Octavian-Adrian Negoiţă

ORTHODOXY AND HETERODOXY IN THE WORKS OF PACHOMIOS ROUSANOS (1508–1553) ON GREEKS AND MUSLIMS

MA Thesis in Comparative History, with a specialization
in Interdisciplinary Medieval Studies.

Central European University

Budapest

May 2017

ORTHODOXY AND HETERODOXY IN THE WORKS OF PACHOMIOS ROUSANOS (1508–1553) ON GREEKS AND MUSLIMS

by

Octavian-Adrian Negoiță

(Romania)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,

Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements

of the Master of Arts degree in Comparative History, with a specialization in Interdisciplinary

Medieval Studies.

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU.

_____
Chair, Examination Committee

_____
Thesis Supervisor

_____
Examiner

_____
Examiner

Budapest
May 2017

ORTHODOXY AND HETERODOXY IN THE WORKS OF PACHOMIOS ROUSANOS (1508–1553) ON GREEKS AND MUSLIMS

by

Octavian-Adrian Negoiță

(Romania)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,

Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements

of the Master of Arts degree in Comparative History, with a specialization in

Interdisciplinary Medieval Studies.

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU.

_____
External Reader

Budapest
May 2017

**ORTHODOXY AND HETERODOXY IN THE WORKS OF PACHOMIOS
ROUSANOS (1508–1553) ON GREEKS AND MUSLIMS**

by

Octavian-Adrian Negoiță

(Romania)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,

Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements

of the Master of Arts degree in Comparative History, with a specialization in

Interdisciplinary Medieval Studies.

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU.

_____
External Supervisor

Budapest
May 2017

I, the undersigned, **Octavian-Adrian Negoiţă**, candidate for the MA degree in Comparative History, with a specialization in Interdisciplinary Medieval Studies declare herewith that the present thesis is exclusively my own work, based on my research and only such external information as properly credited in notes and bibliography. I declare that no unidentified and illegitimate use was made of the work of others, and no part of the thesis infringes on any person's or institution's copyright. I also declare that no part of the thesis has been submitted in this form to any other institution of higher education for an academic degree.

Budapest, 19 May 2017

_____
Signature

Abstract

This thesis investigates the works on Orthodox Greeks and Muslims of the post-Byzantine intellectual, theologian and Athonite monk, Pachomios Rousanos (1508–1553). Active during the first half of the sixteenth-century Ottoman Empire, Rousanos' engages with the religious phenomena that were occurring in Europe and the Ottoman lands in the first half of the sixteenth-century. The aim of this study is to understand how he defines the boundaries of O/orthodoxy in his writings on Orthodox Greeks and Muslims in a time of intense confessional polarization in European lands and of Sunnitization in the Ottoman Empire. Operating with concepts such as "orthodoxy," "heterodoxy," and "heresy," this study is a contribution to the field of Eastern Christian and Ottoman studies.

i

Acknowledgements

Table of contents

Introduction

The conquest of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks on May 29, 1453 was the final act in the gradual demise of the Byzantine Empire that went on for almost two centuries, since 1261. With Ottoman conquests on both sides of the Bosphorus, since 1354, the entire political, religious, and sociocultural landscape changed in the eastern Mediterranean. The Ottoman Empire became one of the dominant polities in the region, building its foundations on the Byzantine Empire and incorporating many of its subjects. Still, the political end of Byzantium did not also imply the end of the Byzantine culture, religion, spirituality, traditions or customs. As the Romanian scholar Nicolae Iorga emphasized in his seminal monograph, Byzantium's legacy endured the collapse of the state.[1]

Scholars have described Greek intellectual life of the post-Byzantine era, typically taking into account the period up to the end of the sixteenth century, in dark colors. In the wake of the Ottoman conquests of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, most of the Byzantine intellectuals left their homelands towards Western Europe in search of political asylum and patronage, unknowingly preparing the emergence of the Italian Renaissance and constructing new networks of learning. In this cultural environment most of these intellectuals became teachers, translators of the Classics from Greek into Latin, and agents for the transmission of the Classical knowledge to Western Europe.[2] Scholars have claimed

---

[1] Nicolae Iorga, *Byzance après Byzance. Continuation de l' 'Histoire de la vie byzantine'* (Bucharest: Association Internationale d'Études du Sud-Est Europén, 1971).

[2] On this issue see Louise Ropes Loomis, "The Greek Renaissance in Italy," *The American Historical Review* 13/2 (1908): 246–258; Deno John Geanakoplos, "A Byzantine Looks at the Renaissance: The Attitude of Michael Apostolis toward the Rise of Italy to Cultural Eminence," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 1/2 (1958): 157–62; Idem, *Constantinople and the West: Essays on the Late Byzantine (Palaeologan) and Italian Renaissances and the Byzantine and Roman Churches* (Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1989); Idem, *Byzantine East and Latin West: Two Worlds of Christendom in Middle Ages and Renaissance. Studies in Ecclesiastical and Cultural History* (Hamden: Archon Book, 1976); Idem, *Interaction of the "Sibling" Byzantine and Western Cultures in the Middle Ages and Italian Renaissance (330–1600)* (New Haven / London: Yale University Press, 1976); Nigel Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy: Greek Studies in the Italian Renaissance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992); Jonathan Harris, *Greek Emigres in the West, 1400–1520* (Camberley / Surrey: Porphyrogenitus, 1995); John Monfasani, *Byzantine Scholars in Renaissance Italy: Cardinal Bessarion and Other Emigrés: Selected Essays* (Aldershot: Ashgate / Variorum, 1995); Idem, *Greeks*

that the post-Byzantine intellectuals who lived within the boundaries of the Ottoman Empire did not develop a taste for philosophical or high theological debates, as they have been more engaged in answering the problems that the Greek population faced under the Ottoman rule.[3]

At first glance, this also seems to be the case of Pachomios Rousanos, an Athonite monk, who was active in the first half of the sixteenth century. Still, the wide range of issues that interested him and people with whom he corresponded or polemicized, invites us to rethink the mainstream narrative of intellectual decline or, at least, strive to understand better the intellectual environment in which Rousanos produced his works. He was very interested in the life of the Church, became a keen traveller and a prolific writer and theologian. His agenda encompassed not only all the domains of the religious life (dogma, apologetics, liturgy, ascetics, Church music), but he also had a particular interest in the life of his Greek Orthodox compatriots, as well in the Greek language, religious learning and geography. Nevertheless, Rousanos was a man of his time. Therefore, the main issues on his agenda were the preservation of the O/orthodoxy and conversion to Islam. Hence, the purpose of this thesis is to analyze Rousanos' works that deal with the Greeks and Muslims and to understand how he constructs the notion of "orthodoxy" in faith."[4]

---

and Latins in Renaissance Italy: Studies on Humanism and Philosophy in the 15th Century (Aldershot: Ashgate / Variorum, 2003); Jonathan Harris and Heleni Porfyriou, "The Greek Diaspora: Italian Port Cities and London, *c.* 1400–1700," in *Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe*, vol. 2: *Cities and Cultural Exchange in Europe, 1400–1700*, ed. Donatella Calabi and Stephen Turk Christensen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 65–86; Sophia Mergiali-Sahas, "Crossing the Paths of Each Other: Renaissance Italy and Byzantium," *Βυζαντινά* 32 (2012): 227–44.

[3] See for instance Asterios Argyriou, *Ιδεολογικά ρεύματα στους κόλπους του Ελληνισμού και της Ορθοδοξίας κατά τα χρόνια της Τουρκοκρατίας* (Larissa, 1980).

[4] For more information on the complex political, social and religious phenomena that occurred during Roussanos' time see Chapter I below.

Life and Works of Pachomios Rousanos

Rousanos was born on November 11, 1508 in Zakynthos and died in 1553 in Naupaktos (Epiros).[5] Although he was mainly an autodidact, Rousanos studied in Venice where he became acquainted with Protestant and humanist ideas.[6] He proved to be well versed in the Classics (Homer and the Tragics) as well as the Scriptures and the texts of the Holy Fathers of the Church. Eventually, Rousanos became a monk in the monastery of Saint George in Zakynthos, and after a while he started to travel frequently around Peloponnesus, Epirus and Thessaly. Later on, he settled in Mount Athos, making the Iviron Monastery the general point of departure for his travels.[7] He also visited Crete, Cyprus, Palestine, Constantinople, Egypt, the Black Sea region and the Aegean islands. Therefore, much of the information that Rousanos recorded in his writings came from personal experience and direct contact with his contemporaries, in addition to various written sources he was able to consult during his travels.[8]

---

[5] On Roussanos' life and works see Andreas Moustoxydes, "Παχώμιος," in *Ἑλληνομνήμων ἢ σύμμικτα ἑλληνικά: Σύγγραμα ἑλληνικόν* 10 (1847): 624–32, 11 (1852): 633–96, and 12 (1853): 697–712; Christophoros Philetas, *Περὶ Ἰωαννικίου Καρτάνου, Δαμασκηνοῦ τοῦ Στουδίτου καὶ Παχωμίου Ῥουζάνου. Ἐπιστολιμαία διάλεξις* (Kerkyra: Ek tēs Typographias tēs Kybernēseōs, 1847); Carlo Castellani, "Pacomio Rusano, grammatico greco del secolo XVI e I manoscritti autografi delle sue opere," *Atti R. Instituto Veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti*, seventh series, 6 (1894-95): 903–10; Ioannes Karmires, *Ὁ Παχώμιος Ῥουσάνος καὶ τὰ ἀνέκδοτα δογματικὰ καὶ ἄλλα ἔργα αὐτοῦ*, Texte und Forschungen zur Byzantinisch-Neugriechischen Philologie 14 (Athens: Verlag der Byzantinisch-Neugriechischen Jahrbücher, 1935), 3–78; O. Lampsiades, "Ὁ Παχώμιος Ῥουσάνος καὶ ὁ βίος τῶν συγχρόνων τοῦ," *Ἐπετηρίς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 13 (1937): 385–92; Börje Knös, *L'histoire de la littérature néo-grecque. La période jusqu'en 1821*, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 1 (Stockholm / Göteborg / Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1962), 281; George Maloney, *A History of Orthodox Theology since 1453* (Belmont / Massachussetts: Nordland Publishing Company, 1976), 106–10; Gerhard Podskalsky, *Griechische Theologie in der Zeit der Türkenherrschaft, 1453–1821. Die Orthodoxie im Spannungsfeld der nachreformatorischen Konfessionen des Westens* (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1988), 98–101; Demetrios Gones, "Ο Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος χθες, σήμερα, αύριο," in *Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος. 450 χρόνια ἀπὸ τὴν κοίμησή του (†1553). Πρακτικά Διεθνούς Ἐπιστημονικοῦ Συμποσίου (Ἀρχονταρίκι Νέας Πτέρυγας Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Στροφάδων καὶ Ἁγίου Διονυσίου, Ζάκυνθος 9-12 Ὀκτωβρίου 2003)*, ed. Demetrios Gones (Athens: Hiera Mētropolis Zakynthou kai Strophadōn, 2005), 20.

[6] On the penetration of Protestant ideas in Venice see John Martin, *Venice's Hidden Enemies: Italian Heretics in a Renaissance City* (Berkeley / Los Angeles / London: University of California Press, 1993), 25–48.

[7] For Roussanos' activities on Mount Athos see: Kriton Chrysochoides, "Ὁ Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος στὸν Ἄθω," in *Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος. 450 χρόνια ἀπὸ τὴν κοίμησή του*, 203–28.

[8] For the availability of Greek books in the Mediterranean in the sixteenth century see Evro Layton, *The Sixteenth Century Greek Book in Italy: Printers and Publishers for the Greek World* (Venice: Library of the Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies, 1994); Marc Lauxtermann, "'And many, many more': A Sixteenth-Century Description of Private Libraries in Constantinople, and the Authority of Books," in *Authority in Byzantium*, ed. Pamela Armstrong (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), 269–84.

Even if his works are not very extensive in length, the literary genres that Rousanos adopted as a writer shed light on his agenda: he wrote hagiography, hymnography, polemical and theological treatises, and letters. The tone and style of his works is polemical and framed within a theological discourse. His works are redolent with quotations from the Scriptures and the works of the Fathers of the Church but also with citations from Classical authors.[9] He polemicized against his fellow Orthodox as well as against Muslims, Jews, Catholics (Latins) and Protestants. In polemicizing with his Orthodox contemporaries, Rousanos was critical about the pagan religious practices that infiltrated the liturgical space, the poor level of religious instruction, and the absence of proper teachers or the deplorable situation of the Orthodox clergy and monks. In his treatises on Muslims, Jews, Catholics and Protestants, Rousanos was eager to contrast the tenets of these religious groups with those of the Orthodox, inevitably arguing for the superiority of the latter and redefining it in the process.

Still, Rousanos was mainly a theologian. After the conquest of Constantinople, he is the first theologian who authored a treatise on the Orthodox Christian dogma (*Dogmatica*; *Σύνταγμα ἢ λόγοι δογματικοὶ*).[10] The treatise was written in six chapters and it deals mainly with the Trinitarian doctrine. Also, Rousanos is the first polemicist to write a treatise against Islam after 1453. Moreover, he is one of the few Greek authors of the post-Byzantine period who inscribed his name on his polemical treatise. His interest in the life of the Church drove him to write also on the Liturgy, Church music, and the principles of the ascetic life.[11] Rousanos' correspondence is not very extensive, but it hints to the connections he managed to make and preserve during his life.[12]

---

[9] For Roussanos's usage of the Scripture see Gerhard Podskalsky, "Pacôme Rhousanos et la Sainte Ecriture," in *Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος. 450 χρόνια ἀπὸ τὴν κοίμησή του*, 493–98 and Nikolaos Olympiou, "Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος καὶ Παλαιὰ Διαθήκη. Ἑρμηνευτικὲς προσεγγίσεις," in *Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος. 450 χρόνια ἀπὸ τὴν κοίμησή του*, 499–526.

[10] For *Dogmatica* see: Ioannes Karmires, *Ὁ Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος*, 24–29; for the Greek edition of the text see also Ibid., 81–167.

[11] Ibid, 57–63.

[12] Ibid, 63–65.

