserlichen Veldtzug/ wider den Türcken/ von 22. Augusti an/ biß auf den 9. Septemb diß 1566. jars/ zugetragen [...]* (Nuremberg: Geyßler, 1566) (Sign. FB Gotha=Pol 8° 2323/5 (13) Rara); [Fran Crnka], *History von Eroberung der ansehnlichen Vesten Sigeth, welche der türckisch Kaiser Solimannus im Jar 1566, den 7. Septembris eingenommen* (Augsburg: Zymmerman, [ca. 1567]) (Sign. HAB= M: Gv Kapsel 7 (31)), which is a translation of [Fran Crnka], *Historia Sigethi, totius Sclavoniae fortissimi prognacvli, quod à Solymanno Turcarum Imperatore nuper captum ... est* (Vienna: Casper Steinhofner, 1568) (Sign. HAB= A: 196.54 Hist. (2)); Anon., *Ein verzeichnus von des Thenren Heldens/ des Graven von Serin/ außgestanden not/ in derselben Befestigung zu Siget [...] welcher von den Türcken gefangen gewesen/ und newlicher zeit wider erlediget worden ist* (Nuremberg, 1567) (Sign. FB Gotha Pol 8° 2323/5 (14) Rara).

<sup>4</sup>Anon., *Neue Zeitungen welcher massen Herr Lazarus von Schwendi Ritter [...] die Türcken[...] erlegt/ [...]*, A ij<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>5</sup>Anon., *Neue Zeyttungen/ von dem 5. Tag Augusti/ diß 1566. Jars [...]*, [üj]<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>6</sup>For example, Nasuf Aga, whose repeated attempts to construct bridges over the Drava to aid Ottoman troop passage were thwarted by nature again and again, was sent a cord with which to hang himself if he could not fulfill his orders;

see [Crnka], *History von Eroberung der ansehnlichen Vesten Sigeth*, [B i]r-B[i]r.

<sup>7</sup>Zrinyi's grandson Miklós retook the castle and died afterwards while hunting. The widely known fates of the Zrinyis were connected in both *Zeitungen* and literature. On the reconquest of Szigetvár fortress, see Anon., *Relation wasmassen durch Herrn Graf Serini, die Oerter in Nider-Hungarn [...] den Türcken ab-erobert* (N.p., 1664) (Sign. HAB= M: Gv Kapsel 7 (22)); Anon., *Beschreibung der ungarischen Haupt-Vestung Sigeth* (N.p., 1664) (Sign. HAB= H: T 456.4° Helmst. (7)); Anon., *Rechteigentliche Abbildung der Stadt Sigeth und Vestung Canischa* (N.p., 1664) (Sign. HAB= IH 602). On the reception of these accounts in central European literature, see Theodor Herold, *Friedrich August Clemens Werthes und die deutschen Zriny-Dramen* (Münster/Westf.: Schöningh, 1898); and Marijan Bobinac, “Theodor Körner im kroatischen Theater,” *Porträts und Konstellationen 1: deutschsprachig-kroatische Literaturbeziehungen*, *Zagreber Germanistische Beiträge* 11 (2002): 59–96.

<sup>8</sup>While no sources survive that confirm this point, we should also consider that the temporary subordination of Württemberg to the Habsburgs during a regency may also have put political pressure on Andreae to preach a sermon urging evangelical support for more active financial and military participation in the defense against the Ottoman Empire. I am thankful to Michaela Hohkamp for this suggestion.

<sup>9</sup>Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 5.

<sup>10</sup>Said, *Orientalism*, 60–73.

<sup>11</sup>Said, *Orientalism*, 61.

<sup>12</sup>The apocalyptic emphasis was new primarily in the German context and may have been absorbed through the discourse on martyrship of societies that had encountered the Ottoman advance earlier; I thank Alison Frazier for pointing out the suggestiveness of James Hankins' work on this topic. James Hankins, “Renaissance Crusaders: Humanist Crusade Literature in the Age of Mehmed II,” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 49 (1995): 111–207.

<sup>13</sup>Bryan S. Turner, *Orientalism, Postmodernism and Globalism* (London/New York: Routledge, 1994), 5. The same was true of the perception of the Turkish threat. Winfried Schulze, *Reich und Türkengefahr im späten 16. Jahrhundert* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1978), 364.

