I. CUPRINS

II. Key-words: Protestant Reforme, Ottoman Empire, imagology, stereotype, polemic, Luther, Calvin, Erasmus, Transylvania, Islam, Mahomed, interferences, reformers, radical reformers, coincidence, providence, politics, geopolitics, mutual interestings, Calvino-Turkism, Papismo-Turkism, Anabaptimso-Turkism, Socianismo-Turkism, Ottoman rugs, Pope, Papality, Ortodox Church, Jew, Holocaust, little horn, parousia, Antichrist, religious tolerance, heretic, *flagellum Dei* etc.

III. SUMMARY

This research aims, in the Romanian cultural and academic context, to strengthen the development and advancement of the ideas of the Reformation, which is hardly evaluated: the reporting of Protestant doctrines, especially of Lutheranism to the Islamic world, to the nuances of power the Ottoman Empire induces European debate in the first half of the 16th century. The theme of this doctoral thesis has benefited from a minor interest in Romanian historiography, as it results from the researches and the bibliographic exposures we have taken.

First of all, evoking diachronic historiography, we will mention what we can now name the "imagology" about the Ottomans: Luther, Calvin, Erasmus, but also their sources of inspiration less publicized by polemic literature: Riccoldo da Monte di Croce, Nicholas Cusanus, Georgius of Hungary, Theodor Bibliander, etc. Regarding the secondary littering of research, we can review the most titrated authors of the twentieth century, famous exegets such as Edward Said, Adam S. Francisco, Mark U. Edwards, Carol Göllner, Tahsin Gemil, Ian Almond, John Goffman, Bernard Lewis, Maxim Mihai, Murat Iyigun, Stephen Fischer-Galati, Halil Inalcik, Kenneth Setton, Andrei Pippidi, Kenneth Setton, Leslie C. Tihany, Paul T. Levin, Mark Greengrass , Alexander Sandor Unghvary etc.

The method of research approached in this exegex is the historical-imagological (polemical). Imagology is a more recent method of study, with origins in literary studies and the history of mentalities, which deals with the study of collective or individual images and the way they are crystallized in the collective and subjective mind, but also about the way they are transmitted and interpreted from a diacronic point of view.

Deepening the study of alterties and, implicitly, of stereotypes, to be in agreement with Edward Said, of the interferences between the West and the Orient, between the Christian and the Muslim, several working hypotheses were born: 1). the Christian and Muslim worlds were so intimately interconnected that they formed the "great western world." The conclusions of the study does not agree with this theory, a thesist and fanatsy assumption of Daniel Goffman, who identified too much with the topic. 2). There was some connection between the two worlds, even from a religious point of view, between the Protestant Reformation and Islam. Most researchers name it "geopolitical", while others, closer to theological studies, call it "providence" - divine intervention, taht represents a hard debate for a long time now. That there was only the horizontal plan of these interferences between the two worlds, or indeed that a metaphysical approach transcends them,

remains to be seen. Regarding from a geopolitical point of view, the Reformation and the Ottoman Empire saved each other, as most researchers in the field have revealed, which may be true.

An important detail in the research economy, which must take account of any interpreter, is the often polemical approach. It is notorious, for example, that Lutheran writing is eminently polemical. Interference with the two worlds oscillates between pact and hatred, between demonizing and needing identity.

Our study aims to put forward the way in which the images of the Sarazins (a fluid concept that initially included the Muslim Arab population, the Berber population, and Christian apostastics in North Africa) and the Ottomans to the great reformers of the sixteenth century from medieval to modernity. There are several imagological similarities. To ensure accuracy of the results, the study will analyze and approach the compared and cross-referenced imagologies. Because both Protestant Reform and Ottoman Islam were turning points in the history of the world and in religious reform, this research will also address a certain biblical theology. We can not sufficiently understand that moment of "0" of European religiosity, called one by one: Reformation, schism, heresy, apostasy, Protestantism, without taking into account a suite of Bibles and biblical resorts.

Geographically, our approach will extend to the eastern boundaries of the Protestant Reform, where the interferences between the two worlds and religions have acquired the colors of the art of cohabitation and religious tolerance. At the congruence of the two worlds, Transylvania became a small paradise for the renegade, the first place in the world where was issued a law that was providing the right to faith, no matter what option.

The theme of this first chapter of our research "Introduction to Religious (Ethnic) and Cultural Stereotypes" is to analyze and understand, in the light of some examples provided by the history of the transition period from the Middle Ages to the Modern Age - a transition whose representative was Martin Luther, the way in which images about "the others" are formed, the way they are transmitted and interpreted. The "other" report will be analyzed from the perspective of the history of imagology that has formalized the description of interethnic stereotypes throughout history. We propose a predominantly religious and ethnic predominant imagological approach to the Ottomans in the writings of Martin Luther, Jean Calvin, Erasmus Desert, etc. Tangentially, in order to have a comparative picture, the research will also perform a imagological radiography of the Jews. The relevance of the imagological analysis for the understanding of politics, religions and interethnic and its reverberations in the daily will be highlighted in the conclusions of this research.