Rousanos is also important for his work as a copyist, aiding the transmission and circulation of valuable Byzantine texts to the post-Byzantine period.[13] Influenced by his own agenda, Rousanos copied texts of theological importance. Among the authors in whose works he developed a great interest are Euthymios Zigabenos (d. after 1118), who is renowned for his work *Panoplia Dogmatica* (*Πανοπλία Δογματική*), in which he deals with the most widespread heresies in Byzantium.[14]

The life and works of Rousanos have received limited attention in the scholarship. Studies on him are limited to a monograph, an edited collection of essays, several articles, and several old editions of the texts, mostly produced by the Greek scholars. The first two scholars who attempted to study Rousanos' life and works were Spyridon Lampros, a renowned Greek paleographer, and Ioannes Karmires, a Church historian. They have produced the first modern editions of Rousanos' texts, to which they added introductory studies.[15] Although their editions of the original Greek texts are still used today–and, in fact, constitute the main sources for this thesis in the absence of more recent critical editions–, the

---

[13] A catalogue of Greek copyists is now available: Ernst Gamillscheg et al. (eds.), *Repertorium der Griechischen Kopisten, 800–1600*, 3 Vols. in 9 fascicles, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Byzantinistik, Band III / 1A–3C (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981–97). On the issue see also Herbert Hunger, "Gebrauchsschriften und Stilisierungsversuche in griechischen Handschriften des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts," in *Η ελληνική γραφή κατά τους 15ο και 16ο αιώνες / The Greek Script in the 15th and 16th Centuries*, ed. Kriton Chrysochoides (Athens: Sophia ΠΑΤΟΥΡΑ, 2000), 11–30; Kriton Chrysochoides, "Τό βιβλιογραφικό ἐργαστήριο τῆς Μονῆς Ἰβήρων στίς πρῶτες δεκαετίες τοῦ 16ου αἰῶνα," in *Η ελληνική γραφή κατά τους 15ο και 16ο αιώνες / The Greek Script in the 15th and 16th Centuries*, ed. Kriton Chrysochoides (Athens: Sophia ΠΑΤΟΥΡΑ, 2000), 523–68. For Roussanos as a copyist see Dyonisios Mousouras, *Αι μοναί Στροφάδων και Αγίου Γεωργίου των Κρημνών Ζακύνθου (Μελέτη φιλολογική και παλαιογραφική)* (Athens: Ekdosis Ieras Monēs Strofadōn kai Agiou Dionysiou, 2003), 17, 29, 72, 102, 138–49, 180–227, 234, 271, 293 and 322.

[14] The manuscript in which Roussanos copied Zigabenos' work is to be found in Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (*Vat. gr. 1447*). On this manuscript see Domenico Surace, "Copisti greci in tre codici sconosciuti della Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale di Roma (S. A. Valle 100, 102-103)," *Νέα Ῥώμη* 8 (2011): 219–304.

[15] Spyridon Lampros, "Ἀνέκδοτος λόγος Παχωμίου τοῦ Ῥουσάνου περὶ δεισιδαιμονιῶν καὶ προλήψεων κατὰ τὸν ΙΣΤ´ αιώνα," *Δελτίον τῆς Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος* 1 (1883): 101–12; Idem, "Ἀντιβολή κωδίκων περιεχόντων τὸν ἀνέκδοτον λόγον Παχωμίου τοῦ Ῥουσάνου." *Δελτίον τῆς Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος* 1 (1883): 367–69; Ioannes Karmires, *Ὁ Παχώμιος Ῥουσάνος* [the only book available that collects editions of some of Roussanos' most important works]; Idem, "Ἀνέκδοτος ὁμιλία τοῦ Παχωμίου Ρουσάνου," *Θεολογία* 14 (1936): 30–41; Idem, "Παχωμίου Ρουσάνου ὁμιλία εἰς τινὰ τῶν ρητῶν τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαίον Εὐαγγελίου," *Νέα Σιών* 31 (1936): 343–49, 395–402, 456–66, 521–24; Idem, "Παχωμίου Ρουσάνου ἀνέκδοτος γραμματικὴ συγγραφή," *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher* 14 (1937-38): 340–47; Idem, "Ὅ ἀνεκδοτος λόγος πρὸς τοὺς δυσανασχετοῦντας πρὸς τὰς ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπαγομένας ἡμῖν θλίψεις τοῦ Παχώμιου Ρουσάνου," *Ἐκκλησία* 16 (1938): 215–19 and 231–35.

introductions they wrote for these editions need to be updated. Since the early twentieth century, the works of Rousanos have attracted modest interest. Asterios Argyriou is one of the most renowned scholars who investigated various aspects of Greek Orthodoxy in the Ottoman Empire. He became interested in Rousanos' works and became the first scholar to signal the necessity for a comprehensive monograph on this intellectual. Argyriou examined Rousanos' works on Islam, on which he wrote a substantial article.[16] Argyriou's work is valuable as it provides the reader with a good description of Rousanos' works on Islam, but he does not go a step further in investigating thoroughly the sources Rousanos used and the rhetoric behind his arguments. Further, the Greek scholar Manoles Serges authored a monograph on Rousanos which was published in two editions.[17] Specialist in ethnology and Greek folk literature, Serges focused on Rousanos' ideas regarding the Greeks and their popular traditions, leaving aside important aspects of Rousanos' intellectual outlook. Last but not least, a substantial contribution to Rousanos' life and works was made by a group of Greek scholars who gathered at a symposium in Zakynthos in 2003 in commemoration of 450 years since Rousanos' death. The contributions to the symposium have been published in 2005 in a collected essays volume, edited by Demetrios Gones.[18] The studies published in this volume focus on key themes in Rousanos' works as well as on detailed analyses of the codices that are preserving them.

---

[16] Asterios Argyriou, "Pachomios Roussanos et l'Islam," *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 51 (1971): 143–64.

[17] Manoles Serges, *Ο Ζακύνθιος μοναχός Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος και ο λαϊκός πολιτισμός του 16ου αιώνα* (Athens, 2000); Idem, *Εκκλησιαστικός λόγος και λαϊκός πολιτισμός τον 16ο αιώνα: Η περίπτωση του Παχωμίου Ρουσάνου* (Athens: Ekdotikos Oikos, 2008).

[18] Demetrios Gones, ed., *Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος. 450 χρόνια ἀπὸ τὴν κοίμησή του.* [See especially the contributions of Kriton Chrysochoides (203–28), Dionysios Mousouras (229–66), Photios Demetrakopoulos (267–310), Georgios Metallenos (353–64), Eutychios Sarmanes (457–72), Gerhard Podskalsky (493–98), Georgios Blantes (527–56) and Konstantinos Pitsakes (557–70)].

Theory, Methodology and Structure

Defining concepts such as "orthodoxy," "heterodoxy," and "heresy" is not an easy task, nor is it the purpose of this thesis. Still, some considerations are in order to understand how Rousanos perceived and defined the boundaries, and distinguished between "orthodoxy" and Orthodoxy.

It is clear that both "orthodoxy" and "heterodoxy" are terms that originated and within a Greco-phone milieu. From an etymological point of view, both "orthodoxy" and "heterodoxy" are compound words of Greek origin. The prefixes *ortho-* (Gr. *ὀρθός, -ή, -όν*), meaning "correct," and *hetero-* (Gr. *ἕτερος, -α, -ov*), having one of its meanings as "one of another kind, different," but also "other than should be," are added to the word *doxa* (Gr. *ἡ δόξα, -ης*) which can mean "notion", "opinion", "judgment" or "doctrine".[19] From a religious point of view, "orthodoxy" (*ὀρθοδοξία*) means "right opinion" or "right doctrine," while "heterodoxy" (*ἑτεροδοξία*) points to any form of religious opinions or dogmas that differ from an official set of orthodox tenets. Nonetheless, at the opposite pole of "orthodoxy" stands "heresy". The meaning of the term "heresy" points to one's violation or conscious alteration of religious dogmas that are generally accepted by a community. In most of the religious systems, "orthodoxy" was always defined as a response to a set of professed teachings that did not fit the framework of the official position accepted by a religious institution or community.[20]

Whenever used within a Christian ecclesiastical context, "Orthodoxy" defines the Eastern Churches, which are professing the Nicene Creed. During the medieval period, in their rivalry for religious authority, the Eastern Patriarchates assumed the title "Orthodox", while the Church of Rome proclaimed itself as the Catholic Church. Also, scholars from the

---

[19] Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, ed., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, rev. Henry Stuart Jones (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 444, 702 and 1249.

[20] John Henderson, *The Construction of Orthodoxy and Heresy: New-Confucian, Islamic, Jewish, and Early Christian Studies* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998).

field of Islamic studies borrowed the terminology from the Christian milieu in order to be able to address the conceptual framework of Muslim dogma or law. Hence, these terms have been expanded in usage and meaning being more and more used without their Christian connotations.[21]

According to the *Confession* of Dositheos of Jerusalem (1641–1707), the Orthodox faith is "that which has been handed down by Christ himself and by the Apostles and by the Holy Ecumenical Councils". [22] On the other hand, as John Binns affirmed, Eastern Christianity has its roots in the Byzantine Empire.[23] Therefore, Orthodoxy was shaped in Byzantium and it was officially defined and professed according to the stipulations of the Ecumenical Councils, the text of the Scripture and the teachings of the Fathers of the Church.[24] Also, an entire tradition containing various theological works, creeds, religious practices and customs emerged around the definitions of the councils. For the Eastern Church, the Nicene Creed represents the condensed form of the Orthodox tenets, with an unequivocal confessional imperative for the community of the faithful. The importance of

[21] For "orthodoxy", "heterodoxy" and "heresy" in Islam see Bernard Lewis, "Some Observations on the Significance of Heresy in the History of Islam," *Studia Islamica* 1 (1953): 43–64; republished with the same title in Maribel Fierro, ed., *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Islam: Critical Concepts in Islamic Studies*, vol. 1 (London / New York: Routlege, 2014), 118–31; Alexander Knysh, "'Orthodoxy' and 'Heresy' in Medieval Islam: An Essay in Reassessment," *The Muslim World* 83 (1993): 48–67; republished with the same title in *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Islam*, vol. 1, 224–41; Norman Calder, "The Limits of Islamic Orthodoxy," in *Intellectual Traditions in Islam*, ed. F. Daftary (London: IB Tauris, 2000), 66–86; republished with the same title in *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Islam*, vol. 1, 242–56]; Brett Wilson, "The Failure of Nomenclature: the Concept of 'Orthodoxy' in the Study of Islam," *Comparative Islamic Studies* 3/2 (2007): 169–94; republished with the same title in *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Islam*, vol. 1, 153–76; Robert Langer and Udo Simon, "The Dynamics of Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy: Dealing with Divergence in Muslim Discourses and Islamic Studies," *Die Welt des Islams* 48 (2008): 273–88; republished with the same title in *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Islam*, vol. 1, 201–12]; Shahab Ahmed, *What is Islam? The Importance of Being Islamic* (Princeton / Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2016), 246–300.

[22] Dositheos of Jerusalem, "Ὁμολογίας," in *Τὰ δογματικὰ καὶ συμβολικὰ μνημεία τῆς ὀρθοδόξου καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας*, vol. 2, second edition, edited Ioannes Karmires (Graz: Akademische Druck, 1968), 835: ὑπό τε ἐκείνου τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν ἁγίων οἰκουμενικῶν συνόδων παραδοθεῖσαν. See also Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, vol. 2: *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600–1700)* (Chicago / London: The University of Chicago Press, 1974), 287; Jaroslav Pelikan and Valerie Hotchkiss, eds., *Creeds & Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition*, vol. 1/2: *Eastern Orthodox Affirmations of Faith* (New Haven / London: Yale University Press, 2003), 658.

[23] John Binns, *An Introduction to the Christian Orthodox Churches* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 3.

[24] For the latest edition of the canons issued at the Ecumenical Councils see Giuseppe Alberigo et al., eds., *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta: Editio Critica*, vol. 1: *The Oecumenical Councils from Nicaea I to Nicaea II (325–787)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006); for a translation of these canons see J. Pelikan and V. Hotchkiss, eds., *Creeds & Confessions of Faith*, 155–241.

creeds as statements of faith for the development of the Eastern Church doctrine shaped the definition of Orthodoxy in the medieval and early modern periods as well. In their development, both creeds and the definitions of "orthodoxy" became subjects of continuity and change in terms of structure.[25] Moreover, according to Andrew Louth, "orthodoxy is a way of defining a community or society through its beliefs in order to make it stand apart from 'others' or 'the other'."[26] By this, Louth refers to the non-Orthodox religious communities that were living both within and outside the borders of the Byzantine Empire.

Turning back to Rousanos, for him Orthodoxy represents the true faith, as it has been revealed by Christ himself through the Scripture and the teachings he left to the Apostles. Rousanos' permanent concern regarding the Trinitarian dogma in his writings clearly asserts his adherence to the Nicene Creed and the canons of the Ecumenical Councils. Also, Rousanos is heavily influenced by the Fathers of the Church (e.g. Basil the Great, John of Damascus, Maximus the Confessor), who are reputed for their activities as defenders of Orthodoxy. Nevertheless, Rousanos is fully aware of the entire body of tradition that Byzantium had left for Orthodoxy. Being engaged in the polemics of his time, Rousanos poses himself also as a protector of Orthodoxy from heterodox teachings and practices from both within and outside of the Christian communities. Even if in the scholarship Rousanos has not been perceived as an "original" theologian, I argue that his originality comes from the way he approaches a global framework in his writings and in the way he organizes his material in order to respond to the challenges that the Christian communities were facing under the Ottoman rule. Originality is a notion that has not been well received during the

---

[25] On creeds and confessions of faith in Christendom see the important monograph of J. Pelikan, *Credo: Historical and Theological Guide to Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition* (New Haven / London: Yale University Press, 2003). On creeds in Islam see Arent Wensinck, *The Muslim Creed: Its Genesis and Historical Development* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932) and Montgomery Watt, *Islamic Creeds* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1994).
[26] Andrew Louth, "Introduction," in *Byzantine Orthodoxies: Papers from the Thirty-Sixth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Durham, 23–25 March 2002*, edited Andrew Louth and Augustine Casiday (Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum, 2006), 9.

Byzantine period, especially in matters related to theology. As Andrew Louth argued for Maximus the Confessor's case, Rousanos' originality lies in his structural eclecticism that drew separate elements together, that is, originality does not only mean innovation but it can also mean being faithful to the origin.[27] Therefore, Rousanos does not try to be original in the modern meaning of the notion but he appeals to the already existing body of works that enable him to create the argumentative structure of his treatises. I believe that by this Rousanos tried to avoid the possibility of somehow altering the dogma or breaking the boundaries of the official Orthodoxy.

Methodologically, this thesis is a textual analysis of Rousanos' texts on Greeks and Muslims. In this thesis I am using only the edited versions of his texts, as production of new editions will remain a task for future studies of Rousanos.[28] In order to understand how he perceives the religious phenomena occurring during his time and how he defines in his works the boundaries of Orthodoxy, I will focus on mapping the political, religious and intellectual

---

[27] Andrew Louth, *Maximus the Confessor* (London / New York: Routlege, 1996), 19–32.