<sup>14</sup>Said, *Orientalism*, 322–5.

<sup>15</sup>In this essay *Germany* refers to territories where German dialect or culture predominated; early modern German lands included parts of modern Germany, Poland, Ukraine, the Baltic states, Switzerland, Austria, Hungary, Transylvania, and Croatia.

<sup>16</sup>Szigetvár fortress merited the second-highest expenditures and third-highest troop deployment among the Hungarian border fortresses in 1556 and coordinated several regional fortifications; see Géza Pálffy, “The Hungarian-Habsburg Border Defence Systems,” in *Ottomans, Hungarians and Habsburgs in Central Europe: The Military Confines in the Era of Ottoman Conquest*, ed. Géza Pálffy and Pál Fodor, 3–69 (Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 2000), 7. In addition to its strate-

gic value, Szigetvár was an important source of taxes subsequently surrendered to the Ottomans. Gábor Ágoston, "The Costs of the Ottoman Fortress-System in Hungary," in Pálffy and Fodor, *Ottomans, Hungarians and Habsburgs*, 195–228, here 219.

<sup>17</sup>The status of the incident is reflected in the lack of a comprehensive overview of the 1566 hostilities and their origins. Fragments are provided in Eduard Wertheimer, "Zur Geschichte des Türkenkrieges Maximilians II. 1565 und 1566," *Archiv für Österreichische Geschichte* 53 (1875): 43–101; on the background, see Alfred Kohler, *Ferdinand I* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2003), 207–24.

<sup>18</sup>Citations in text refer to Jacob Andreae, *Dreyzehn Predigen vom Türcken*. In *w[ö]lchen gehandelt würdt von seines Regiments Ursprung/ Glauben und Religion/ Vom Türkischen Alcoran/ unnd desselben gründlicher Widerlegung durch sein selbs des Alcorans Zeugnissen/ Von seinem Glück und Wolfart/ darumb jme Got so lange zeit wider sein arme Christenheit z[ü]gesehen/ Wie ihme zubegegnen/ und wider jhme glücklich zustreiten/ Unnd von seinem endtlichen Undergang [...]* (Tübingen: Ulrich Morharts Wittib, 1568) [Sign. HAB=A 116.3 Theol. (2)]. A second edition was printed by the same press in 1569. Approximately twenty copies of the two editions survive.

<sup>19</sup>Said, *Orientalism*, 7.

<sup>20</sup>Steven Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople 1453* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 13–14, 179–81; Robert Schwoebel, *The Shadow of the Crescent: The Renaissance Image of the Turk, 1453–1517* (New York: St. Martin's, 1967), 19–22; Erich Meuthen, "Der Fall von Konstantinopel und der lateinische Westen," *Historische Zeitschrift* 237 (1983): 1–35; Matthias Thumser, "Türkenfrage und öffentliche Meinung. Zeitgenössische Zeugnisse nach dem Fall von Konstantinopel (1453)," in *Europa und die osmanische Expansion im ausgehenden Mittelalter*, ed. Franz-Reiner Erkens (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1997), 59–78.

<sup>21</sup>Halil Inalcik, *The Ottoman Empire: The Classical Age, 1300–1600* (London: Phoenix, 1973), 41–52.

<sup>22</sup>Robert Waissenberg, ed., *Die Türken vor Wien: Europe und die Entscheidung an der Donau 1683* (Salzburg: Residenz Verlag, 1982). An overview of contemporary reactions is found in Walter Sturminger, *Die Türken vor Wien in Augenzeugenberichten* (Düsseldorf: Rauch, 1968).

<sup>23</sup>As, for example, the Romance of the Childe Rolande (regularly integrated in German histories as an element of Charlemagne's reign and an aspect of the Frankish past of German-speaking lands). One example is Cyriakus Spangenberg, *Quernfurtische Chronica* (Erfurt: Baumann, 1590) (Sign. HAB=A: 150 Hist. (2)).