Historical imagology is today one of the main topics of a certain research in the field of sociology history, anthropology, ethnography[1] etc. The concrete conditions for the formation of the structures of thought, culture, civilization, and the mentalities of the various peoples are of great importance for the way they perceive the world, the social processes and phenomena, the existence of other peoples, manifestations in time and space of the "other" different from "them" or "us"[2], the limk with the past and with the "other", as the well-known orientalist Edward Said expressed in *Orientalism*. Said question the concept of "Orientalism"[3] as a source of distorted cultural representations by which the Western world perceived the East. His theses suggest the existence of subtle and persistent Eurocentric prejudices against the world and Islamic culture, which originated in a long tradition of a false European culture about Asia. Said argues that such cultural representations have served as an argument for materializing the colonialist and imperialist ambitions of European and US states. In the eyes of the US, Muslims and Arabs are viewed stereotypically as potential terrorists or oil suppliers. The Islamic world is so caricatured that it becomes extremely vulnerable to military interventions.[4] In the same rhetoric in *Orientalism*, Said states that the study of Islamic culture and civilization is only a form of political intellectualism meant to assert European identity, rather than to be concerned about a real academic approach. As such, Oriental study branches function as a practical method of "imperialist" discrimination and domination. In other words, Western Orientalists are presumed to know the Orient better than the Orientals know.[5] Ever since Antiquity, European art has stereotyped the Orient. Said thinks that Eschil/Aeschylus's tragic Persian tragedy (472 BC) is a false work because it does not reproduce the true nature of the Orient. Colonial subjects are unable to think, act or speak for themselves, much less to write their own history.[6] As a result, Western orientalists had to build the history of the East, the cultural identities of Asia from the perspective of a West that is the true cultural standard of emulation, the norm from which "oriental enigmatics and exotics" were derived.[7] The theses of Orientalism put face to face a Orient described by the eyes of the West: an irrational and weak

---

[1] Ion Chiuciudean şi Bogdan-Alexandru Halic, *Curs de imagologie. Imagologie istorică* (Bucureşti: Şcoala Naţională de Studii Politice şi Administrative, 2008), 7.

[2] Alexandru Duţu. *Literatura comparată şi istoria mentalităţilor* (Bucureşti: Univers, 1982), 37.

[3] Edward Said. *Orientalism* (London: Penguin Books, 2003), XIII.

[4] Edward Said. (26 April 1980). "Islam Through Western Eyes", *The Nation*. Retrieved 6 June 2013.

[5] Edward Said. *Orientalism* (London: Penguin Books, 2003)*, XI.

[6] *Ibid.,* 56-57.

[7] *Ibid.,* 38-41

world, an effeminate of the "other", and at the opposite pole: European political power, reason and masculinity. This projection and discriminatory definition of the "other" in the Orient has created a series of inequalities.[8] Daniel Goffman applies this concept to the Ottoman Empire, which was considered to be the "other", exotic, inexplicable, unchanged, an "empire" sitting on the periphery of the countries of Europe.[9]

Said's opera caused a wave of criticism. Famous orientalists such as Albert Hourani, Robert Graham Irwin, Nikki Keddie, Bernand Lewis, and Kanan Makyia have lost their prestige because Orientalism affected the public perception of scientific integrity and the quality of their message.[10] For Keddie, one of the unfortunate consequences of launching this work is even at a semantic level, that is, the word "oriental" has been downgraded so much that it has become synonymous with a curse.[11]

In the fiery dispute caused by the launch of this book, Orientalist Bernard Lewis argues that the desire to know the West was always motivated by a disinterested curiosity that the Islamic world did not show to Europe.[12] If we were to apply the theses and antitheses presented above at the time of the Middle Ages, we can emphasize the hegemonic wish of the Ottomans who wanted to conquer the Gates of Europe. For most historians, the desire of Carol Quintus and the various popes to release Constantinople/Istanbul and Jerusalem from Muslim domination was a legitimate one. These cradles of civilization belonged to Christianity. But it was not always so. The fascination of the East and the West has been a real miracle for both worlds, to a greater or lesser extent, at one time or another. Whether we are talking about sultans or kings, colonialists or missionaries, curiosity about the "other" has often crossed the boundaries of discovery and knowledge, to domination and appropriation. To some extent, we tend to agree to both Said and Lewis.

In the chapter "Religious (ethnic) imagination and cultural stereotypes in Martin Luther's polemical writings," our research attempts to crystallize imagological profiles using exegeto-polemic tools.

From the point of view of a polemic analysis, the contradictory character of many of Lutheran writings is highlighted from the outset. We will specifically analyze the polemics directed

---

[8] Edward Said. *Orientalism* (London: Penguin Books, 2003)*,* 65-67.

[9] Daniel Goffman. *The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 5.

[10] Lewis Bernard. ''The Question of Orientalism'', *Islam and the West* (London: 1993): 99, 118.