[28] Regarding Rousanos' works I will use the following editions of the texts: Rousanos, "Πρὸς τοὺς ἑλληνίζοντας καὶ τοὺς τὰ θεῖα μυστήρια βεβηλοῦντας, καὶ ὅτι οὐ δεῖ προσέχειν τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀσεβέσιν οὖσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς εὐσεβέσιν, κἂν ὀλίγοι ὦσι," Spyridon Lampros, ed., in "Ἀνέκδοτος λόγος Παχωμίου τοῦ Ῥουσάνου περὶ δεισιδαιμονιῶν καὶ προλήψεων κατὰ τὸν ΙΣΤ´ αἰῶνα," *Δελτίον τῆς Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος* 1 (1883): 105–12; Idem, "Περὶ τῆς ἐκ τῶν θείων γραφῶν ὠφελείας καὶ ὅτι οὐκ αἴτιοι οἱ ταύτας συγγραψάμενοι τῆς ἀσαφείας, ἀλλ᾽ ἡ ἡμετέρα ἀμάθεια καὶ ἀφέλεια, καὶ περὶ διδασκάλων," in *Κανέλλου Σπανοῦ, Γραμματικὴ τῆς κοινῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων Γλώσση. Παχωμίου Ρουσάνου, Κατὰ χυδαϊζόντων καὶ αἱρετικῶν καὶ ἄλλα του αυτού*, ed. Ioannes Basilikos (Tergeste: Typois tou Austriakou Loud, 1908), 55–77; Idem, "Περὶ Καρτανιτῶν αἱρετικῶν," in *Κανέλλου Σπανοῦ, Γραμματικὴ τῆς κοινῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων Γλώσση*, 77–80; Idem, "Περὶ τῆς τῶν Καρτανιτῶν αἱρέσεως," in *Κανέλλου Σπανοῦ, Γραμματικὴ τῆς κοινῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων Γλώσση*, 80–81; Idem, "Αἱ τοῦ καταράτου Καρτάνου αἱρέσεις καὶ φληναφίαι καὶ ἡ τούτων ἀνατροπὴ," in *Κανέλλου Σπανοῦ, Γραμματικὴ τῆς κοινῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων Γλώσση*, 81–115; Idem., "Ὁμιλία πρὸς τοὺς ἀγροίκως τὴν θείαν Γραφὴν διασύροντας," Spyridon Lampros, ed., in "Ἐκ τῶν Ὁμιλιῶν τοῦ Παχωμίου Ῥουσάνου." *Νέος Ἑλληνομνήμων* 13 (1916): 56–67; Idem, "Τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ (ιε᾽ σεπτεμβρίου). Ἄθλησις τοῦ ἁγίου μάρτυρος Νικήτα τοῦ νέου," Hippolyte Delehaye, ed., in "Le martyre du saint Nicétas le jeune," in *Mélanges offerts a M. Gustave Schlumberger, membre de l'Institut, a l'occasion du quatre-vingtième anniversaire de sa naissance*, vol. 1: *Histoire du Bas-Empire, de l'Empire Byzantin et d' l'Orient latin. Philologie Byzantine* (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1924), 208–11; Idem, "Περὶ τῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων καὶ τῶν σαρακηνῶν πίστεως," in *Ὁ Παχώμιος Ῥουσάνος καὶ τὰ ἀνέκδοτα δογματικὰ καὶ ἄλλα ἔργα αὐτοῦ*, ed. Ioannes Karmires (Athens: Verlag der Byzantinisch-Neugriechischen Jahrbücher, 1935), 242–65; Idem, "Λόγος ὑπεραπολογητικὸς καὶ ἠθικὸς πρὸς τοὺς δυσανασχετοῦντας πρὸς τὰς ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπαγομένας ἡμῖν θλίψεις καὶ τὴν Θείαν Πρόνοιαν λοιδοροῦντας," Ioannes Karmires, ed., in "Ὁ ἀνέκδοτος λόγος πρὸς τοὺς δυσανασχετοῦντας πρὸς τὰς ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπαγομένας ἡμῖν θλίψεις τοῦ Παχωμίου Ρουσάνου," *Ἐκκλησία* 16 (1938): 216–19 and 231–35; Idem, "Μηνὶ Σεπτεμβρίῳ κθ᾽. Ἀκολουθία ψαλλομένη εἰς τοὺς ὁσίους πατέρας τοὺς ἐν Στροφάσιν ἀναιρεθέντας καὶ εἰς ἅπαντας τοὺς παραπλήσιον τέλος λαχόντας," Eutychios Sarmanes, ed., in "Ἀκολουθία τῶν Στροφάσιν ἀναιρεθέντων ὁσίων πατερῶν ὑπὸ Παχωμίου Ῥουσάνου συντεθείσα," *Θεολογία* 68/1-2 (1997): 269–83; Idem, "Ἐπιστολὴ Ἀθανασίῳ Ναυπάκτου," in *Ἑλληνομνήμων ἢ Σύμμικτα Ἑλληνικά*, republished edition, ed. A. Moustoxydes (Athens, 1965), 452–458.

context of the eastern Mediterranean up to the end of the sixteenth century. I have chosen for this thesis not to focus on the entire corpus of Rousanos' works: instead, I will focus on his treatises that deal with the Greek and Muslim communities and shed light on the main topic of discussion. Also I will identify the sources Rousanos is using for creating his line of argumentation and I will focus on the "diagnostics" and the "remedies" he envisages for combatting the threats to Orthodoxy. Nevertheless, I will examine the rhetoric that Rousanos is using in his works in order to identify key topics that span throughout his texts. Last but not least, I will read Rousanos works both in a wider Mediterranean context, by appealing to the texts of some of his contemporaries, but also from the perspective of the Byzantine literary tradition about which he was very conscious, in order to frame him as a post-Byzantine theologian and intellectual. The approach I adopt is multidisciplinary and draws on methodologies from fields such as theology, literary and manuscript studies, as well as history.

Regarding its structure, this thesis is divided into three chapters. The purpose of the first chapter is two-fold: 1) it is meant to give an introduction to politics of conversion and Sunnitization in the Ottoman Empire in the "Age of Confessionalization", discussing issues concerning conversion to Islam and the Sunni policies initiated by Sultan Süleyman; and 2) to provide an historical and historiographical review of the Orthodox Greek in the Ottoman society from 1453-1560s. I will discuss topics such as the status of the Greek communities under the Ottoman rule, the emergence of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and its activities within the Ottoman administration, and the Greek intellectual and religious life. The second chapter deals with Rousanos' perceptions of major challenges that Orthodoxy faced in the Ottoman Empire. In this chapter I will discuss the problems that Rousanos is finding regarding the Orthodox and their religious life, and the remedies he envisages for the preservation and survival of Orthodoxy. Hence, I will address the following issues: 1)

11

Rousanos' criticism of monasticism / clergy and the level of religious instruction; and 2) popular culture and pagan religious practices as seen by Rousanos. I will reserve the final part of the second chapter for an analysis of the polemic between Rousanos and Ioannikios Kartanos, as it is the perfect example of how Rousanos constructs the boundaries of Orthodoxy. The third chapter focuses on Rousanos' polemical works that directly deal with Islam. In the first part of this chapter I will analyze two of his hagiographical texts, while in the second part I will deal extensively with Rousanos' major polemical treatise on Islam.

Chapter 1 - The Greeks in the Early Modern Ottoman World, 1453–1566

For a better understanding of the political and religious landscape in which Rousanos operated, the main purpose of this chapter is to provide a concise overview of the religious dynamics in the Ottoman Empire during his lifetime, with an emphasis on the status of the Orthodox Greek communities under the Ottoman rule. The second aim is to offer an outline of the historiography regarding the relations between the Ottoman Porte and its Orthodox Greek subjects, the emergence of the Patriarchate of Constantinople under the Ottoman rule, and the intellectual and religious life of the Orthodox Greeks up to 1566.

1.1. Politics of Conversion and Sunnitization in the Ottoman Empire in the "Age of Confessionalization"

The early sixteenth century ushered in what has been labeled by scholars as the "Age of Confessionalization," although confessional-cum-territorial polarization becomes prominent only in the 1550s and afterwards.[29] In the first half of the sixteenth century Protestant ideas began to spread in European territories and the confessional groups that emerged sought to define their status and confessional boundaries. At the same time, in the

---

[29] On the confessionalization thesis see: Joel Harington and Helmuth Smith, "Review: Confessionalization, Community, and State Building in Germany, 1555–1870," *The Journal of Modern History* 69/1 (1997): 77–101; Heinz Schilling, "Confessionalization and the Rise of Religious and Cultural Frontiers in Early Modern Europe," in *Frontiers of Faith: Religious Exchange and the Constitution of Religious Identities, 1400–1750*, ed. Eszter Andor and István György Tóth (Budapest: Central European University / European Science Foundation, 2001), 21–36; Thomas Brady, "Confessionalization–The Career of a Concept," in *Confessionalization in Europe, 1555–1700: Essays in Honor and Memory of Bodo Nichan*, ed. J. M. Headley, Hans Hillerbrand and Anthony Papalas (Burlington: Ashgate, 2004): 1–20; Heinz Schilling, "Confessionalization: Historical and Scholarly Perspectives of a Comparative and Interdisciplinary Paradigm," in *Confessionalization in Europe 1555–1700*, ed. J. M. Headley, H. J. Hillerbrand and A. J. Papalas (Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate, 2004), 21–36 and also Heinz Schilling and István György Tóth, "From Empires to Family Circles: Religious and Cultural Borderlines in the Age of Confessionalization," in *Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe*, vol. 1: *Religion and Cultural Exchange in Europe, 1400–1700*, ed. Heinz Schilling and István György Tóth (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 25–46.

eastern Mediterranean, for the Ottoman conquerors began a period of interimperial rivalry with the Safavid Empire of Iran that in turn led to new articulations of Ottoman Sunnism and Safavid Shiism.[30] The Ottoman administration initiated complex religious reforms to fashion the Ottoman imperial Sunni ideology and to delineate the confessional boundaries among different Muslim groups.[31] Moreover, complex religious, cultural and social processes, such as Islamization and Turkification, peaked in the early sixteenth century in the newly conquered Ottoman territories. Along with these developments, the dynamics of the confessional relations changed between Islam and Christianity, as conversion to Islam became one of the most widespread religious phenomena. During the "Age of Confessionalization," in both Christian and Muslim communities across Europe and the Ottoman Empire religious texts—such as narratives of conversion, confessions of faith, catechisms or pamphlets with theological content—began to be produced in greater numbers and disseminated among the people. As a corollary to the phenomenon of changing and defining faith, the question of religious orthodoxy became a topic of prime importance for the scholars and religious officials from both Christian and Muslim polities.

---

[30] Adel Alouche, *The Origins and Development of the Ottoman-Safavid Conflict (906–962 / 1500–1555)* (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1983); Marcus Dressler, "Inventing Orthodoxy: Competing Claims for Authority and Legitimacy in the Ottoman Safavid Conflict," in *Legitimizing the Order: The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power*, ed. H. Karateke and M. Reinkowski (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 151–76; republished with the same title in Maribel Fierro, ed., *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Islam: Critical Concepts in Islamic Studies*, vol. 1 (London / New York: Routlege, 2014), 99–117.

[31] Tijana Krstić, "Illuminated by the Light of Islam and the Glory of the Ottoman Sultanate: Narratives of Conversion to Islam in the Age of Confessionalization," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 51/1 (2009): 35–63; Idem, *Contested Conversions to Islam. Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Stanford / California: Stanford University Press, 2011); Derin Terzioğlu, "How to Conceptualize Ottoman Sunnitization: A Historiographical Discussion," *Turcica* 44 (2012-2013): 301–38; Kaya Şahin, *Empire and Power in the Reign of Süleyman. Narrating the Sixteenth-Century Ottoman World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Guy Burak, "The Second Formation of Islamic Law: the Post-Mongol Context of the Ottoman Adoption of a School of Law," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 55/3 (2013): 579–602; Derin Terzioğlu, "Where *ilmi-i hal* Meets Catechism: Islamic Manuals of Religious Instruction in the Ottoman Empire in the Age of Confessionalization," *Past and Present* 220 (2013): 79–114; Guy Burak, *The Second Formation of Islamic Law. The Ḥanafi School in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015); T. Krstić, "From Shahāda to ʿAqīda: Conversion to Islam, Catechization and Sunnitization in the Sixteenth Century Ottoman Rumeli," in *Islamisation: Comparative Perspectives from History*, ed. Andrew Peacock (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2017), 296–314. On the influence of Ottoman Scholars on the issue see now Abdurrahman Atçıl, *Scholars and Sultans in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017).

The early modern Ottoman Empire was an arena of confessional polarization, where the politics of Sunnitization initiated by the sultans affected all the religious groups.[32] The territorial expansion from the fourteenth to the early sixteenth century brought various lands of the Balkans, as well as of Europe and the Middle East under the Ottoman influence, incorporating in this way various ethnic and religious communities. Establishment of the Muslim rule and culture (often referred to as Islamization) in the newly conquered territories in the Balkans was followed by the process of conversion to Islam, which was fuelled by economic, social and religious factors. As Minkov showed, the process of conversion to Islam in the Ottoman Empire took many forms: 1) the child levy tax (*devshirme*; *παιδομάζωμα*); 2) the impact of the forced conquests over the Christian population (*'anwatan*); 3) the neo-martyrdom and its effect on the Christians; and 4) the issues posed by interreligious marriages and concubinage.[33] According to the existing studies, the process of conversion in the Balkans was very slow in the fifteenth century—with significant regional differences, but it intensified during the reign of Sultan Süleyman (1520-1566).[34] The Ottomans' adherence to the Hanafī School of Islamic law helped them with incorporating the non-Muslims into society, as this school of law was more lenient and practical in the interpretation of sharīʿa (Islamic law). The Ottoman religious foundations and patronage changed the religious landscape of the cities.[35] The production of Ottoman Sunni Hanefi catechisms boomed in the sixteenth century, seeking to bring some religious conhesion and

---

[32] In addition to the references listed on note 31 see Anton Minkov, *Conversion to Islam in the Balkans: Kisve Bahası Petitions and Ottoman Social Life, 1670–1730* (Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2004); Molly Greene, *The Edinburgh History of the Greeks, 1453 to 1768: The Ottoman Empire* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015), 71–84 and 139–61. For Süleyman's policies and his fashioning as the Lawgiver and Caliph see Colin Imber, *Ebu's-suʿud: The Islamic Legal Tradition* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997); Huseyin Yılmaz, *The Sultan and the Sultanate: Envisioning Rulership in the Age of Süleyman the Lawgiver (1520–1566)*, PhD Dissertation (Cambridge / Massachusetts: Harvard University, 2004); Snjezana Buzov, *The Lawgiver and His Lawmakers: The Role of Legal Discourse in the Change of Ottoman Imperial Culture*, PhD Dissertation (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2005).

[33] A. Minkov, *Conversion to Islam in the Balkans*, 64–109.

[34] For the statistics see Ibid., 28–63.