<sup>24</sup>On Habsburg financial gifts to the Ottomans, see Ernst Dieter Petritsch, "Tribut oder Ehrengeschenk? Ein Beitrag zu den habsburgisch-osmanischen Beziehungen in der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts," in *Archiv und Forschung: Das Haus-Hof- und Staatsarchiv in seiner Bedeutung für die Geschichte Österreichs und Europas*, ed. Elisabeth Springer (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1993), 49–58; and corrections to Petritsch in Guido Komatsu, "Die Türkei und das europäische Staatensystem: Untersuchungen zu Theorie und Praxis des frühneu-

zeitlichen Völkerrechts," in *Recht und Reich im Zeitalter der Reformation. Festschrift für Horst Rabe*, ed. Christine Roll, 2nd ed., 121–44 (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1997), 131.

<sup>25</sup>Ernst Dieter Petritsch, ed., *Regesten der Osmanischen Dokumente im österreichischen Staatsarchiv*, vol. 1 (1480–1574) (Vienna: Österreichische Staatsdruckerei, 1991), 146. The treaty expired automatically with the death of any party, which forced Ferdinand's successor Maximilian II to renegotiate in 1564. Negotiations collapsed over a dispute relating to the Hungarian king Jan Zápolya's encroachments into Habsburg territory in Transylvania, which Maximilian's general Lazarus von Schwendi had countered—leading to the treaty's revocation and the advance of Suleiman's armies toward Szigetvár under his personal command. The diplomatic prelude to events at Szigetvár is described in Maximilian Lanzinner and Dietmar Heil, eds., *Deutsche Reichstagsakten. Abt. Reichsversammlungen 1556–1662. Der Reichstag zu Augsburg 1566*, 2 vols. (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 2002), 1:95–104 (hereafter cited as *RTA 1566*).

<sup>26</sup>Komatsu, "Die Türkei und das europäische Staatensystem," 122.

<sup>27</sup>Miller, "Holy War," 46.

<sup>28</sup>On French-Ottoman diplomacy as a factor affecting the Habsburgs, see De Lamar Jensen, "The Ottoman Turks in Sixteenth-Century French Diplomacy," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 16 (1985): 451–70; on the legal status and political role of French-Ottoman treaties, see Komatsu, "Die Türkei und das europäische Staatensystem," 132–4.

<sup>29</sup>Said, *Orientalism*, 59.

<sup>30</sup>Wolfgang Steglich, "Über die Reichstürkenhilfe in der Zeit Karls V.," *Militärgeschichtliche Mitteilungen* 1 (1972): 1–55; Schulze, *Reich und Türkengefahr*, 67–219; Moritz Csáky, "Karl V., Ungarn, die Türkenfrage und das Reich," in *Das römisch-deutsche Reich im politischen System Karls V.*, ed. Heinrich Lutz (Munich/Vienna: R. Oldenbourg, 1982), 223–37.

<sup>31</sup>Stephen A. Fischer-Galati, *Ottoman Imperialism and German Protestantism, 1521–1555* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972), 117.

<sup>32</sup>Schulze, *Reich und Türkengefahr*, 67–219.

<sup>33</sup>*RTA 1566*, Nr. 3, "Proposition des Kaisers," 179. All translations are my own.

<sup>34</sup>*RTA 1566*, Nr. 199, "Türkenhilfe, Antwort," 773ff.

<sup>35</sup>Miller, "Holy War," 88–9.

<sup>36</sup>Said, *Orientalism*, 71; Turner, *Orientalism, Postmodernism and Globalism*, 7.

<sup>37</sup>This included, for example, Hungary, to which a small but significant number of German publications were directed. András F. Balogh, "Die deutschsprachigen Ungarnflugschriften vom Anfang des 16. Jahrhunderts," in *Eine Unterredung gegen die Türken. Zweisprachige, kommentierte Edition der deutschen Flugschrift VD 16: T2239*, ed. András F. Balogh (Budapest, Littera Nova, 2003), 5–39.

<sup>38</sup>In addition to the Ketton translation, the Cluniac corpus included controversialist texts. On the contents and errors of these texts, see Marie-Therese d'Alverny, "Deux traductions latines du Coran au Moyen Age," *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Age* 17 (1947–8), 69–131; James Kritzeck,

“Robert Ketton’s Translation of the Qur’an,” *Islamic Quarterly* 2 (1955), 309–12; Johann Fück, *Die arabische Studien in Europa bis in den Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1955), 3–9.