[11] Nancy Elizabeth Gallagher. *Approaches to the History of the Middle East* (London: Ithaca Press, 1994), 144–45.

[12] Bernard Lewis. *The Muslim Discovery of Europe* (New York: Norton & Company, 1982).

against the Catholics and Jews, as well as those written against the Lutheran co-religions. "The Lord's Warrior," as Luther self-defined himself, uses messages of religious or prophetic-biblical origin for that purpose. It can be seen that the Lutheran polemic was not the only Christian polemic, but it was perhaps one of the most important in an astral moment of world history. The internal and external causes of that type of polemic will be highlighted in the findings of this research.

The portraits Luther made to the Turks, sometimes paradoxical, were directly influenced by the Ottoman threat of Suleiman the Magnificent's army, but also by the writings circulating at that time: the treaty written by the monk Georgius of Transylvania, Riccoldo's Rejection of the Qur'an of Montecroce, Nicolas Cusa's Quench of the Qur'an. I agree with Francisco Adam who dissociates both Wolf's position and those of Fischer-Galati and Hagemann. Wolf claims that Luther is the perfect exponent of his age (including rhetoric and polemics), while Fischer-Galati and Hagemann claim that he was *grosso-modo* influenced by his era.[13] It would not be right to give the reformer only mitigating circumstances, as it is not right to unilaterally criticize the contradictory claims.

The image of the Turks was directly influenced by external causes, the reformer having no physical tangents with them. Also, an important factor is the apocalyptic background of Lutheran theology. The Reformer builds the evaluation of Islam from a eschatological perspective. Luther's world lived in the last few days.[14] The assessment of the images of the Turks and Jews is also required to be evaluated from this perspective. Moreover, the analysis must also be made in the light of one of the most important theological paradigms we encounter in its writings, namely the concept of the three states: spiritual, material and political, and marital reality. Luther was convinced that the Turks were attempting to these fundamental realities of the world and the order created by God, threatening the disappearance of the Christian religion and the society of the sixteenth century.

Luther, by definition, a polemic writer, has made excessively contradictory claims, of which we mention the image of the Ottomans who are superior to the Papists, both in deeds and in holiness. Unlike the Ottomans, the Jews are portrayed as "enemies from inside". Indeed, Luther slightly changes his approach when he convinces that the Mohammedans do not want to believe in a divine Christ who has made the salvation of every sinner, but opts, like the Catholic Church, for a religion of salvation through deeds.

---

[13] Adam S. Francisco. *Martin Luther and Islam* (Leiden: BRILL, 2007), 127.

[14] Georg Captivus Septemcastrensis. *Tratat despre obiceiurile, ceremoniile și infamia turcilor* (București: Humanitas, 2017), 177.

Ian Alomod uses the double sense of the Greek pharmakon: poison and cure, to introduce the ambiguous role that Islam plays in Luther's vision: a diabolical and divine, corrupt and pure, the epitome of blasphemy and, at the same time, the sacred restorer.[15] In Luther's response to the Ottoman threat, one can only observe the paradox that ultimate salvation is in the hurdle, enemy, and curse, and damnation comes from forms of allegiance-generated comfort, all this ambiguous reality belonging to the mysterious and enigmatic paths of God.[16]

Whether Luther took Europeans, Jews, or Turks into imagological collimation, we can unequivocally conclude that the multiple portraits he emanates are influenced by the stereotypes of the Middle Ages. This causality does not absolve the reformer of the wrongful speech. Whether they are damned like "terrible Turks" or appreciated as "Turkish nobles," these different facets are part of the same complex imagological style that reveals, in a "darkened" age, at least complex people. It is imperative to mention that we need to be careful in deciphering the "real" of "imaginary".

Decontextualization can further distort the meaning of portraits. Decontextualing, we should notice that the German reformer's approach was theological, not racial or biological, however, his words were "used" as a pretext for mass extermination. That is why we need a lot of caution and discernment to better understand the "real Jew" of the "imaginary Jew".

The Lutheran "Jewish Question", and its settlement, is tributary to anti-Semitism/Judaism that has been abounding since antiquity, and especially the phobia and superstition of the Middle Ages.

We can state, together with the specialists in the field, that Luther was not an anti-Semite in the sense of modern terminology, but only an anti-Jewish. Taking into account all the mitigating circumstances of his time, the analyzes that have been carried out so far, we can not say, in synch with some scholars, that Luther is a pertinent cause of the "final solution," as well as we can not call, together with some scholars, to the ritual of lustration. Luther was not a superman, but a submissive man in the limits of his time. Catholic critics tend to accuse Luther of psychological affections, while Protestant researchers give the reformer more mitigating circumstances.

Luther's writings are an example of the disastrous effect of defamatory ethnic and religious imagology and of the formidable power of multiplying and amplifying "heavy printing plates" (stereotypes). In this sense, we propose the method of nuance "the other" to the detriment of stereotyping, cliché and black and white image.