[35] Howard Crane, "The Ottoman Sultan's Mosques: Icons of Imperial Legitimacy," in *The Ottoman City and Its Parts: Urban Structure and Social Order*, ed. Irene A. Bierman, Rifa'at A. Abou-El-Haj, Donald Preziosi (New York: Aristide D. Caratzas, 1991), 173–243.

establish standards of belief and practice in the society which absorbed numerous new converts as well as Muslims of different linguistic backgrounds and allegiances to different schools of Islamic law.[36]

Since the early conquests in Anatolia, the Ottomans developed a set of integrationist policies and social mechanisms regarding the conquered populations, which shaped their dynamics with the subjected Christian religious groups. Scholars of Byzantine, Balkan and Ottoman studies have until recently spoken on the topic in terms of "syncretism."[37] While some emphasized the tolerant character of the Ottoman Empire, others perceived the Ottoman conquests as harmful and disruptive for the Christian life and institutions.[38] Nevertheless, as Heath Lowry pointed out, the Ottomans usually were open towards integrating the members of the Christian Balkan elite in the Ottoman society, as those proved to be helpful in mediating between the conquerors and the conquered people.[39] This Ottoman practice led to the emergence of a new ruling class with a specific identity (*Rumi*s).[40] Still, as recent converts to Islam, the *Rumi*s attracted the opposition of the Muslim *'ulemā* that declared itself against the influence that these recent converts enjoyed in the Empire.[41]

---

[36] T. Krstić, "From Shahāda to 'Aqīda."

[37] Fredrick Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*, ed. M. Hasluck, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1929); Speros Vryonis, *The Decline of the Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh to the Fifteenth Century* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1971); Michel Balivet, *Romanie byzantine et pays de Rûm turc: Histoire d'un espace d'imbrication gréco-turc* (Istanbul: The Isis Press, 1994); Cemal Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995); Heath Lowry, *The Nature of the Early Ottoman State* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003).

[38] M. Balivet, *Romanie byzantine et pays de Rûm turc*; S. Vryonis, *The Decline of the Medieval Hellenism*.

[39] H. Lowry, *The Nature*, 115–30.

[40] For *Rumi* identity see: C. Kafadar, "A Rome of One's Own: Reflections on Cultural Geography and Identity in the Lands of Rum," *Muqarnas* 24 (2007): 7-25; T. Krstić, *Contested Conversions to Islam*, 51–74.

[41] A. Atçıl, *Scholars and Sultans*.

1.2. Orthodox Greeks in Ottoman Society, 1453-1560s: A Historical and Historiographical Review

The status of the Orthodox Greeks in the Ottoman Empire, their relations with the Islamic authorities and their officials, as well as relations with other religious groups in the empire is still a matter of debate among scholars. The historiography was until recently dominated by nation(al)ist approaches to the topic.[42] Most of the studies have provided a decontextualized narrative that isolates the Greeks from the wider Ottoman society. Consequently, the dynamics of the relations between the Ottoman Muslims and the Orthodox Greeks of the early modern Ottoman Empire is yet to be fully understood, as large amounts of archival material and other types of sources are still unedited.

One of the first attempts to discuss the Orthodox Greeks and their status under the Ottoman regime was undertaken by Sir Steven Runciman.[43] Through his analysis, Runciman was able to discuss the main aspects of the issue by overemphasizing the "captivity" motif that characterized the relations between the Church of Constantinople and its flock to the Ottoman State. Runciman points to the decline of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and its administrative structures, which had to take measures to accommodate the Greek people and to guarantee the survival of Orthodoxy in an Islamic state. Still, during the past years several studies have been published that aim to revisit the "Runciman paradigm." Most important among these contributions were authored by Molly Greene and Tom Papademetriou,

---

[42] See for instance Theodore Papadopoullos, *Studies and Documents relating to the History of the Greek Church and People under Turkish Domination* (Brussels, 1952); republished with supplementary material at Aldershot / Hampshire: Variorum, 1990; Georgiades Arnakis, "The Great Church of Constantinople and the Ottoman Empire," *The Journal of Modern History* 24/3 (1952): 235–50; Apostolos Bakalopoulos, *Ιστορία του νέου Ελληνισμού*, vol. 2/1: *Τουρκοκρατία, 1453–1669: Οι ιστορικές βάσεις της νεοελληνικής κοινωνίας και οικονομίας* (Thessaloniki, 1964); Nikolaos Pantanzopoulos, *Church and Law in the Balkan Peninsula during the Ottoman Rule* (Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1967); republished in Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1984; A. Bakalopoulos, *Η ανασύνταξη του ελληνισμού και οι αγώνες του επί Τουρκοκρατίας (1453-1669). Πανεπιστημιακές παραδόσεις* (Thessaloniki, 1974); Georgios Christopoulos (ed.), *Ο ελληνισμός υπό ξένη κυριαρχία (περίοδος 1453-1669). Τουρκοκρατία - λατινοκρατία* (Athens: Ekdotikē Athenōn A. E., 1974).
[43] Steven Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquests to the Greek War of Independence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

respectively.[44] While Papademetriou's focus is mostly directed towards the evolution of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople and its relations with the Ottoman authorities, Greene's analysis provides a comprehensive account of the social, religious and cultural life of the Greek communities of the Ottoman Empire in a wider Mediterranean context.[45] Both studies are immensely important because for the first time we have accounts that seek to view the Greek Orthodox as both constitutive of and constituted by Ottoman society and history, rather than existing as a homogenous, well defined ethno-religious group, unchanged from the fifteenth to the nineteenth centuries, led by the Patriarch of Constantinople.

During its entire existence the Byzantine society rested upon two main pillars: the state, represented by the Byzantine emperor (βασιλεύς), and the Church, led by the Patriarch of Constantinople (πατριάρχης). The Byzantine emperor, being chosen by divine appointment, was the protector of the Church, and had a vital role in ensuring the Church's integrity, but also in the territorial spread of the Church into the known world (οἰκουμενική). The emperor was an important decision maker in the election of the patriarch, who, in turn, played an important part in the Byzantine coronation ceremonial. As the leader of the ecclesiastical institution, the Patriarch was maintaining Christianity–one of the fundamental elements of the Byzantine civilization–through the activities of the Church within the Byzantine Empire.

The conquest of Constantinople in 1453 marked the end of the Byzantine state, but the Church survived the political collapse due to the sultan Meḥmed II, who understood the implications of the Patriarchate for the Orthodox population of his empire. Therefore, the

---

[44] Tom Papademetriou, *Render unto the Sultan. Power, Authority, and the Greek Orthodox Church in the Early Ottoman Centuries* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015) and M. Greene, *The Edinburgh History of the Greeks*.

[45] See as well her important contributions to the study of the Greek merchants in the early modern Mediterranean: M. Greene, *A Shared World: Christian and Muslims in the Early Modern Mediterranean* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); Idem, *Catholic Pirates and Greek Merchants: A Maritime History of the Mediterranean* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010). In addition see also the important contribution of Nathalie Rothman, *Brokering Empire: Trans-Imperial Subjects between Venice and Istanbul* (Ithaca / London: Cornell University Press, 2012).

sultan appointed the anti-unionist monk Gennadios II Scholarios (*c*. 1400–*c*. 1472) as the first patriarch of Constantinople under the Ottoman rule on January 6, 1454.[46] The individual Meḥmed II chose for this key position was not anonymous; Scholarios was an influential Byzantine intellectual, a vehement anti-Latin figure, well versed in the matters of Byzantine law, Orthodox theology, Church administration, Greek philosophy and Latin scholarship.

As an Islamic state, the Ottoman Empire inherited from previous Muslim polities certain religious policies for the management of non-Muslim populations, but also developed new administrative practices that enabled these communities to continue their activities within the Empire and integrated them into Ottoman society. Consequently, Orthodox Greeks were incorporated into the Ottoman society as *dhimmi*s, being a part of the non-Muslim *reʿāyā*.[47] In exchange for paying the *djizya*, the Orthodox benefited from the protection of the State, and was allowed religious and administrative autonomy under the leadership of the Patriarch of Constantinople who became their appointed representative in front of the sultan. By appointing Scholarios as patriarch, Mehmed II incorporated the Patriarchate into his administrative apparatus as an "office of the state" (according to Papademetriou) meant to exercise control over the Orthodox population.

The restoration of the Patriarchate had both political and symbolical implications. Politically, this event must be understood in the context of Mehmed II's project of

---

[46] On more information on the Patriarch Gennadios II Scholarios see C. J. G. Turner, "The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius," *Byzantion* 39 (1969): 420–55; Theodoros Zeses, *Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος: Βίος, Συγγράμματα, Διδασκαλία*, Analekta Blatadon 30 (Thessaloniki: Patriarhikon Idruma Paterikōn Meletōn, 1980); Teuvo Laitila, "Infidel Orthodox? Patriarch Gennadios II (1454–1456) and the Making of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in the Context of Sultan Mehmed II's Policy," *Byzantium and the North* [Acta Byzantina Fennica] 4 (1988-89): 51–76; H. Barbour, *The Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios and His Translation of the Commentary of Armandus de Bellovisu on the* De Ente et Essentia *of Thomas Aquinas*, Studi Tomistici 53 (Vatican, 1993); Franz Tinnefeld, "Georgios Gennadios Scholarios," in *La Théologie byzantine et sa tradition*, vol. 2: *(XIIIᵉ–XIXᵉ s.)*, ed. Carmelo Giuseppe Conticello and Vassa Conticello (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), 447–541; Marie-Hélène Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400–vers 1472): un intellectuel orthodoxe face à la disparition de l'empire Byzantin*, Archives de l'Orient chrétien 20 (Paris: Institut Français d'études byzantines, 2008).

[47] H. Inalcık, "The Policy of Mehmed II toward the Greek Population of Istanbul and the Byzantine Buildings of the City," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 23-24 (1969-70): 231–49; republished in H. Inalcık, *The Ottoman Empire: Conquest, Organization and Economy: Collected Studies* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1978), Study VI.

transforming Constantinople into his new capital and the repopulation of the city. [48] Symbolically as well the appointment was immensely important for the new ruler of Constantinople. According to Kritoboulos of Imbros, the sultan assumed the role of the Byzantine emperor during the ceremony and assured Scholarios that all the privileges that the patriarchs before him enjoyed under the Byzantine rule will be granted under the Ottoman rule as well. [49] This represents one of the moments that have been labeled under the category of 'the foundation myths' in historiography, as the contemporary sources for this historical event are absent and the entire analysis relies on the later Greek sources of the sixteenth century. [50]

Between 1453 and by the end of the sixteenth century, the Byzantine Church went through a period of adaptation to the Ottoman administration. The list of the first patriarchs that succeeded to the Patriarchal throne reveals short and multiple tenures of the office. [51] The election of the patriarch was at first dependent on the sultan and afterwards it became more and more reliant on the social network to which the patriarchal candidate could have appealed in order to seize the position. Various polities or influent families of the Christian world that had certain political or economic stakes in the Ottoman Empire, attempted to impose a

---

[48] On this issue see H. Inalcık, "The Policy of Mehmed II"; Gülrü Necipoğlu, *Architecture, Ceremonial and Power: The Topkapı Palace in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries* (New York: Architectural History Foundation, 1991), 3–30; Elizabeth Zachariadou, "Constantinople se repeuple," in *1453: Η άλωση της Κωνσταντινούπολης και η μετάβαση από τους μεσαιωνικούς στους νεώτερους χρόνους*, ed. T. Kioussopoulou (Herakleio: Crete University Press, 2005), 47–59; republished in E. Zachariadou, *Studies in Pre-Ottoman Turkey and the Ottomans* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), Study XXIII; Çiğdem Kafescioğlu, *Constantinopolis / Istanbul: Cultural Encounter, Imperial Vision, and the Construction of the Ottoman Capital* (Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009); H. Inalcık, *The Survey of Istanbul, 1455: The Text, English Translation, Analysis of the Text, Documents* (Istanbul: Türkiye Bankası / Kültur Yayınları, 2010).

[49] See for instance the testimony of Kritoboulos of Imbros: Kritoboulos, *Historiae*, ed. Roderich Reinsch, Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 22 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1983), 9112-16.

[50] On the "foundation myths" see Benjamin Braude, "Foundations Myths of the Millet System," in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: Functioning of a Plural Society*, vol. 1: *The Central Lands*, ed. Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis (New York / London: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982), 69–88.

[51] On the chronology of the Patriarchs of Constantinople under the Ottoman rule see A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, "Πατριαρχικοὶ κατάλογοι (1453-1636)," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 8 (1899): 392-401; Vitalien Laurent, "Les premiers patriarches de Constantinople sous la domination turque (1454-1476). Succession et chronologie d'après un catalogue inédit," *Revue des études byzantines* 26 (1968): 229-63; Paraschevas Konortas, *Les rapports juridiques et politiques entre le Patriarcat Orthodoxe de Constantinople et l'Administration ottomane, de 1453 à 1600 (d'après documents grecs et ottomans)*, PhD Dissertation (Paris: Universite Paris I Pantheon–Sorbonne, 1985), 443; M.-H. Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 468.

particular candidate for the patriarchal office by buying the position or appealing also to people from the sultan's entourage.[52] As it has been pointed out by Elizabeth Zachariadou, during the post-Byzantine period the influence of the Greek archons grew within the Orthodox communities.[53] As individuals from wealthy families, archons held key positions in the Ottoman administration and later became influent businessmen and/or merchants.[54] The influence of these archons proved to be very important for the election of patriarchs, as they would act as intermediaries between the patriarchal candidate and the Ottoman administration. Because of the dynamics fuelled by personal or political interest, the post-Byzantine period had numerous cases of depositions of patriarchs as well as re-enthronements, which created disruptions in the activities of the Patriarchate.

Regarding the status of the patriarch in the eyes of the Ottoman administration, Papademetriou argued that the Patriarch of Constantinople was perceived as no more than a *mültezim* (tax collector).[55] His analysis of the economic relations between the Ottomans and the patriarch points to the fact that the Ottoman administration's main concern was to collect taxes from the Orthodox population for the imperial Treasury. Also, there was a close relation between the expansion of the Ottoman territories and the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Patriarchate, because the jurisdiction of the patriarch grew over the Orthodox in accordance with the territorial expansion of the Porte.[56] The financial obligation of the patriarch to the Ottoman administration was the payment of the *kharadj*.[57] This type of tax consisted in the payment to the Treasury of an annual sum of 2000 florins (usually the payment was made

---

[52] For instance, in the case of Scholarios the Greek archons mediated for him in front of the sultan. See M.-H. Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 74–77.

[53] E. Zachariadou, "Les notables laïques et le Patriarcat Oecuménique après la chute de Constantinople," *Turcica* 30 (1998): 119-134; republished in E. Zachariadou, *Studies in Pre-Ottoman Turkey and the Ottomans* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), Study XXII; For the influence of the archons regarding the ecclesiastical affairs of the Patriarchate see also T. Papademetriou, *Render unto the Sultan*, 179–213.