<sup>39</sup>On the sources of medieval knowledge of Islam in Europe, see Margaret Meserve, “Medieval Sources for Renaissance Theories on the Origins of the Ottoman Turks,” in *Europa und die Türken in der Renaissance*, ed. Bodo Guthmüller and Wilhelm Kühlmann (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2000), 409–36; Siegfried Raeder, “Die Türkenpredigten des Jakob Andreae,” in *Theologen und Theologie an der Universität Tübingen*, ed. Martin Brecht, 96–122 (Tübingen: JCB Mohr/Siebeck, 1977), 119–22.

<sup>40</sup>Miller, “Holy War,” 22; Thomas E. Burman, “Tafsir and Translation: Medieval Arabic Exegesis and the Latin Qur’ans of Robert of Ketton and Mark of Toledo,” *Speculum* 98 (1998): 703–32.

<sup>41</sup>David Choi, “Martin Luther’s Response to the Turkish Threat: Continuity and Contrast with the Medieval Commentators Riccolando da Monte Croce and Nicholas of Cusa” (PhD diss., Princeton University, 2003).

<sup>42</sup>Miller, “Holy War,” 90.

<sup>43</sup>Bibliander consulted UB Basel Ms. A III 19. On Bibliander’s Koran edition, see reliably only the following: Fück, *Die arabische Studien in Europa*, 6; Martin Steinmann, *Johann Oporinus: Ein Bäsler Buchdrucker des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Basel: Helbing und Lichtenhahn, 1967), 21; Raeder, “Türkenpredigten,” 98–9; Harry Clark, “The Publication of the Koran in Latin: A Reformation Dilemma,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 15 (1984): 3–12; and definitively Hartmut Bobzin, *Der Koran im Zeitalter der Reformation* (Beirut/Stuttgart: Steiner, 1995), 159–275. Older literature perpetuates the fable that Bibliander was a gifted Arabist and his edition a scholarly translation, as does Franco Cardini, *Europa und der Islam. Geschichte eines Missverständnisses*, trans. Rita Seuß (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2000), 224, which even calls the Bibliander Koran the first step in a developing *Islamwissenschaft*.

<sup>44</sup>Based on Munich SB Cod. Arab. Monac. 7 and Cod. Arab. Monac. 28.

<sup>45</sup>Bobzin, *Koran*, 323–63.

<sup>46</sup>Bobzin, *Koran*, 470–97.

<sup>47</sup>Debate persists about the author’s identity; I follow current consensus. The modern critical edition is [Georgius de Hungaria], *Tractatus de moribus, conditionibus et nequicia turcorum*, ed. Reinhard Klockow (Cologne/Weimar/Vienna: Böhlau, 1993); on printed editions and translations of the text, see 52–60.

<sup>48</sup>Silke Falkner, “‘Having It Off’ with Fish, Camels and Lads: Sodomitical Pleasures in *Turcica* Discourse,” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* (forthcoming).

<sup>49</sup>[Georgius de Hungaria], *Tractatus de moribus [...] turcorum*, 170, 172.

<sup>50</sup>Modern facsimile edition: Bartholomaeus Georgevics, *De captivitate suae apud Turcas*, ed. Reinhard Klockow and Monika Ebertowski (Berlin: Druckwerkstatt im Kreuzberg Museum, 2000).

<sup>51</sup>Ulrich Andermann, “Geschichtsdeutung und Prophetie.

Krisenerfahrung und –bewältigung am Beispiel der osmanischen Expansion im Spätmittelalter und in der Reformationszeit,” in Guthmüller et al., *Europa und die Türken*, 29–54, here 33–5.

<sup>52</sup>Wolfgang F. Reddig, *Reise zum Erzfeind der Christenheit. Der Humanist Hans Dernschwam in der Türkei (1553–1555)* (Paffensweiler: Centaurus, 1990), 38.

<sup>53</sup>[Georgius de Hungaria], *Tractatus de moribus [...] turcorum*, 404.

<sup>54</sup>The Gutenberg indulgence letter has been edited and commented: Ferdinand Geldner, *Der Türkenkalender: “eyn manung d. cristenheit widder d. durken”;* Mainz 1454; *der älteste vollständig erhaltene gedrucktes Buch* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1975); see also Eckehard Simon, *The ‘Türkenkalender’ (1545): Attributed to Gutenberg and the Strasbourg Lunation Tracts* (Cambridge: Medieval Academy of America, 1988). A modern reprint of a similar text is Raimundus Peraudi: *Ablaßbrief zum Texten des Kampfes gegen die Türken* (Speyer: Peter Drach, 1490; Speyer: Zechner, 1990).