---

[15] Ian Almond. "Deconstructing Luther's Islam: the Turk as a curse or cure?", în *Yearbook of Muslims in Europe,* vol. III (2011): 620.

[16] *Ibid.,* 654.

No matter how different the "other" to "us" we have the duty to be tolerant in a world that goes back in time.

In the chapter "The Orthodox Church in Martin Luther's vision. The Leipzig Dispute" will show that there have been attempts to bring the Lutherans towards Orthodox, Jews and even Turks as a counterweight to the major confrontation between the Catholic Church and the reformer. This approach was partly due to a certain doctrinal congruence between the Lutherans and the Orthodox, but also to a mutual empathy triggered by the suffering caused by the persecution of Rome, and, ultimately, by a partial ignorance of one another.

Since the beginnings of Christianity, tensions have existed between Greek-speaking and Latin-speaking churches. The tension intensified when Rome proclaimed the axiom: "Rome locuta est, causa finita est" ("Rome spoke, the dispute is over"). Given this duality in Christianity and the need for a supportive pole, the Protestants began expressing interest and sympathy for the Orthodox Church. Luther needed the "other" to defend his own positions. Reported to personal beliefs, the reformer was sincere in his misiological approaches to Orthodox, Turkish, or Jewish.

In Luther's view, the Church of Christ was more than Roman communion. The translation of the Confessions from Augsburg into the Greek language shows this increased interest. With the translation of the Confession, the path of dialogue between the West and the East was opened. Melanchton played an even more important role near the Orthodox world.[17]

We can draw some pertinent conclusions from the theological dispute in Leipzig. On the one hand, the Orthodox Church appears, at first instance, to play a role as apologetic tool. The instrument is mainly used by Luther, who aligns itself with the orthodox. Of course, we notice that Eck also uses the third exponent of the debate to accuse both of them of heresy. George Florowski argues that "Graeca Ecclesia" was used as a polemical tool both Protestants and Catholics.[18] It is noteworthy that each theologian uses contradictory arguments, quoting almost the same Church Fathers. A balanced evaluation is that either the polemists used half-false arguments, or the authors of the writings have, in some places, expressed paradoxically. History shows that the Lutheran Church and the Orthodox Church did not go together. Therefore, the circumstances and ignorance of the "other" play a prominent role in getting momentary steps. We must not forget that both churches were in captivity, the Lutheran movement resisted "in the face" of the tyrant of Rome, while the Orthodox Church subsists under the rule of the sultan.

---

[17] Alexander Șandor Unghvary. *The Hungarian Protestant Reformation* (Toronto: Edwin Mellen Press, 1989), 185.

[18] Georges Florowsky. *Christianity and Culture,* vol. II in the *Collected Works* (Belmont, MA: Nordland Publishing Company, 1974), 147.

On the other hand, if we take into account the following quote:

> Over the last two thousand years, Oriental Christians who were not under the authority of the Pontiff of Rome, the Muscovites, the White Russians, the Greeks, the Bohemians and many other peoples living in the delightful lands of the world, believe the same as us, baptizes just like us, preaches just like us, lives the same as us.[19]

we conclude that Luther was convinced of the doctrinal similarities between the Reformed prophets, the Hussites, and the Orthodox believers.

The Orthodox, like the Turks, who, through their incursions in Europe, strengthened the Reformation, distracting Carol V's attention from solving the "problem of Germany", represented more than an apologetic tool in the struggle with the Catholic Church. The Lutherans have seen in the territory of the Eastern Roman Empire a ramp for the launch of the mission. This missionary Lutheran project, according to Daniel Benga, was born during the dialogue between the two sides, and he did not exist initially, as stated in the polemic writings.[20] If these polemical correspondences following the dialogue between Constantinople and Tubingen (1573-1581) were assumed to be sources of first hand, then we would have a false picture of dialogue. Because each camp has tendentiously interpreted the data in favor of the confession it is part of. The same professor claims that the Lutherans sent to Constantinople the Augustan Confession for the Greeks (Confesssio Augustana Graeca) for the patriarch to express his opinion on these statements of faith.[21]

The basis of the dialogue itself was put together with Melanchton's translation of the Augsburg Confession, in Greek, and its dispatch to Constantinople. The outcome was the same as that of the Jews and the Ottomans. Each player has succeeded in capitalizing on short-term benefits. In the long run, the Orthodox Church remained the same church with its implacable destiny, ignoring the "Ecclesia semper reformanda".

In the chapter "Religious (ethnic) imagination and cultural stereotypes in the writings of Jean Calvin. Study on the Turks" the research carries us further among the imagological profiles decripted from the writings of a more weighted reformer, with much less polemics and polemic accents. We will once again highlight the common imaginative sources of the reformers, to which

---

[19] Jaroslav Pelikan. *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom.* vol. 2, *The Christian Tradition - A History of the Development of Doctrine* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974), 281 *apud* George Hancock-Ştefan. *Impactul Reformei asupra românilor între 1517-1645* (Oradea: Editura Cartea Creştină, 2003), 35.