[54] See for instance the case of Kantakouzenos' family. T. Papademetriou, *Render unto the Sultan*, 193–213.

[55] Ibid., 107–38.

[56] Ibid.

[57] P. Konortas, *Les rapports juridiques*, 413–14.

21

around Easter time). According to Paraskevas Konortas, this type of tax was introduced by the Sultan Bayezid II between in the 1460s or 1470s.[58]

So far the scholars thought about the patriarch of Constantinople as the head of the Orthodox *millet* (nation) from the Ottoman Empire (i.e. *millet başı*).[59] Terms as *millet*, *millet başı*, or *etnarches*, used by the majority of scholars, prove not adequate to characterize the Orthodox community reorganized by the Ottomans immediately after 1453. Scholars such as Benjamin Braude and Paraskevas Konortas have argued for a different terminology based on various contemporary Ottoman documents.[60] Hence, the term *tā'ife* has been suggested as an alternative to *millet*.[61] The incorrect usage of the term related to the Orthodox also led scholars to a misconception of the authority of the patriarch in the Orthodox world during the first period of "*Tourkokratia*." Although it was considered that the patriarch had jurisdiction over all the Orthodox of the Empire, Konortas and Socrates Petmezas underlined that because the Orthodox East was governed for centuries by more than one ecclesiastical institution (the Pentarchy), the Orthodox could not be constituted as a compact religious group (*tā'ife*) under the leadership of the Patriarch of Constantinople.[62] Moreover, Konortas affirmed that each bishop who was under the authority of the Sultan was the head of his own community of believers (*tā'ife*).[63] Terms such as *millet* or *millet başı* began to be used after the sixteenth century, after the Ottoman authorities began to recognize only one Orthodox *tā'ife*.

---

[58] Ibid.
[59] S. Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, 186–207.
[60] B. Braude, "Foundation Myths," 72; P. Konortas, "From *Tâ'ife* to *Millet*: Ottoman Terms for the Greek Orthodox Community," in *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism: Politics, Economy and Society in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. Dimitri Gondicas & Charles Issawi (Princeton / New York: The Darwin Press, 1999), 171; M.-H. Blanchet, *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios*, 88.
[61] Ibid.
[62] P. Konortas, "From *Tâ'ife* to *Millet*," 170; Socrate Petmezas, "L'organisation ecclésiastique sous les ottomans," in *Conseils et mémoires de Synadios, Prêtre de Serrès en Macédoine (XVIIe siècle)*, ed. Paolo Odorico (Paris: Editions de l'Association „Pierre Belon", 1996), 491–92.
[63] P. Konortas, "From *Tâ'ife* to *Millet*," 172.

Regarding *ethnarches*, this term emerged in the nineteenth century, as a consequence of the nationalist ideas that circulated in the Ottoman Empire.[64]

During the Ottoman times, Orthodoxy thrived in Mount Athos.[65] Since the first conquests of the Balkan territories by the Ottomans, the monks of Athos managed to obtain from the new rulers official documents that granted them exemption of taxes and privileges over their properties.[66] Therefore, due to its special status within the Ottoman Empire, Mount Athos attracted the attention of various Byzantine aristocrats who managed to hide their wealth in the Athonite monasteries from the Ottoman threat.[67] One of the employed methods was by pious endowments, as the Islamic law recognized the Christian *vakıf*.[68] Still, Mount Athos did not represent just a safe place for the Byzantine aristocrats, but also for the survival of Orthodoxy and the Greek intellectual life. The Athonite wondering monks were agents of faith, proselytizing throughout the Christian lands of the Ottoman empire, carrying with them relics and holy icons, preaching and collecting manuscripts (especially those that had religious content).[69]

---

[64] Ibid. For *millet* in the Ottoman Empire see also Daniel Goffman, "Ottoman Millets in the Early Seventeenth Century," *New Perspectives on Turkey* 11 (1994): 135-58 and Vjeran Kursar, "Non-Muslim Communal Divisions and Identities in the Early Modern Ottoman Balkans and the *Millet* System Theory," in *Power and Influence in South-Eastern Europe, 16th-19th century*, ed. Maria Baramova, Plamen Mitev, Ivan Parvev and Vania Racheva (Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2013), 97–108.

[65] On Mount Athos and its importance for the Eastern Christianity in the early modern period see Kriton Chrysochoides, ed., *Ο Ἄθως στους 14ο-16ο αιώνες / Mount Athos in the 14th-16th Centuries* (Athens, 1997); E. Zachariadou, "Mount Athos and the Ottomans, *c*. 1350–1550," in *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, vol. 5: *Eastern Christianity*, ed. Michael Angold (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 154–68; Graham Speake and Kallistos Ware, ed., *Mount Athos: Microcosm of the Christian East* (Oxford / New York / Vienna: Peter Lang, 2012).

[66] Zachariadou, "Mount Athos," 156.

[67] E. Zachariadou, "'A Safe and Holy Mountain': Early Ottomans," in *Mount Athos and Byzantine Monasticism: Papers from the Twenty-Eight Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Birmingham, March 1994*, ed. Anthony Bryer and Mary Cunningham (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1996), 127–34.

[68] T. Papademetriou, *Render unto the Sultan*, 94.

[69] Heath Lowry, "A Note on the Population and Status of the Athonite Monasteries under Ottoman Rule (*ca.* 1520)," *Wiener Zeitschrift für Kunde des Morgenlandes* 73 (1981): 115–35; republished in Heath Lowry, *Studies in* Defter*ology. Ottoman Society in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, Analecta Isisiana 4 (Istanbul: The Isis Press, 1992) Study XII; See also Nicolas Oikonomides, "Monastères et moines lors de la conquête ottomane," *Südost-Forschungen* 35 (1976): 1–10 and Aleksandar Fotić, "Athonite Travelling Monks and the Ottoman Authorities (16th-18th Centuries)," in *Perspectives on Ottoman Studies. Papers from the 18th Symposium of the International Committee of Pre-Ottoman and Ottoman Studies (CIEPO)*, vol. 1, ed. Ekrem Causevic, Nenad Moacanin and Vjeran Kursar (Berlin / Münster / Wien: LIT Verlag, 2010), 157–65.

The relations between the Orthodox Greeks and Western Europe also intensified during the sixteenth century. Turning their attention from the situation of the Roman Catholic Church, many European humanists—such as Hans Dernschwam (1494–1568/69), Stephan Gerlach (1546–1612) and Martin Crusius (1524–1607)—began to look to the Church of Constantinople and to the Greek world. As Asaph Ben Tov showed, after traveling to the territories of the Ottoman Empire and observing the situation of the Orthodox Church, the interest of these humanists in the situation of the Greek world grew to include not only the issue of religious union, but cultural history as well.[70] Many of them managed to create contacts with Greek intellectuals and high Church officials. Due to these contacts, important texts related to the history of Greek people and Church were published in Europe. In the second part of the sixteenth century a great number of Greek manuscripts were brought to Europe from the Ottoman lands. Mostly from the second half of the sixteenth-century, the encounters between the Orthodox Church officials and various leaders of the Catholic and Protestant religious groups from Europe intensified. One of the best-known episodes is the theological dialogue between the Patriarch Jeremiah II Tranos of Constantinople (*c*.1530–1595) and the Lutheran theologians of Tübingen, which took place between 1576 and 1581. This theological dialogue makes the perfect example of a non-political debate between religious officials.[71]

The intellectual life of the Greeks was shaped by the Ottoman context. After the fall of Constantinople and up to the end of the sixteenth-century, the intellectuals who remained under the Ottoman rule were usually members of the Church administration, whose agenda was dominated by theological issues concerning the Orthodox life under the Ottoman rule.

---

[70] Asaph Ben Tov, "'Turco-Graecia': German Humanists and the End of Greek Antiquity," in *The Renaissance and the Ottoman World*, ed. Anna Contadini and Claire Norton (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), 181–95.

[71] On this debate see George Mastrantonis, *Augsburg and Constantinople: The Correspondence between the Tübingen Theologians and Patriarch Jeremiah II of Constantinople on the Augsburg Confession* (Brookline / Massachusetts: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1982) and Dorothea Wendebourg, *Reformation und Orthodoxie. Der theologische Briefwechsel zwischen der Leitung der württembergischen Kirche und dem Ökumenischen Patriarchen Jeremias II. in den Jahren 1574–1581* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).

Contemporary intellectual responses to the incorporation of the Patriarchate into the Ottoman administration as well as to the transformations that occurred within the Church, point to the fact that Rousanos was not the only post-Byzantine intellectual who had critical views of the contemporary dynamics from within the Ottoman state. Therefore, although individuals such as the historian Kritoboulos of Imbros (c. 1410–c. 1470) might have painted in warm colors the transition period to the Ottoman rule, the general opinion of the post-Byzantine intellectuals on the incorporation of the Patriarchate and its administrative structures to the Ottoman administration was generally negative. Hence, various post-Byzantine intellectuals, such as Gennadios II Scholarios (c. 1400–c. 1472), Theodore Agallianos (*c*. 1400–1474), Damaskenos Stoudites (d. 1577) and Meletios I Pegas (1549–1601) became very vocal and critical about the situation of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Orthodox people under the Ottoman rule. In their writings, these intellectuals sanctioned a series of issues that contributed to the decline of the Church under Ottoman rule. Among these, the practice of office buying within the ecclesiastical system, the ignorance that characterized most of the members of the monastic communities and clergy, and the absence of religious instruction among the community of the faithful are the most addressed topics. Writing in the immediate years after 1453, Scholarios drew a general picture regarding the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate under the Ottoman rule. He complained about the apostasy of the faithful, the ignorance of the clergy and the hypocrisy of the Orthodox, by pointing to the fact that all these are connected to the divine punishment received by the Greeks from God for their sins.[72] Theodore Agallianos, also known as Theophanes of Medeia, also emphasized in his writings the decadence of the Church in the following years after the fall of Constantinople,

---

[72] Scholarios, "Lamentation de Scholarios sur les malheurs de sa vie," in *Oeuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, vol. 1, ed Mgr. L. Petit, X. A. Sidéridès and M. Jugie (Paris: Maison de la bonne presse, 1928), 283–94; Scholarios, "Κατὰ τῆς σιμονιανῆς αἱρέσεως ἢ ἀπιστίας," in *Oeuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, vol. 3, ed. Mgr. L. Petit, X. A. Sidéridès and M. Jugie (Paris: Maison de la bonne presse, 1930), 239–51.

by criticizing the large influence that the *archon*s had in the ecclesiastical affairs.[73] Further, Damaskenos Stoudites, one of Rousanos' contemporaries, follows Agallianos' ideas on the *archon*s highlighting the destruction of the true monastic spirit by allowing lay people to build monasteries. Damaskenos' criticism is mainly directed towards the contemporary ecclesiastical hierarchy, whose members are ignorant and poorly instructed. According to his view, one of the people to blame for the decadent situation of the Church is the patriarch of Constantinople himself, who allowed such abuses to happen.[74] Later on, Meletios I Pegas, the patriarch of Alexandria, became very critical in his homilies about the popular religious practices, which he perceives as a deviation from the true Orthodox practices. As Rousanos, Pegas mainly criticizes practices that occur during the religious feasts (bringing animals into the Church's premises, fairs that do not promote Christian values, etc.) and during certain religious services related to baptism, death and marriage.[75]

This is the context in which Rousanos lived and produced his works. As his contemporaries, he was influenced by the changes that happened in the Ottoman Empire and within the Greek Orthodox communities as well. Rousanos became interested in these phenomena and tried to point out the problems that Orthodoxy faced. Roussanos' texts are important contributions not just for the field of theology but also for that of history and religious studies in general. An in-depth analysis of his works can help in creating a better understanding of the religious and social transformations that occurred in the early modern Ottoman Mediterranean.

---

[73] C. Patrineles, *Ὁ Θεόδορος Ἀγαλλιανὸς ταυτιζόμενος πρὸς τὸν Θεοφάνην Μηδείας καὶ οἱ ἀνέκδοτοι λόγοι του* (Athens, 1966).

[74] Stoudites, "Διάλογος Δαμασκηνοῦ ἐπισκόπου Ῥεντίνης. Τὰ δὲ πρόσωπα ὁ αὐτὸς ἐπίσκοπος καὶ ὁ τῆς Ἁγίας Ἀναστασίας ἡγούμενος," Elenes Kakoulide-Panou, ed., in "Δαμασκηνού Στουδίτη «Διάλογος»," *Δωδώνη. Επιστημονική Επετηρίς της Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής του Πανεπιστημίου Ιωαννίνων* 3 (1974): 446–58; For Damaskenos' life and works see Lamprine Manou, *Δαμασκηνός ο Στουδίτης, ο βίος και το έργο του* (Athens: Syndesmos tōn en Athēnais Megaloscholitōn, 1999).

[75] Basilike Tzoga, *Μελέτιος Πηγάς (1550–1601), Πατριάρχης Αλεξανδρείας: βίος - δράση - εργογραφία*, PhD Thesis (Athens: Kapodistrian University, 2009).

Chapter 2 - Pachomios Rousanos' Perceptions of Major Challenges to Orthodoxy

One of Rousanos' main concerns was the spiritual and intellectual life of his Greek compatriots in a time when Orthodoxy underwent a period of adaptation and survival to the new political environment. Coming from a monastic milieu, Rousanos perceived Orthodoxy as the only path towards the spiritual, cultural and social salvation of the Greek people. Hence, he engaged in polemics regarding any type of innovations he observed in the Orthodox tenets and practices. Rousanos became a keen observer of the transformations that Orthodoxy and the Greeks were facing under the Ottoman rule. As a passionate traveller, he was able to gain a global understanding of the religious phenomena in the eastern Mediterranean. Due to his critical and observant mind, intellect and capacity for consulting various texts of theological content, Rousanos managed to capture in his writings the major issues that challenged Orthodoxy from both contemporary (i.e. sixteenth century) and traditional theological perspectives.

The aim of this chapter is to analyze the situation of the Greeks and their faith under the Ottoman rule of the first half of the sixteenth century as perceived by Rousanos in his writings. For this I will address two of the main challenges which, according to Rousanos, were threatening the integrity of Orthodoxy and eased the process of conversion to Islam: 1) the trends in monastic life, the outlook of the Orthodox clergy, and the level of religious instruction, which were intertwined in Rousanos' view; and 2) popular culture and religious practices. As an example of how he was conceiving the boundaries of Orthodoxy, in the last part of the chapter I will present as a study case his polemic with Ioannikios Kartanos.