<sup>55</sup>Choi, “Martin Luther’s Response,” 186; Mark U. Edwards, Jr., *Luther’s Last Battles: Politics and Polemics, 1531–1536* (Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 1983).

<sup>56</sup>Noteworthy: Ludwig Hagemann, *Martin Luther und der Islam* (Altenberge: Verlag für Christlich-Islamisches Schriftum, 1983); Edwards, *Luther’s Last Battles*, 97–114; Rudolf Mau, “Luthers Stellung zu den Türken,” in *Leben und Werk Martin Luthers von 1526–1546*, ed. Helmar Junghans, 2 vols. (Berlin [GDR]: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1983), 1:647–62, 2:956–66; Bobzin, *Koran*, 13–156; Martin Brecht, “Luther und die Türken,” in Guthmüller et al., *Europa und die Türken*, 9–28; Gregory J. Miller, “Luthers Türkenchriften,” *Luther-Jahrbuch* 71 (2004; forthcoming).

<sup>57</sup>Miller, “Holy War,” 111.

<sup>58</sup>Volker Leppin, *Antichrist und Jüngster Tag* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1999), 45–50.

<sup>59</sup>While incomplete and flawed, the starting point for studies of the genre is still Carl Göllner, *Turcica*, 3 vols. (Bucharest/Baden-Baden: Valentin Koerner, 1974). Its mistakes and omissions are discussed in Miller, “Holy War,” 6–7.

<sup>60</sup>Rudolf Wolkan, “Zu den Türkenliedern des XVI. Jahrhunderts,” *Festschrift zum VIII. allgemeinen deutschen Neuphilologentage in Wien Pfingsten 1898* (Vienna/Leipzig: Braumüller, 1898), 65–77; Senol Özyurt, *Die Türkenlieder und das Türkenbild in der deutschen Versüberlieferung* (Munich: Fink, 1972); Bertrand Michael Buchmann, *Türkenlieder zu den Türkenkriegen* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1983).

<sup>61</sup>Gert Melville, “Die Wahrheit des Eigenen und die Wirklichkeit des Fremden. Über frühen Augenzeugen des osmanischen Reiches,” in Erkens, *Europa und die osmanischen Expansion*, 79–101; Almut Höfert, “Ist das Böse schmutzig? Das Osmanische Reich in den Augen europäischer Reisender des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts,” *Historische Anthropologie* 11:2 (2003): 176–92; Amanda Wunder, “Western Travelers, Eastern Antiquities, and the Image of the Turk in Early Modern Europe,” *Journal of Early Modern History* 7 (2003): 89–119.

<sup>62</sup>John W. Bohnstedt, “The Infidel Scourge of God: The Turkish Menace as Seen by German Pamphleteers of the Late

Reformation,” *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 58–9 (Philadelphia, 1968); Miller, “Holy War.”

<sup>63</sup>Edited sources in Anton von Gévy, ed., *Urkunden und Actenstücke zur Geschichte der Verhältnisse zwischen Österreich, Ungarn und der Pforte im XVI. und XVII. Jahrhundert*, 3 vols. (Vienna: A. Strauss’ Witwe, 1840–1842); Karl Nehring, ed., *Austro-Turcica 1541–1552. Diplomatische Akten des habsburgischen Gesandtschaftsverkehrs mit der Hohen Pforte im Zeitalter Süleymans des Prächtigen* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1995).

<sup>64</sup>Reinhold Franke, *Die päpstlichen Ausschreibungen von Ablässen und Steuern zum Kampfe gegen die Türken 1464–1543* (diss. Universität Halle, 1924).

<sup>65</sup>Cornelia Kleinlogel, *Exotik-Erotik. Zur Geschichte des Türkensbildes in der deutschen Literatur der frühen Neuzeit (1453–1800)* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1989); Carina Lee Johnson, *Negotiating the Exotic: Aztec and Ottoman Culture in Habsburg Europe, 1500–1590* (PhD diss., University of California at Berkeley, 2000); Falkner, “Having It Off.”