[20] Daniel Benga. *Metodologia cercetării ştiinţifice în teologia istorică* (Bucureşti: Sofia, 2003), 91.

[21] *Ibid.*

each has made its own contribution. Calvin's imagology must be analyzed through the eyes of the fundamental conceptions of the great French reformer theology - dogma about theocracy, (in) tolerance, predestination, the Triune God etc. Furthermore, the shadows and the lights of the imagological portraits must be interpreted in the note of the same tumultuous context of Europe threatened with the extinction of "flagelum Dei" and the inner enemy - the Papacy.

Most controversies in which the reformer was involved had the dogma of predestination. Against the enemies of God: Figius, Bolsec, Servetus, or Castellio, like David, Calvin used impulsive psalms and insulting epithets: "reeds", "pigs","beasts." Therefore, the imagological analysis above must be made through the doctrine of predestination. In fact, Calvin has some theological obsessions through which he thoroughly builds his entire postament: the Papacy, Islam, the draconian discipline applied in the theocratic Geneva and, of course, the divine decrees materialized in the dogma of predestination. If God has decided to lose large groups of people who have spawned lies and created new religious systems, how can the same God make those people (or part of them) the object of His mission? Calvin basically cancels the role of free will. Why should you call them "brutal beasts","devilish dogs", "detestable blasphemous" if God "blinded them in their stupidity" and they did not exercise their free will? This "monstrous decree" of predestination is summed up in a very plastic manner in terms of the dispute between Calvin and the humanist Sebastian Castellio.[22] In response to Calvin's accusation that "he would have stolen timber from Basel," Castellio responds magistralistically to the absurd rhetoric of the theory of predestination:

> ... suppose that things happened as you say and that I was actually stolen ... so it was written to me, as you rebuke me. Then why are reproving me? Should not you be merciful to me, because God has given me such a fate and made me so that, wishing I can not, must I forfeit? Why are you screaming in the four corners of heaven that I have committed myself to the theft? To refrain from stealing it in the future? But if I was forced by my fate, if this deed is the result of divine predestination, you ought to exonerate in your writings: I bear the yoke of fatality - a yoke I can not deny. In this case, it would be impossible for me to abstain from the theft as much as I grow up with my height in my body.[23]

Without erring, much of the theology of the "Pope of Geneva" can be summed up in the phrase:

---

[22] Ştefan Zweig. *Lupta împotriva unui rug. Castellio împotriva lui Calvin* (Bucureşti: Humanitas, 2016)*,* 186. Apelând la pedepsele vetero-testamentare, Calvin dorea moartea acestei „lichele umaniste": „Dumnezeu să te nimicească, Satano!"

[23] *Ibid., 186-187.*

"implacable destiny" or, more simply, in popular fatalists: "That's what God wanted!".

It is hard to appreciate if the descriptions Calvin made to Muslims, which he calls "raw beasts" or "devilish dogs" to mention only two of them, are more positive than those in Luther literature or in the century literature 16th century. The fact is that they belong to the rhetoric of his time.

One of Calvin's constants is the "Islam-Papal" binary, which corresponds to the two horns of Antichrist. There are a number of critics who claim that the reformer, cause of his fighting to Catholic Church, he is closer to Islam. It is hard to prove that Islam and Calvinism have many common points but you do not believe that because of this common background Calvin was tolerant to Islam. It is true that there were mutual political interests Calvin, like Luther, was not only aware of the Muslim's danger to Europe, but also of the potential help that this threat to Europe's catalysis had in the survival of Protestantism. This argument, which some call "political influence," others in religious terminology and cataloging as "providence" is also supported by Stephen Fischer-Galati[24] or Murat Iyigun[25].

The images Calvin attributes to the Turks play a coercive rhetorical role in the anti-Catholic agenda or even against their own believers. We must be careful that this discourse is modeled almost exclusively by the Bible. Sure, the author receives the interpretation of the biblical message on Muslims in the socio-political and military context of the time. Of course, the author cover the interpretation of the biblical message on Muslims in the socio-political and military context of the time. In a Dark Middle Age in which heresy and rebellion were punished with death, in which mutual demonization had reached paroxysical odds, not to mention the impudent language. The problem of scabrous language occurs when we take into account Calvin's reference system, namely, the Bible, and the Protestant Reform that he advocated.

In the chapter "Religious (ethnic) imagology and cultural stereotypes in the writings of Erasmus. Study on the Turks" will examine and understand, in the light of some examples given by the history of the transition period from the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, to the Modern Era - a transition whose representative was the great humanist Erasmus Desert - the way in which the images of "the others" are transmitted and interpreted. Unlike imagological analyzes about the Turks in Luther and Calvin's writings, this approach will also be undertaken from the perspective of humanism that has defined the Renaissance era. The "others" report will be analyzed from the

---

[24] Stephen Fischer-Galati. *Ottoman Imperialism and German Protestantism 1521-1555* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959), 117.