2.1. Monasticism, clergy and religious instruction

During the first part of the sixteenth century, Rousanos became one of the fiercest critics of the Orthodox monks, especially in Athonite communities, and clergy. As Manoles Serges points out, Roussanos offered no positive feedback on the monastic life of his time.[76] Being himself a monk based in Athos, he observed the lifestyle of his fellow Athonite monks, and was concerned about the way the Ottoman rule was influencing post-Byzantine monasticism and clergy. Moreover, Rousanos understood that for a revitalization of the Greek intellectual and religious life he must raise awareness of the ignorance that characterized the monks and the Orthodox priests. In Rousanos' view, those individuals took more interest in the material affairs than in seeking salvation of the Orthodox by providing a good level of religious instruction.[77]

Along with the Ottoman conquests in the Balkans, Mount Athos became one of the most popular places where members of the Byzantine elite came to seek refuge and to save their wealth. In the early Ottoman centuries, the Athonite monasteries grew in number and prestige due to the relations that they had with the Ottomans.[78] Nevertheless, this context proved not to be favorable for the spiritual and moral life of the monks. Since *c*. 1400 onwards, the *idyorrithmic* monastic lifestyle became increasingly popular in Mount Athos.[79] This is a type of monastic organization that allows the monks to live a more independent life, with the possibility of keeping personal wealth. As opposed to the *cenobitic* monasticism, the idyorrithmic monks were not supposed to live all together inside the monastery, but instead they had personal households around the monastic complex.[80] This type of monasticism also

---

[76] Manoles Serges, *Εκκλησιαστικός λόγος και λαϊκός πολιτισμός τον 16ο αιώνα: Η περίπτωση του Παχωμίου Ρουσάνου* (Athens: Ekdotikos Oikos, 2008), 123.
[77] Rousanos, "Περὶ τῆς ἐκ τῶν Γραφῶν ὠφελείας," 71–73.
[78] Heath Lowry, "A Note on the Population and Status of the Athonite Monasteries."
[79] M. Barbounes, "Η καθημερινη ζωη στο Άγιον Όρος κατά τον 16ο αιώνα και ο Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος," in *Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος. 450 χρόνια ἀπὸ τὴν κοίμησή του*, 196-198.
[80] Alice-Mary Talbot, "Idiorrhythmic monasticism," in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, vol. 2, ed. Alexander Kazhdan (New York / Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 981–82.

facilitated the emergence of monastic vagabondage. Benefiting from a certain degree of protection from the Ottoman State, monks started to wonder around the Mediterranean for different reasons. As Aleksandar Fotić showed, these monks were agents of Orthodoxy in the Ottoman Empire, by carrying relics of saints with them, spreading various ideas of Orthodox spirituality, disseminating pamphlets of theological content, etc.[81] With the approval of the Ottoman administration, the Athonite wondering monks were allowed to travel to other Christian territories in order to collect alms for their monasteries.[82] As this situation turned to be beneficial for both the Ottomans and monasteries, the wondering monks took advantage of the situation and they began to get money for themselves from the Orthodox people, and became more interested in material aspects of life. Rousanos is also concerned about the theological ideas that these monks were spreading throughout the Greek lands. According to him, some monks who became acquainted with Protestant ideas in the course of their travels claimed that the Orthodox do not need to visit the Holy Places in order to contemplate the events described in the Scripture. Instead, by accusing those monks of disseminating heterodox teachings, Rousanos affirms that pilgrimage is beneficial for the spiritual life of the Christians.[83]

Rousanos levels numerous criticisms against the idyorrithmic monasticism. He reacts first against the ignorance that characterized the monks who were practicing this lifestyle (mostly Athonite monks), by pointing out the fact that the essence of monasticism is contrary to these monks' behaviour and practices. As Rousanos puts it, this ignorance is a consequence of the lack of proper and true knowledge of Orthodox monasticism.[84] In Rousanos' understanding, the vibrant monasticism represents the insurance of a powerful

---

[81] Aleksandar Fotić, "Athonite Travelling Monks and the Ottoman Authorities," 157–65.
[82] Ibid.
[83] Georgios Metallenos, "*Πρωτοπρεσβύτερος. Κριτικὲς ἐπισημάνσεις στὸ ἔργο τοῦ Π. Ρουσάνου Κατὰ Ἁγιοκατηγόρων*," in *Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος. 450 χρόνια ἀπὸ τὴν κοίμησή του*, 353–64; Anastasios Maras, "Ο Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος και η εποχή του: Κατά Αγιοκατηγόρων," *Μνημοσύνη* 13 (2013): 315–28.
[84] Rousanos, "Περὶ τῆς ἐκ τῶν Γραφῶν ὠφελείας," 75.

spiritual life of all Christians.[85] The idyorrithmic monasticism replaced the cenobitic one, allowing each monk to take care of himself. The monastic discipline took a turn for worse since without the constant supervision of an abbot the activities of the monks were not properly regulated. According to Rousanos, the monastic discipline can only be regained by a continued contemplation of the words of the Scripture.[86] This low level of monastic life also affected the understanding of the Orthodox tenets, as the monks did not pay attention anymore to their religious instruction and spiritual life.

According to Rousanos, along with the members of the clergy, the monks have a sacred purpose towards the salvation of the souls of the Orthodox. They should be role models of Orthodox behavior and proper instructors for the Christians. Instead, as Rousanos argues, the monks themselves do not have a clear idea about what Orthodoxy is anymore.[87] As representatives of the monastic milieu, the monks should be the keepers of the truth of Orthodoxy, and benefit only from the people's gratitude.[88] Rousanos condemns the luxurious lifestyle that many of the monks pursued as a consequence of the idyorrithmic monasticism. In his view, a general climate of secularization penetrated Athos and transformed it into an auspicious place for those who seek a life of plenty. Rousanos also condamnds the vices that began to characterize the monks of his time: arrogance, gossip, love of silver, etc.[89] The money collected by the monks in the Orthodox lands was portrayed by Rousanos as a theft, because many of these wondering monks were taking more than their share from the collection to supply their own treasuries.[90] Moreover, these monks were not just offending God by their behavior, but they were also working against the Church institutions and

---

[85] Ibid.
[86] Rousanos, "Ὁμιλία πρὸς τοὺς ἀγροίκως τὴν θείαν Γραφὴν διασύροντας," 57.
[87] Ibid.
[88] Rousanos, "Περὶ τῆς ἐκ τῶν Γραφῶν ὠφελείας," 75.
[89] Serges, *Ἐκκλησιαστικός λόγος*, 123–137.
[90] Rousanos, "Περὶ τῆς ἐκ τῶν Γραφῶν ὠφελείας," 73.

disregarded them.[91] Rousanos talks about these monks as illiterate and unclean, taking pride in their ignorance and trying to impose it also on other Christians.[92] Moreover, he is very critical when it comes to the attitudes of these monks to the educated clergy or people. As he puts it, most of them despise education and disregard the educated by treating them with scorn.[93] The wealth increase of the Athonite monasteries attracted predatory raids of the Ottoman pirates. These incursions ended up in pillaging of the monasteries, while the monks were taken hostages and often forced to convert to Islam.[94]

As sources for his arguments regarding the idyorrithmic monasticism, Rousanos uses, in addition to the stipulations of the Church councils that sanctioned the status and the role of monasticism in Church life, the writings of Pachomios the Great (292-346), Basil the Great (330-379), Gregory the Great (*c*. 540-604), the *Typikon* of Athanasios of the Great Lavra of Mount Athos and some unknown Church juridical texts.[95] He made use precisely of these texts in order to argue for a reform of the sixteenth-century Orthodox monasticism. Produced by reputed Church theologians and monks in the formative period of monasticism in both East and West, these treatises had an unquestionable degree of authority in the monastic milieu of the medieval and early modern periods. By basing his arguments on them, Rousanos aimed to point out the authentic monastic values that needed to be restored in the sixteenth-century Greek world. According to him the monks have four duties: 1) chastity; 2) abstinence from surfeit; 3) poverty; and 4) obedience.[96] In Rousanos' view, all these duties were disregarded by the Orthodox monks of the sixteenth century, which caused a decline of monasticism and its spiritual and didactic role in the Christian life.

---

[91] Rousanos, "Ὁμιλία πρὸς τοὺς ἀγροίκως," 58.
[92] Ibid.
[93] Ibid.
[94] Serges, *Ἐκκλησιαστικός λόγος*, 130.
[95] Konstantinos Pitsakis, "Ζητήματα Κανονικοῦ Δικαίου στὸν Παχώμιο Ρουσάνο," in *Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος. 450 χρόνια ἀπὸ τὴν κοίμησή του*, 557–70.
[96] Rousanos, "Περὶ τῆς ἐκ τῶν Γραφῶν ὠφελείας,".

Rousanos did not view the situation of the clergy any more benevolently. In his works both monks and clergy are portrayed as ignorant of the Orthodox tenets and disinterested in the religious instruction of the people. Burdened by taxes by the Ottoman State and the Patriarchate, the priests took very small interest in the revitalization of the spiritual life of the Orthodox.[97] An important aspect that is touched by Rousanos in his works concerns the level of literacy among clergy. In his view, most of the priests were illiterate and performed the services by reciting the prayers by heart.[98] Furthermore, the manner by which priests were selected for being ordained was tainted by bribery within the Church.[99] According to Rousanos, it is hence only logical to affirm that the ecclesiastical positions were not awarded based on the instruction and skills of the candidate, but on the monetary basis.

As emphasized above, the level of religious instruction of the Orthodox was heavily influenced by the situation among monks and clergy during the Ottoman period. Rousanos deplores the absence of proper teachers and institutions that can enhance the quality of religious learning in the Greek lands. Thus, a poor knowledge of the tenets of faith led to the increase in the cases of conversion to Islam among the Orthodox population of the Ottoman Empire. For the Greek case, institutions of learning were almost inexistent in Rousanos' time. Only later on, as a result of the encounters between Protestant and Catholic missionaries with the Ottoman Christians, few institutions were founded for the education of the Greek boys, but outside the Ottoman lands. In 1577, the Greek College in Rome opened its doors to the Greeks and facilitated their Catholic-oriented education.[100] Furthermore, after the fall of Constantinople a Greek College was established in Venice that had the purpose of preparing the Greek boys for studying at the University of Padua. Regarding the Protestants, their support for the education of the Greeks came only towards the end of the sixteenth-century,

---

[97] Serges, *Ἐκκλησιαστικός λόγος*, 129–130.
[98] Rousanos, "Περὶ τῆς ἐκ τῶν Γραφῶν ὠφελείας," 70–73.
[99] Rousanos, "Κεφάλαια πρός τινας διὰ ταῦτα ἀμφιβάλλοντας. Κεφάλαιά τινα περὶ Ἱερωσύνης," in *Ὁ Παχώμιος Ῥουσάνος,* ed. I. Karmires, 288.
[100] Ibid., 135.

after the initiation of their dialogue with the Patriarch Jeremiah II.[101] Thus, in the first part of the century, the Greek population of the Ottoman Empire had a restricted access to education. The only functioning institution was the Patriarchal Academy of Constantinople, which had problems regarding its curriculum and staff.[102]

This is why Rousanos suggests that a reform of monasticism and clergy is necessary, so that many more Orthodox Christians can benefit at least from elementary religious education. Educated monks and priests can participate in the intellectual life of the Geeks by turning into proper teachers. Rousanos' main ideas revolve around the usefulness of the Scripture, the only source of true knowledge beneficial for the life of the Orthodox. He perceives the Scripture as a remedy for the ignorance of the monks and priests and as the most proper manual of religious instruction.

2.2. Popular culture and religious practices

In his travels Rousanos was also a keen observer of the popular and religious practices across the Ottoman lands. He dedicates an entire treatise to combating the presence of such practices among the Orthodox. Short in length, the treatise provides several examples of practices that Rousanos encountered during his time.[103] From his point of view, many of these practices were associated with pagan rituals, which originated in the ancient Greek world.[104] During the Byzantine period, the Church sanctioned through its councils the performance of certain practices within the Christian communities. Still, even if at the official level of the Church these practices were condemned, in the popular milieu they were

---

[101] Ibid.
[102] On the Patriarchal Academy of Constantinople see Manouel Gedeon, *Χρονικά της Πατριαρχικής Ακαδημίας: Ιστορικαί ειδήσεις περί της Μεγάλης του Γένους Σχολής 1454-1830* (Constantinople: Ek tou Patriarchikou Typographeiou, 1883).
[103]Rousanos, "Πρὸς τοὺς ἑλληνίζοντας," 105–12.
[104] Ibid., 106.

common and permitted by the members of the clergy.[105] Following the example of the theologians before him, Rousanos opposes their existence. According to his view, the presence of these heterodox-pagan practices can be explained by the ignorance and poor instruction of the people and clergy, and is damaging to the authentic spirit of Orthodoxy.

Rousanos' first criticism is directed at the religious feasts and their celebration. He draws attention to the animal sacrifices that were performed in the Orthodox world during specific feasts by deploring the fact that these rituals were taking place in the sacred space of the Church. He is not criticizing only the common people, but indirectly he also speaks against the clergy, which in its ignorance allows such acts to transpire. Among the practices that were associated with the divine services, Rousanos is critical of the people who are perpetuating practices related to the rites for the dead or baptism. First, by referencing the Greek comedian Aristophanes and some poets of the ancient Hellenic times, Rousanos derides the practice of putting coins in the hand of the dead so that they can be able to pay their way into eternity. This evidently relates to the pagan Hellenic idea, according to which the soul descends into Underworld and it has to pay a tax to Charon, the boatman who conducts the dead into Hades.[106] Rousanos' observations are supported by the research of Margaret Alexiou on the ritual lament in the Greek world, as she emphasizes that this practice was very popular in post-Byzantine Greece.[107] Regarding baptism, Rousanos narrates that he witnessed one practice that opposed the Orthodox administration of this holy mystery. As he relates, in one of his travels he attended a baptism performed by a priest, when he noticed that the midwife threw a handful of salt into the water prepared for the service. When Rousanos interrogated the priest in charge of the Church, the latter replied that he was not to blame for

---

[105] Ibid.
[106] Ibid., 108.
[107] Margaret Alexiou, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*, second edition, rev. Dimitrios Yatromanolakis and Panagiotis Roilos (New York / Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2002), 26–27.

the situation.[108] Rousanos emphasized the fact that the entire service was wrongly performed and that it was not in agreement with the Orthodox official practices, since the proper way to baptize was only by water. One of the last cases of pagan practices which Rousanos witnessed does not concern the Orthodox Christian people. He tells the story of some Turkish-speaking sailors who before they raised the anchor prepared food for an unknown god, so that their journey would be blessed by good wind.[109] Hence, Rousanos' testimony points to widespread pagan practices in the eastern Mediterranean not just among the Orthodox, but also among the Muslims.

Nevertheless, Rousanos' criticism on popular religious practices easily finds its correspondences in both the European and Ottoman contexts. In Europe, the process of confessionalization drove Protestants to dismiss popular practices when they polemicized against Catholics.[110] In the Ottoman world in the era of Sunnitization, scholars such as Imam Birgivī (1522–1573) were also writing against popular practices rife in popular Islam.[111] In this sense, Rousanos' criticism is very much in the spirit of the "age of confessionalization" in that it seeks to restore "purity" and "orthodoxy" of the Orthodox faith.