<sup>66</sup>Turner, *Orientalism, Postmodernism and Globalism*, 3.

<sup>67</sup>Turner, *Orientalism, Postmodernism and Globalism*, 67.

<sup>68</sup>Sermon sources are important for our understanding of developing knowledge, since pastors and theologians were often humanists whose vast correspondences made them nodes for the collection and dissemination of information. Johnson, *Negotiating the Exotic*, 6–7. Moreover, in sermons, the early modern local scholar constructed knowledge about the Turks for his congregation. Sermons functioned as a major source of entertainment and information that catered to the limited literacy of early modern audiences. Beth Kreitzer, “The Lutheran Sermon,” in *Preachers and People in the Reformations and Early Modern Period*, ed. Larissa Taylor, 35–63 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 35. Finally, apocalypticism was among the most central and popular themes of interest in early modern Germany. Robin Barnes, *Prophecy and Gnosis* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988).

<sup>69</sup>On Andreae (1528–1590) see his own memoir, which unfortunately stops in 1562: *Leben des Jakob Andreae, Doktor der Theologie, von ihm selbst mit großer Treue und Aufrichtigkeit beschrieben, bis auf das Jahr Christi 1562*, ed. Hermann Ehmer (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1991). Also see Johann Valentin Andreae, *Fama Andreaana reflorescens sine Jacobi Andreae Waiblingensis vitae etc. recitatio* (Strasbourg: Reppius, 1630); Christian Moritz Fittbogen, *Jakob Andreae, der Verfasser der Konkordienformel* (Hagen: Risel, 1881); J. Schall, “Tübingen und Konstantinopel,” *Blätter für württembergische Kirchengeschichte* 7 (1892): 33f; Rosemarie Streisand, “Theologie und Kirchenpolitik bei Jakob Andreae bis zum Jahr 1568,” *Blätter für württembergische Kirchengeschichte* 60–1 (1960–1), 244–394; Robert Kolb, *Andreae and the Formula of Concord* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1977), 9–57; J. Ebel, “Jacob Andreae (1528–1590) als Verfasser der Konkordienformel,” *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 89 (1978): 78–119; Carl Andresen, ed., *Handbuch der Dogmen- und Theologiegeschichte*, vol. 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1984), 138–142; Irene Dingel, *Concordia Controversa* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1996), passim. Some of Andreae’s most oft-reprinted works include: *Sechs Christlicher Predigt von dem recht Christlichen und Geistlichen Kloster leben* (Tübingen: Ulrich Morharts Wittib,

1562); *Ein Christliche Predigt, von Christlicher Einigkeit der Theologen Augspurgischer Confession: zu Dresden den XXII. Martij Anno 1570 gehalten* (Wolfenbüttel: Conrard Horn, 1570); *Ein Christliche Predigt/ von dem grenlichen erschrockenlichen Laster der Gotteslösterung* (Tübingen: Gruppenbach, 1578); *Ein Christliche Predigt vber das Euangelion Matthei am 22. Cap. vom Gesetz/ vnd der Person Christi* (Tübingen: Gruppenbach, 1578); *Eine Predigt vom grossen Abentmal* (Magdeburg: Francke, 1579); *Ein Christliche Predig, Vom hochwürdigen Sacrament, des Leibs und Bluts ... Jesu Christi* (Tübingen: Gruppenbach, 1583).

<sup>70</sup>Interestingly, the majority of surviving printed texts come from Catholic authors. This state of affairs may result from geographical proximity: Ottoman armies advanced primarily on Catholic territories. Well-known texts in this genre from the sixteenth century by Protestant authors include: Eberhard Weidensee, *Ein Sermon von dem grausamen und unmenschlichen laster des volsauffens, und wie es Gott mit ewiger und zeitlicher plage, auch durch den Türcken, zu straffen drawet: Aus dem fünfften Cap. Esai genomen* (Magdeburg: Rödinger, 1541); Johann Gigas, *Vom Türcken und Sterben, zwo kurtze Predigten* (Frankfurt/Oder: Johann Eichorn, 1566); Heinrich Efferhen, *XIII Christenliche Predigten auß dem XXXVIII. und XXXIX. Capitel Ezechiels* (Strasbourg: Rihel, 1571); Melchior Fabricius, *Türcken Predigt, das ist: Wie man sich wider desselben gewalt und grausame Tyranny trösten, und in diesem ietzschwwebenden ganz gefährlichen zustand [...] verhalten solle* (Nuremberg: Catherina Gerlachins Erben, 1592); Polycarp Leyser, *Zwo christliche Predigten, eine uber das Evangelium am 25. Sonntag nach Trinitatis. Die ander, uber das ander Capitel des Propheten Joels ... zu Wittenberg gehalten* (Wittenberg: Simon Grönenberg, 1593); Solomon Gesner, *Fünffzeben Predigten vom Türcken uber das 38 und 39 capitel Ezechiels* (N.p.: Clemen Berger, 1596); Georg Mylius, *Land Tags Predigt, wie christliche Landschafften[...] sich] verhalten sollen* (Leipzig: Zacharia Berwald, 1597).