[25] Murat Iyugun. "Luther and Suleyman", *University of Colorado and IZA,* March 2008: 1-39.

perspective of historical imagology that has assisted us in describing stereotypes of interethnic reporting throughout history. The significance of our imagological investigation to understand the current political, religious and inter-ethnic environment will be highlighted in the findings of this research.

Erasmus emphasizes the importance of free will in choosing man for salvation, including Muslims. Although he claimed that God used the Turkish attacks on Europe to reform Christians, it did not appear that these incursions were predested, but rather that the barbarians chose to attack (God knew in his foreknowledge). The portraits that Erasmus makes to the Turks are both the fruit of personal analysis and of the rhetoric of time. From this language of time, Luther and Calvin complete their images of the Turks. In the negative manifestations of the Reformation, if we take the Radical Reform as a point of reference, unlike the Erasmus moderation, Luther and Calvin have in some places expressed radical accents. When I say radical accents, I mean behavioral.

Although the Turks are "a barbarian race of obscure origins" and "do not have credits", in the eyes of the humanist, the most dangerous Turks are "the Turks from the heart" - the sins of Christians. Christian struggle should be manifested on both plans: first, by personal example, Christians must preach to the Turks Christ; Secondly, just to be pleased with the Lord and to represent the Savior correctly before the barbarians, the followers of the cross must solve the problem of "the Turks from the heart." In reality, both approaches are behavioral. They could not be communicated better than from an authentic humanist and a gentleman in behavior and words.

Regarding the issue of "just war", we refute the pacifist thesis put forward by Nathan Ron. Nor can we, along with Fernandez, appreciate that Erasmus changed from pacifists thinking to the bellicose camp. Olin's analysis tends too much towards reductionism. However, all researches have a common denominator, namely, Erasmus apologizes for "concordia". In a Europe permanently threatened with dissolution, only Christians changed by God can save them from Islam menace.

Finally, perhaps the most important reminder that this study gives us is the following: the tolerant spirit is imperative to prevail even today on any ethnic, religious or cultural distinction. Otherwise, in the absence of a *concordia* that emanates from Christ, Europe will again be subjected to the assault of disaggregation.

In the chapter "Affirmation of the Anabaptist Religious Identity and Freedom in the Conflict of Christians and Ottomans of the 16th-17th Centuries" we will find that mutual interests in struggle for survival or hegemony and doctrinal similarities that have contributed not only to the closeness of the Reformers to the Crescent, but also of radical leaders. These interferences represent the meeting points between East and West.

The affirmation of one's own religious identity was a problem for the 16th century Protestants, all the more so for those who descended from those who split Christianity, such as the Anabaptists, who like external enemies, Muslims, were condemned by opponents as being devilish, sublime beings or witches.[26] Radical Anabaptists have been given these names because of doctrinal disagreements with most Christians, especially the practice of credobaptism (immersion baptism administered at an age when man understands, while most Christians practice pedobaptism - baptism of infants), exacerbated pacifism - refusal of the majority to wear weapons, or to the desire for permanent refashioning of the church according to the ministry: "semper reformanda" ("continuing to reform").[27] Because of these theological considerations, which made them different in the eyes of the majority of Christians, the fact that they were suspected of being politically dangerous, and especially because of the constantly fueled by public opinion that they were allies of the Muslims, the minority anabaptist of those times was passed through the persecutions of Catholic and Protestant confreres. The research will highlight the factors that have contributed to changing the position of radical reformers towards Islam and the Ottoman Empire. Thus, not only the politico-religious context was decisive in the paradigm shift but also in its own anabaptist agenda.

Looking at the history of the Christian Church, it is easy to note that, starting with the generation of the apostles, then every century, Christians not only longed for the millennium, but hoped for the fulfillment of "hopeful happiness". The 16th century was no exception, on the contrary, due to the effervescence on the theological, military and political scene, there was a time when the Lord was expected to come back and save his own people.

Built under the slogan of "Better Turkish than the Papist", the Reformation was the turning plate for Luther, even for the whole of Christendom, and not only, creating a rush to the heart of the Ottoman Empire.

Among the reformers, Martin Luther was the most Adventist in the sense of the desire, almost paroxystical, that the Lord should appear in the clouds of heaven. From Calvin's writings, the same longing to see Jesus, an expression expressed in an average tone.

---

[26] Gary K. Waite. *Eradicating the Devil Minions: Anabaptistes and Witches in Reformation Europe, 1535-1600* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), 33-34, 63-71, 197-205 *apud* Gary K. Waite. "Menno and Muhammad: Anabaptists and Mennonites Reconsider Islam, 1525-1657", *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol. 41, no. 4 (2010): 997.

[27] Ellen G. White. *Martin Luther după 500 de ani. Introducere și Retrospectivă Istorică de Florin Lăiu* (Pantelimon: Viață și Sănătate, 2017), 94.

In the light of the Lutheran eschatology of Ottoman dangers, Reformation was not just a historic moment, but a very important one God had for reforming the church just before the return of Jesus.