2.3. Rousanos and the *Kartanite* movement

Ioannikios Kartanos is known as the first theologian in the post-Byzantine period who attempted a translation of the Scripture in vernacular. Although the exact date of his birth is unknown, it is believed that he was born sometime around 1500.[112] Kartanos lived for a long

---

[108] Rousanos, "Πρὸς τοὺς ἑλληνίζοντας," 109–10.

[109] Ibid., 108.

[110] Peter Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1978); R. Scribner, *Popular Culture and Popular Movements in Reformation Germany* (London / Ronceverte: The Hambledon Press, 1987).

[111] Katharina Anna Ivanyi, *Virtue, Piety and the Law: A Study of Birgivī Meḥmed Efendī's al-Ṭarīqa al-Muḥammadiyya*, PhD Thesis (Princeton: Princeton University, 2012), 52–69.

[112] On Kartanos and the "Kartanite" movement see A. Argyriou, "La Bible dans le monde orthodoxe au XVIe siècle," in Les temps des Réformes et la Bible, ed. Guy Bedouelle and Bernard Roussel (Paris: Beauchesne,

time in Kerkyra and Venice, and travelled around Greece, Constantinople and the Holy Land. Kartanos was a member of the clergy, as he was a priest and *protosyncellos* in the diocese of Corfu, where he also died around 1567. While he was imprisoned in Venice around 1535-1536, Kartanos wrote his notorious work *The Old and New Testament: The Flowers and the Necessary Things* (Παλαιά τε καὶ Νέα Διαθήκη ἤτοι τὸ ἄνθος καὶ ἀναγκαῖον αὐτῆς; also known as Ἄνθος, *Florilegium*), which was published in Venice in 1536. After the publication of his work, Kartanos travelled to Constantinople and asked to be ordained a bishop as a reward for his achievement. Contrary to his expectations, he was called heterodox by the Ecumenical Patriarch along with his work and teachings. After this event, Kartanos took refuge in the diocese of Naupaktos and continued to gain popular recognition for his work and started to gather followers. Even after his death, his supporters still represented a strong faction.[113]

Kartanos' *Florilegium* is divided into four parts: 1) a summary of the popular theology (*dogmatica*); 2) a compilation of the Old and New Testament, in which he inserted descriptions of events of ecclesiastical and lay history; 3) nineteen homilies on sins and vices; and 4) an explanation of the Liturgy followed by a paraphrase of the prayer "Our Father." Kartanos wrote his work in vernacular Greek aiming towards a larger audience. Aware as Rousanos about the poor level of religious instruction of the Orthodox, in the prologue of the treatise Kartanos states that the work is written for the instruction of the people.[114] Nevertheless, scholars have pointed out that the style and quality of Kartanos' language is defective.[115] In his work he assembles diverse elements borrowed from both Italian and Greek sources. Elene Kakoulide-Panou argued in favor of an Italian prototype for Kartanos'

1989), 385–400; Elene Kakoulidi-Panou, *Ιωαννίκιος Καρτάνος: Παλαιά τε καὶ Νέα Διαθήκη. [Βενετία 1536]* (Thessaloniki: Kentro Ellenikes Glosas, 2000), 17–90; Michael Jeffreys, "Ioannikios Kartanos *Βιβλίον πάνυ ὠφέλιμον*," *Ἑλληνικά*, 50/1 (2000): 45–53.

[113] E. Kakoulidi-Panou, *Ιωαννίκιος Καρτάνος*, 23.

[114] Knös, *L'histoire de la littérature néo-grecque*, 282.

[115] A. Argyriou, "La Bible dans le monde orthodoxe," 396.

treatise (*Fioretto di tutta la Biblia historiato*).[116] Most of the Biblical references used are taken from apocryphal materials.[117]

Kartanos' endeavor is part of the process of vernacularization of the sacred texts that started in Western Europe, which until that time was unknown to the Eastern Christian world. His work is the first of its kind and became a bestseller in the Greek lands for almost fifty years. The popularity of Kartanos' work over time points to the fact that the Orthodox Greeks were in need of such an enterprise. Kartanos' readers were not only clergymen and laymen, but his work also gained recognition in the monastic milieu. Argyriou named the "kartanite" movement one of the largest popular movements of the Ottoman Greek world.[118] The edition of Kartanos' Florilegium, which was published with revisions in Venice in 1567, was referenced until the eighteenth century.[119]

The fiercest adversary of the "kartanite" movement was Rousanos, who wrote multiple treatises in which he polemicized with the work and teachings of Kartanos. Rousanos' response to the movement emphasizes his concern about the religious instruction of the Orthodox. As a keen reader of the Scriptures and a talented theologian, Rousanos was in favor of the correct understanding of the sacred texts, from which he diligently quoted in his works. The *dossier* of the works in which Rousanos is polemicizing against Kartanos consists of the following treatises: 1) *On the benefit gained from the lecture of the Scriptures* (Περὶ τῆς ἐκ τῶν θείων γραφῶν ὠφελείας); 2) *Homily against those who slander the Holy Scriptures by ignorance* (Ὁμιλία πρὸς τοὺς ἀγροίκως τὴν θείαν Γραφὴν διασύροντας); 3) *On the Kartanite heretics* (Περὶ Καρτανιτῶν αἱρετικῶν); 4) *On the heresy of the Kartanites* (Περὶ τῆς τῶν Καρτανιτῶν αἱρέσεως); 5) *On Kartanos' abominable heresy, it's nonsense and*

---

[116] Kakoulidi-Panou, Ἰωαννίκιος Καρτάνος, 47–50.
[117] Knös, *L'histoire de la littérature néo-grecque*, 282.
[118] A. Argyriou, "La Bible dans le monde orthodoxe," 397.
[119] Ibid., 396–97.

followers (Αἱ τοῦ καταράτου Καρτάνου αἱρέσεις καὶ φληναφίαι καὶ ἡ τούτων ἀνατροπὴ); and

6) *Letter to Athanasios of Naupaktos* (Ἐπιστολὴ Ἀθανασίῳ Ναυπάκτου).[120]

In these works, Rousanos polemicizes against Kartanos on two levels: theology and linguistics, both being intertwined in his arguments. On theological ground, Rousanos is dismissive of Kartanos's explanations of the Trinity, especially the relations between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Hence, Rousanos accuses Kartanos of a form of Arianism and tendency towards pantheism. Rousanos' arguments on the relations between the persons of the Trinity are based on the dogmatic formulations of the Ecumenical Councils, which he also uses when he writes his own systematic treatise on the Orthodox tenets. On the linguistic grounds, Rousanos is a supporter of the *koine* Greek when it comes to the language of the Scriptures. Aware of the process of vernacularization that took off in Western Europe in the first half of the sixteenth century, he dismisses the translation of the Scripture in any of the dialects used by the Greeks. Hence, Rousanos' polemic against Kartanos' work must be understood in the larger European context. His arguments against the vernacularization of the Scriptures in the Greek world are similar to those of the Catholics who were discussing the translation of the Scripture at the Council of Trent (1545–1563) around the same time when Rousanos was polemicizing against Kartanos and his teachings.[121] Rousanos states that *koine* Greek is the source of all Greek dialects spoken in the sixteenth-century Ottoman lands.[122] According to him, the usage of these dialects in the ecclesiastical milieu damages the unity of the Church in an age when unity is of vital

---

[120] On these works see the Introduction.

[121] On the Council of Trent see Hubert Jedin, *A History of the Council of Trent*, vol. 1: *The Struggle for the Council*, trans. Dom Ernest Graf (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1957); Idem, *A History of the Council of Trent*, vol. 2: *The First Sessions at Trent, 1545–1547*, trans. Dom Ernest Graf (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1961). For the last edition of the official papers of the council see K. Ganzer, ed., "Concilium Tridentinum," in *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta: Editio Critica*, vol. 3: *The Oecumenical Councils of the Roman Catholic Church: From Trent to Vatican II (1545–1965)*, ed Giuseppe Alberigo et al. (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), 1–178.

[122] G. Maloney, *A History of Orthodox Theology*, 107.

importance for the survival of Orthodoxy.[123] Moreover, as it happened also in Kartanos' case, any translation may alter the original text in such a way that it can affect the integrity of the tenets. Although Rousanos is aware of the fact that not all the Greeks are speaking *koine*, he believes that with proper instruction this can be achieved. Hence, this language can become a useful tool for a renaissance of the religious and intellectual life of the Orthodox Greek world.

2.4. Conclusion

The themes of Rousanos' polemical works discussed in this chapter are all closely intertwined. The poor level of religious instruction among Greeks is closely connected with the status of monasticism and clergy. The presence of popular religious practices that occur among the Orthodox is a consequence of the ignorance of the priests/monks as well as a result of the absence of proper religious education. Rousanos perceives Orthodoxy as more than a set of tenets formed at the Ecumenical councils. For him, Orthodoxy represents a tradition rooted in specific practices that are also related to a particular linguistic tradition (*koine* Greek). In his works, he polemicizes against any deviations from this tradition that can alter the true spirit of Orthodoxy. Rousanos does not only criticize the ignorance of the monks and clergy, but he also seeks to a revitalize Orthodoxy by raising awareness of the necessity for proper religious instruction. He also attempts to define the boundaries of the Orthodox behavior by appealing to a specific set of authoritative texts that enable him to point to the deviations he observes among monks and clergy. To him, the popular practices that impregnated the religious life of the Greeks and the process of vernacularization of the Scripture constitute a threat to the true Orthodox faith. From the references he makes in various other works, it is clear that Rousanos was aware of the debates transpiring among

---

[123] Ibid.

Catholics and Protestants in Europe; it is less clear whether he was cognizant of how his Muslim contemporaries felt about the issue of popular practices and ignorance of the articles of faith. Be it as it may, his polemical works seem to capture the confessionalizing, orthodoxizing spirit of the "age of confessionalization" much earlier than the early seventeenth century when such tendencies become more common among the Greek Orthodox intellectuals, largely in response to confessions of faith by the controversial, "Protestant" patriarch Cyril Loukaris (d. 1638).

Chapter 3 – Pachomios Rousanos and Islam

Conversion of the Orthodox to Islam was one of the major issues on Rousanos' agenda. Rousanos believed that living under the Muslim rule posed danger to Christian life and dogma, which incited him to raise awareness among the Orthodox about the dangers of conversion. Rousanos also polemicized with Islam in order to define Orthodoxy and its boundaries. As a faithful defender of faith, he presents Islam as Christianity's opposite, arguing for the superiority of the latter. He is the first post-Byzantine intellectual to write an extended polemical treatise against Islam, in which he systematically dealt with its tenets.[124] In his *Apologetic and ethical discourse for those who endure with difficulty the miseries that the pagans are inflicting on us and insult the Divine Providence* (*Λόγος ὑπεραπολογητικὸς καὶ ἠθικὸς πρὸς τοὺς δυσανασχετοῦντας πρὸς τὰς ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπαγομένας ἡμῖν θλίψεις καὶ τὴν Θείαν Πρόνοιαν λοιδοροῦντας*), he is also the first post-Byzantine author who alludes to the *devshirme* system. In the same work, Rousanos denounces Muhammad as a false prophet, saying that he is a deceiver and a seducer of souls.[125] In addition to direct polemics, Rousanos also used the genre of hagiography and martyrology to push back against both Muslims and other Christian groups (Catholics and Protestants). In this chapter I will analyze Rousanos' works that focus on Islam. First, I will deal with two of his hagiographical texts (*The Life of Niketas the Younger* and *The Martyrdom of the Holy Fathers of Strophades*), and then I will turn to Rousanos' treatise against Islam.

---

[124] Rousanos, "Περὶ τῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων καὶ τῶν σαρακηνῶν πίστεως," in *Ὁ Παχώμιος Ῥουσάνος*, 242–65.

[125] Rousanos, "Λόγος ὑπεραπολογητικὸς," 231–35.

3.1. Saints, Orthodoxy and Islam

Martyrdom is the ultimate act of confession of faith. For Christianity, martyrdom is the highest expression of one's religious conviction, as it entails suffering and death for a creed. Early Church fathers emphasized that besides the salvation of a soul, one of the major purposes of martyrdom is to provide an example of behavior that could trigger the conversion of other people.[126] In the era of the persecutions of the early Christians, the number of those who openly preferred martyrdom grew due to the spiritual rewards that were bestowed upon the martyr.[127] The example of martyrs was well received by the early Church, which associated it with sainthood. The lives and narratives on martyrs' deaths were put on paper by various ecclesiastical authors, who incorporated them within the life of the Church. The purpose of the hagiographies was threefold: 1) to teach Christian values; 2) serve a liturgical need; and 3) transmit the martyr's example to the following Christian generations.[128] Along with the freedom that Christians enjoyed after Constantine the Great's recognition of Christianity as a licit religion in 313, the era of early Christian martyrdom ended.

In the late Byzantine/early Ottoman period, martyrdom re-emerged as a complex social and religious movement fuelled by the process of Islamization and conversion to Islam that spanned the fourteenth and eighteenth centuries.[129] Still, in the early modern times,

---

[126] Joyce Ellen Salisbury, *The Blood of Martyrs: Unintended Consequences of Ancient Violence* (London: Routledge, 2004).

[127] On the early Christian martyrdom see Daniel Boyarin, *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism* (Stanford: California 1999); Lucy Grig, *Making Martyrs in Late Antiquity* (London: Duckworth, 2004).

[128] Martin Hinterberger, "Byzantine Hagiography and its Literary Genres: Some Critical Observatios," in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography*, vol. 2: *Genres and Contexts*, ed. Stephanos Efthymiadis (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), 28.

[129] On neomartyrdom see Demetrios Constantelos, "The 'Neomartyrs' as Evidence for Methods and Motives Leading to Conversion and Martyrdom in the Ottoman Empire," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 23 (1978): 216–34; E. Zachariadou, "The Neomartyr's Message," *Kentro Mikrasiatikon Spoudon* 8 (1990-91): 51–63; Nomikos Michael Vaporis, *Witnesses for Christ: Orthodox Christian Neomartyrs of the Ottoman Period, 1437–1860* (Crestwood / New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2000), 1–30; Marios Sariyannis, "Aspects of 'Neomartyrdom': Religious Contacts, 'Blasphemy' and 'Calumny' in 17th-Century Istanbul," *Archivum Ottomanicum* 23 (2005-2006): 249–62; Krstić, *Contested Conversions to Islam*, 121–64; Giorgos Tzedopoulos, *Ορθόδοξοι νεομάρτυρες στην Οθωμανική Αυτοκρατορία: Η συγκρότηση της. πρακτικής και της ερμηνείας του ομολογιακού θανάτου*, PhD Thesis (Athens: Kapodistrian University, 2012).