<sup>71</sup>Raeder, “Türkenpredigten,” 101, suggests Andreae got this information from Postel’s *De orbis terrae concordia* (Basel, 1544).

<sup>72</sup>Irene Backus, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation (1378–1615)* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 328–9.

<sup>73</sup>David Chytraeus, *De Lectione historiarum recte instituenda et historicorum fere omnium series et argumenta breuiter et perspicue [...]* (Strasbourg: Christian Mylius, 1565), A6<sup>v</sup>-A7<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>74</sup>Leppin, *Antichrist*, 59–63.

<sup>75</sup>As in Martin Luther, *Die gantze Heilige Schrift Deusch, Wittenberg 1545*, ed. Hans Volz 2 vols. (Munich: Rogner und Bernhard, 1972), 1559.

<sup>76</sup>Justus Jonas, *Das siebend Capitel Danielis, Von des Türcken Gotteslesterung, und schrecklicher Mörderey* (Wittenberg: Luft, 1530).

<sup>77</sup>Johannes Brenz, *Türcken Biechlein: wie sich Prediger vnd Laien halten sollen, so der Türck das Teutsche Land überfallen würde* (Wittenberg: Rhaw, 1537).

<sup>78</sup>Miller, “Holy War,” 114–25, summarizes the main points of reception of Muhammad’s biography in German pamphlet literature.

<sup>79</sup>Raeder, “Türkenpredigten,” 101, attributes this story to the Latin tradition of the Cluniac corpus, particularly the

“Apologia al-Kindis,” transmitted through Vincent of Beauvais into Bibliander’s work.

<sup>80</sup>Raeder, “Türkenpredigten,” 102, traces this account back to the Byzantine historian Theophanes Homologetes (d. 814), who was translated into Latin by Anastasius Bibliothecarius (d. 879), and transmitted by Vincent of Beauvais, whence it entered Bibliander and Luis Vives’ works on the Koran as well.

<sup>81</sup>Raeder, “Türkenpredigten,” 102, n.8.

<sup>82</sup>Interestingly, Andreae diverges from the burden of Lutheran literature on the Turks here; Miller, “Holy War,” 112–13, argues that Lutheran authors identified Islam with works righteousness.

<sup>83</sup>On Lutheran treatments of Islamic soteriology, see Miller, “Holy War,” 107–11.

<sup>84</sup>The classic statement on this subject, which unleashed a wild debate, is Heinz Schilling, “Die Konfessionalisierung im Reich. Religiöser und gesellschaftlicher Wandel in Deutschland zwischen 1555 und 1620,” *Historische Zeitschrift* 246 (1988): 1–45.

<sup>85</sup>For example, see the discussions of Heinrich Richard Schmidt, “Sozialdisziplinierung? Ein Plädoyer für das Ende des Etatismus in der Konfessionalisierungsforschung,” *Historische Zeitschrift* 265 (1997): 639–82.

<sup>86</sup>[Georgius de Hungaria], *Tractatus de moribus [...] turcorum*, 227–37.

<sup>87</sup>On the results of the rhetorical conflation of Israelites and Jews in Reformation preaching, see Susan R. Boettcher, “Preliminary Considerations on the Rhetorical Construction of Jews in Luther Preaching at mid-Sixteenth Century,” in *Reformierter Protestantismus und Judentum im Europa des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Achim Detmers (Wuppertal: Foedus, forthcoming).