Another important chapter of the research is "The Influence of the Ottoman Threat on the Protestant Reformation (Reformers)". The 16th century was a remarkable epoch due to effervescence on the religious, political and military scene. The geopolitical map of the times reveals the powers, the opposition and the minority: the Habsburg hegemony, the emulation of France at the supremacy of Europe, the threat of Ottoman imperialism, and the Protestants' efforts to survive. Ottoman policy intended to maintain the lack of political unity in Europe, weaken the Habsburgs, and prevent a crusade that could unite Europe's disparate forces. Ottoman intervention was thus an important factor not only in the rise of national monarchies, as in France, but also in the rise of Protestantism in Europe. The measure of influencing the Ottoman threat to the genesis of the Protestant movement in Europe is the question of research. The question, "Who did the Turks support more: Protestants or Catholics?", Has long been a realm of the polemics of theologians and historians. Another problem is whether the influence of the Ottoman menace on the consolidation of the Protestant Reformation was a mere coincidence, a historical fact or a divine intervention that transcends human decision-makers.

The paradigm of providence (divine intervention in history) can not be scientifically proven. This deduction does not deny reality.

We also subscribe to the paradigm of the geopolitical strategy (of mutual interests), which is supported by Kenneth Setton, Tahsin Gemil, Stephen Fischer-Galati, Halil Inalcik, Petere Wallace, Daniel Goffman, David Abufalia, Alexander Sandor Unghvary, Murat Iyigun, MacCulloch, Mark Greengrass. In other words, history confirms that the Turks helped the Reformation to survive. In the study, "Dealing with Luther's Islam: The Turk as a Curse or Blessing?", Ian Almond claims that Luther gives little space to political considerations and interests in relation to doctrine. The Reformer has demonstrated a profound interest in religious fundamentalism (biblical), a dedication to his letter, which leaves little room for realpolitik.[28] The criticism of Islam is of a theological nature, surely *dressed* in the colors of German Protestantism.[29] The same interpretation is supported by Carter Lindberg: "Luther's main concern was of a theological, not a political nature, therefore he

---

[28] Ian Almond, "Deconstructing Luhter's Islam The Turk as As Curse or Cure?", *Yearbook of Muslims in Europe*, vol. III, *Middle East and Islamic Studies* (2012): 619.

[29] *Ibid.,* 629.

regarded the Turks as" the rod of God's wrath against the sins of the Europeans."[30] On the other hand, Edward Mark claims that occasionally Luther has subordinated his religious principle to politics[31]:

> As early as 1520, Protestant states were ready to use the army to defend their faith. In the Treatises "Warning of His Loved German People" (1531) and "On the Three Hierarchies" (1539), Luther supports the princes' decision, even though many years ago he did not agree with the war against the king. In 1530, the Protestant rulers rejected the papal invitations to attend a church council, although for several years, they and Luhr insisted on organizing such a meeting. Moreover, Luther justified in writing the seizure of the Naumburg Catholic Elector, Johann Friedrich, and approved and praised the two offenses launched by the League of Schmalkalden against the Catholic League Brauschweig-Wolfenbuttel.[32]

Beyond religious reasons, one of Luther's real reasons for changing his view of Ottoman danger was the proximity of the invincible Turkish army to the gates of Vienna. From a circumstantial perspective, Luther regarded the Turks as allies against the Papacy.

The tradition of princes and cities to oppose imperial authority, the religious and economic appeal of the Lutherans, the German opposition to Roman policies, the Pope's refusal to summon a council, and perhaps the most significant, the Ottoman threat - all created favorable conditions for the survival of the Protestantism. Protestants took advantage of this instability from the Turkish attacks and strengthened their power in Germany. They exploited the Habsburg need for military assistance against the Turks. Almost all concessions made by the Habsburgs in 1526 were directly influenced by Ottoman danger. It seems paradoxical that the Reformation has really taken root because of the Turks who have distracted the Habsburgs from the religious question of Germany, making the latter dependent on cooperation with the Lutherans in order to achieve their secular ambitions in Europe. Strengthening, expanding, and legitimizing Lutheranism must be attributed to Ottoman imperialism more than any other factor. We are ousted to recall that every main actor on the scene of this effervescent century has played his own role, whether it be the Habsburg Empire, the Ottoman power, or the Protestant Reform. The Turks favored the Protestants to the extent that they served their interests in Europe, while the latter took full advantage of the Ottoman incursions

---

[30] Carter Lindberg. *The Europeans Reformations* (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd, 2010), 227.

[31] Mark U. Edwards, ''Luther's Last Battles'', *Concordia Theological Quarterly*, vol. 48, nr. 2-3 (1984): 127.

[32] *Ibid*.

to strengthen their power. Both camps wanted to lower the Habsburg power, implicitly the Catholic Church.

In the chapter "Religious tolerance in the Ottoman Empire and in the 16th century Europe", we will exhibit with historical arguments that in the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries, the wave of refugees was from the West to the East, and not, as nowadays, from the East to the West, and we attempt a recalibration of the concept of religious tolerance in the Ottoman Empire. The same tolerant East belonged to Transylvania, a cradle of religious tolerance at the confluence between the Muslim East and the Christian Occident. In this case, Transylvania was connected with the Muslim Orient.

In order to have a correct picture of the religious tolerance offered to Christians and Ottoman Jews, we must consider the following historical filters: the conquest of Constantinople and the Constantinople (Byzantine Empire[33]) by the Turks, the idea of the crusade animating the hearts of the Europeans, the Inquisition and all forms religious persecution triggered by Catholics against Protestants, the fear of the Turks who had come to paroxysm, the advancement of Ottoman conquests in Europe coupled with the widespread idea that the end of the world is imminent, and surely, the idea of religious tolerance that is not the same with the modern concept of religious freedom. If we do not relate to these realities during the Reformation, we will either fall into the trap of the exacerbation of religious freedom offered by the Sultans, or we will remain in the assent of the majority of Europeans of those times who viewed the Turks as "blood-drawn dogs devouring of Christians."

The last chapter of the research "Calvino-Turkism in Central Europe" will approach Transylvania's position on the Ottoman Empire[34] and the European actors in search of its own definition and the preservation of its institutional configuration, and how this beautiful corner the world has been modeled by the power games of the time. The proximity of Transylvania to the Ottoman Empire, in terms of the suzerainty that the Porte exerted in this area, was labeled by the criticism of the time as "Calvino-Turkism" with obvious political functionalities and religious connotations. It is a concept accepted by some, disavowed by others, the latter being those who, following the criteria of Marxist political history, oppose the conditioning of religious politics

---

[33] Nicolas Drocout, "L'Empire dit "byzantin"", dans Les Empires médiévaux, dir. S. Gouguenheim, Paris, (Perrin), 2019: 43-66.

[34] For Banat you can read Adrian Magina, *De la excludere la coabitare. Biserici tradiţionale, Reformă şi Islam în Banat (1500-1700),* Academia Română, Centrul de Studii Transilvane, Cluj-Napoca, 2011.

without a progressive economic mediation at the social level (the emphasis on the service of the Romanians in this period denies the Marxist vision) .

The Calvino-Turkim clearly designates a relationship based on mutual (legitimate) interests, geostrategic and geopolitical interests, that is, Transylvania wanted to develop freely of any task to the Habsburg Empire and even to the Ottoman Empire, to which *gyzia* paid, in exchange for granted autonomy, while the Ottomans wanted Transylvania to be a buffer zone between the West and the East, and also their money. As such, those doctrinal affinities between Islam and Protestantism are rather pure coincidences, generated by the sources of the revelation of each religion, certain, which can create a certain "twinning" at the spiritual level and not only. It is true that those doctrinal affinities embodied in the syntagm "Socianismo-turkism", such as the denial of the divinity of Jesus, can confirm the diachronic path of both sources of inspiration: Judaism - heretical Christianity (Nestorianism, Ebionism) - Islam - Socialism (Unitarianism). But, claiming Calvin or Unitarian Protestantism is inspired by Islam and vice versa, it can not be sustainable either from religious or historical point of view.

 Under these strange auspices of history, which some attribute to divine intervention, which can not be demonstrated or excluded, two of the most important events of our history have been consumed: the decree of religious tolerance, which we must take into account today, 100 years after the Great Union, more than ever, respecting the right of religious minorities, and the Unification of 1600.

Another example of the cultural tangencies between the Ottoman Empire and Transylvania are Ottoman carpets in Transylvania. Stefano Ionescu opinion is that most probably rugs holders did not understand much of their religious context, weaving their own cultural context.[35] However, Ottoman carpets in Transylvania strengthen to a certain extent the term "Calvino-Turkishm" in its wider sense. The history of the Anatolian carpets, preserved as works of art, is likely to provide a fair picture of inter-ethnic, inter-cultural, and even inter-confessional dialogue, which is a particular feature of Transylvania until nowadays.

Embroaching a little on the interference between Islam and the eastern borders of the Protestant Reformation, we notice that association is getting interesting. Under the aegis of the "Ottoman Pax", Transylvania becomes not only the cradle of the four accepted religions, and the first place in the world where religious tolerance is legitimate - "mutually tolerates", so that confessional irenism (with the exclusion of Orthodoxy however) became a reality, but also the

---

[35] Ionescu, Stefano (2014). "Early single-and double-niche 'Transylvanian' rugs", *Carpet Collector*. Hamburg: SN Verlag Michael Steinert (3): 64–77

theater of the fulfillment of the Union Act in 1600. Of course, there were other exceptions, as was the case of sabatarians persecuted by recognized religions. Transylvania was the place where the leaders of the radical reform have been traced and disseminated, contributing significantly to the spirit of tolerance that persists here today.

Paradoxically, but animated by different political, religious and cultural intentions, the Turks and Protestants of the 16th century could say they have saved each other.