42

neomartyrdom was not an occurrence limited to the Eastern Christian world. The encounters between Protestantism and Catholicism produced a number of new martyrs as well.[130] In the late Byzantine/early Ottoman era, neomartyrdom was closely linked to the expansion of the Ottomans in the eastern Mediterranean, and the religious confrontations not only between Christians and Muslims, but between different denominations of Muslims, and different denominations of Christians as well. In this context, neomartyrdom was related to confessional polarization in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and it involved Sunni and Shii Muslims, the Orthodox, the Catholics, the Armenians, etc. The importance of neomartyrs for the Orthodox Church under the Ottoman rule has been emphasized by many contemporary Greek theologians.[131] In his introduction to the *Neon martyrologion* published in Venice in 1794, the Athonite monk Nikodemos Hagiorites (fl. 1784-1809), stressed the crucial role of neomartyrs in the renewal of the Orthodox faith. As Hagiorites pointed out, neomartyrs are "the glory and pride of the Eastern Church and the censure and shame of the heterodox."[132]

As in the first centuries of the Christian Church, the purpose of the hagiographies on neomartyrs was pedagogical and liturgical, but they had other functions as well. In the Greek case, the authors often resorted to this genre in order to define the confessional boundaries of Orthodoxy and to highlight what being an Orthodox entailed in the Ottoman world.[133] These hagiographies began to contain more information on Islam than they did during the Byzantine time.[134] For the Greek Orthodoxy, the hagiographies proved to be a powerful instrument in

---

[130] Brad Gregory, *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 5.

[131] See Gennadios Scholarios' homily on neomartyrdom: Scholarios, "Sur la rareté des miracles au temps présent," in *Oeuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*, vol. 3, ed. Mgr. L. Petit, X. A. Sidéridès and M. Jugie (Paris: Maison de la bonne presse, 1930), 368–90.

[132] Nomikos Michael Vaporis, "The Price of Faith: Some Reflections on Nikodemos Hagiorites and His Struggle against Islam, Together with a Translation of the 'Introduction' to His *New Martyrologion*," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 23/3-4 (1978), 194.

[133] T. Krstić, Contested Conversions to Islam, 142.

[134] N. M. Vaporis, *Witnesses for Christ*, 17.

the religious and communal relations with the Catholic or Protestant worlds.[135] The presence of martyrdom among the Orthodox Christian of the Ottoman Empire was a polemical tool against Latin Catholicism, which can be traced to the Byzantine times.[136] Neomartyrdom reached its peak during the seventeenth century, when the literary production of hagiographies rose in number as a consequence of the social and religious encounters between the Orthodox and Muslims.[137] Along with the publication of Hagiorites' work, stories about neomartyrs had a wide circulation and distribution among the Christian subjects of the Ottoman Empire. Wandering monks were the main agents of dissemination of both hagiographies and ideas meant to highlight the way an Orthodox ready to receive martyrdom should behave.[138]

As a genre, the hagiography of neomartyrs was based on its Byzantine literary legacy. The Byzantine hagiography supplied the Orthodox world with a large corpus of texts, which influenced the development of the genre in the post-Byzantine period. Hagiography is a complex genre that involves several formats (*vita*s, *passio*s, translations of relics, collections of miracles, etc.). For the post-Byzantine times, the most common forms of hagiography are *passio* and *akoluthia*. A *passio* narrates the death of a person sentenced to death for confessing his/her Christian faith. According to Hinterberger, the template of a *passio* is composed of three elements: 1) a location under the rule of a non-Christian ruler who persecutes Christians; 2) a theological debate between the saint and a non-Christian official; and 3) a detailed description of the physical torments of the saint.[139] To these elements, a saint's biography may be included in the *incipit*. *Akoluthia*, on the other hand, represent church services written in strophes for the commemoration of saints.[140] In most cases, the

---

[135] T. Krstić, *Contested Conversions to Islam*, 134–35.
[136] Ibid, 138.
[137] M. Sariyannis, "Aspects of 'Neomartyrdom'," 121.
[138] A. Fotić, "Athonite Travelling Monks," 160,
[139] M. Hinterberger, "Byzantine Hagiography," 28.
[140] Ibid. 35

akoluthia are based on a saint's life (*vita*).[141] For the post-Byzantine period, the audience of these hagiographies has been the focus of any thorough examination. Still, considering the Byzantine case, I suggest that these texts were usually written for a large audience, and shaped according to the society and the milieu in which they originated. Hagiographical texts are not confined just to a specific period or location, but, as Efthymiades and Kalogeras have argued, they were meant to transcend the boundaries of space and time and to affect the spiritual life of Christians across the ages and regions.[142] Written usually in a simple style and language, hagiographical texts aimed to satisfy the spiritual needs of the Christian communities. The performance of these texts did not serve just a liturgical purpose, but in the post-Byzantine world it was used also in non-ecclesiastical spaces, and served evident propagandistic purpose. Rousanos used hagiography as a vehicle for polemics. Aware of the impact that hagiographies have on the people without a thorough religious instruction, Rousanos took advantage of hagiography in order to provide for the Orthodox examples of Christian behavior and to polemicize against Islam and other religious groups.

The first of his texts I will discuss is *The Life of Niketas the Younger*, which Rousanos extracted from an unknown Sinaxarion in an abbreviated form.[143] Apparently, he is not the author of the work; instead, Theodore Mouzalon (d. 1294), the first great *logothete* under Emperor Andronikos II, was suggested as the author of the life.[144] The *Life* is a *passio* and begins by providing the audience with general information on the saint's life. Nothing is known about Niketas, except from the information provided in the text. The adjective the "younger" attributed to him, points to one of the specific features of neomartyrdom. Commonly, most of the new saints that carried the name of an already known saint received

---

[141] Ibid.
[142] Stephanos Efthymiadis and Nikos Kalogeras, "Audience, Language and Patronage in Byzantine Hagiography," in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography*, vol. 2: *Genres and Contexts*, ed. Stephanos Efthymiadis (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), 247.
[143] For the edition of the text see Rousanos, "Ἄθλησις τοῦ ἁγίου μάρτυρος Νικήτα τοῦ νέου," 208–11.
[144] Vitalien Laurent, "Notes critiques sur de récentes publications," *Échos d'Orient* 31 (1932): 113–14.

also the denomination the "young" or the "new" in order to be distinguished from their namesakes.[145]

The life of Niketas is not lengthy, but it contains all the features of a polemical hagiographical text. According to the *Life*, Niketas' birth name was Theodore. He grew up in Ankyra of Galatia (Anatolia) around 1300, during the reign of the Seljuk Sultan Masʿūd II (1282-1307). In the text a reference appears to an emperor named Andronikos, which may point to the Byzantine Emperor Andronikos II (1282-1328), rendering the time frame as 1282 to 1307.[146] As customary for the members of the clergy, when he was ordained lecturer, Theodore changed his name to Niketas, in honor of the martyr Nicetas the Goth. When he was twenty years old, he travelled to Nyssa in Cappadocia accompanied by two merchants to visit his maternal aunt, his sister and her husband. When they arrived in Nyssa it was the month of Ramadan and they were seen drinking wine inside the city. Niketas and the merchants were caught and brought before a *mukhtār*, who started to interrogate them on their deed. Niketas' line of defensw revolved around the prohibition against wine, arguing that it was something new, and not a practice that Christians were supposed to practice like Muslims. When Niketas called Muhammad a false prophet, the *mukhtār* became angry and ordered him to be whipped, and then condemned him to death at the stake along with the two merchants.

Further, the text informs us that a large assembly of Muslim locals came together at the execution spot and tortured Niketas with sharp knives. The Muslim gathering offered them the oportunity of renouncing Christianity in order to save their lives, which the two merchants accepted, but Niketas declined, preferring martyrdom instead. According to the story, Niketas suffered martyrdom on the very day of the feast of saint Niketas the Goth, his name patron. Present at the place of execution, his aunt was begging him to save his life.

---

[145] G. Schlumberger, "Le martyre du saint Nicétas le jeune," 208.
[146] Max Ritter, "Life of Nicetas the Younger," in *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History*, vol. 5: *(1350-1500)*, ed. David Thomas and Alex Mallett (Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2013), 709–11.

Niketas' refusal was followed at the moment of his martyrdom by an anathemization of the Prophet Muhammad and Islam, and a prayer to Christ. When his parents learned of the events that occurred with Niketas, they travelled to Nyssa and gathered his remains into an recipient. In the presence of the bishop of Koloneia, they buried Niketas in the church of saint Gregory of Nyssa.[147]

The story perfectly fits the framework of a post-Byzantine hagiographical text. Providing at first brief information on the biography of Niketas, the story narrates the encounter between the saint and a Muslim official that resulted in a polemical discussion over Islamic customs. Also, the passage in *Life* when Niketas denigrates Prophet Muhammad's name reflects the Orthodox ideas about Islam as set forward by the Byzantine polemicists, such as John of Damascus and John Kantakouzenos did before him. Although the style and the language of the text are simple and abundant in tropes, it provides information on the condition of the Christian communities in Anatolia around 1300. The main cause of Niketas' martyrdom is his disregard for Ramadan, and the differing Muslim customs. His defiance of Islam led to his public execution, which was ordered by the Turkish official and executed by the Muslim mob of the city. As Ritter pointed out "the text bears witness to the importance of martyrdom for the identity and self-assurance of the Orthodox communities in Muslim Anatolia, and draws a sharp line between the Muslim authorities and population and the Christians of the area."[148]

This text must have been important for Rousanos as it narrates a perfect example of a Christian martyrdom in "Turkish" lands. The intended audience of this hagiographical text was confined to the Orthodox people within the Ottoman Empire. I argue that because of its abreviated form, this *Life* must have also served a liturgical purpose, by being used at the service and read inside the Church. Furthermore, Niketas was a member of the lower clergy;

---

[147] G. Schlumberger, "Le martyre du saint Nicétas le jeune," 211.
[148] Ibid., 711.

47

hence, considering also Rousanos' criticism of clergy and monasticism, I believe that he also aimed to provide the priests and monks with the perfect example of behavior that a member of the clergy or monastic community should have towards the Muslim threat. The steadiness in the Orthodox faith against all threats is perceived by Rousanos as one of the remedies to combat the high rate of conversion to Islam, which was peaking in the first half of the sixteenth century.

The next hagiographical text authored by Rousanos is an *akolouthia* (liturgical service) dedicated to the monks who suffered martyrdom in islands of Strophades under Ottomans.[149] The text is composed in the form of a canon. The canon contains nine odes (each containing around four strophes), a *kontakion* and a brief synaxarion. Background information provided by the text regarding the identity of the martyrs is very limited. The historical context in which Rousanos wrote this text revolves around the political dynamics between the Ottomans and the Venetian Republic. In 1537, the Sultan declared war against Venice in order to occupy Corfu. The failures of diplomatic relations between the two polities led to an Ottoman attack on the island. Being unsuccessful in its military campaign against Corfu, the Ottoman fleet turned towards other islands in its vicinity. Hence, the islands of Strophades were pillaged by the Ottoman army. The Orthodox monastery of Strophades suffered severe damage, and its monks were killed by the Ottoman soldiers. It is known that after the disaster the monastery was rebuilt.[150] The date of Rousanos' text in commemoration of the martyred holy monks can be placed after 1537. The editor of the text, Eutychios Sarmanes, argued in favor the year 1538.[151]

As the *Life* of Niketas, the audience of the text is represented by the Orthodox flock, its clergy and the monastic communities. The style of the *akoluthia* meets the requirements of the Byzantine hymnography, as the text was intended mainly for a liturgical performance,

---

[149] Rousanos, "Ἀκολουθία ψαλλομένη εἰς τοὺς ὁσίους πατέρας τοὺς ἐν Στροφάσιν ἀναιρεθέντας," 269–83.
[150] E. Sarmanes, "Ἀκολουθία τῶν Στροφάσιν ἀναιρεθέντων ὁσίων πατερῶν," 266–67.
[151] Ibid., 266.

being sang and recited during the feast day of the martyrs (September 29). Rousanos had also a didactic purpose with this text. In order to uphold them as an example of true monastic behavior, he filled his text with praise towards the martyrs, fulfilling at the same time a requirement of the genre. The virtues of the monks who endured hardships under the attack are contrasted in the text with a tough portrayal of the Ottomans. In this case, Rousanos' *akolouthia* represents his first attempt to contrast the Muslim way of life with that of the Orthodox, on which he will elaborate later in his polemical treatise against Islam.

Considering the long *durée* of the relations between the Ottomans and the Orthodox Christians, the phenomenon of neomartyrdom transformed along the centuries. As Zachariadou pointed out in her seminal article on neomartyrdom, the Church of Constantinople condoned crypto-Christianity as a survival strategy against the Ottoman threat during the fourteenth-century. Nevertheless, in the eighteenth-century, Nikodemos Hagiorites highlights the fact that martyrdom for Christ must be sought by a true Christian.[152] ,How can Rousanos' hagiographical works be understood within this evolving attitude of the Orthodox church vis-à-vis neomartyrdom? Rousanos was not openly promoting martyrdom as later post-Byzantine hagiographers did; instead his awareness towards conversion to Islam made him integrate hagiography as part of his agenda in order to reach a wider audience. For instance, although at first his *akoluthia* on the fathers of Strophades had a regional character, later the feast of these saints was officially recognized by the Orthodox Church along with Rousanos' hagiographic text.[153]

---

[152] E. Zachariadou, "The Neomartyr's Message," 55 and 58.
[153] Dionyses Flemotomos, "Μιὰ λογοτεχνικὴ ἀνάγνωση τῆς Ἀκολουθίας τοῦ Παχωμίου Ρουσάνου εἰς τοὺς ἐν Στροφάσιν ἀναιρεθέντας Ὁσίους Πατέρας," in *Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος. 450 χρόνια ἀπὸ τὴν κοίμησή του*, 399–420.

3.2. Rousanos and his treatise against Islam

The post-Byzantine polemical literature against Islam was deeply rooted in the Byzantine anti-Islamic literary tradition. Conscious about this tradition, post-Byzantine authors made use of the already existing anti-Islamic Christian texts when building their own arguments.[154] Still, under Ottoman rule, Christian Greek polemicists were facing challenges of a newly emerging political landscape in the eastern Mediterranean and, therefore, the polemical literary production also came to develop its own specific features in terms of authorship, audience, style and argumentative structure. Most of the post-Byzantine polemical treatises that deal with Islam are anonymous. Often their authors also incorporate polemics against Catholics in order to draw the audience's attention also to the pitfalls of Catholicism, which by the early seventeenth century figured as the second most serious challenge to Orthodoxy in the Ottoman Empire due to extensive Catholic missionary presence in the region.[155]

Pachomios Rousanos was the first theologian of the post-Byzantine period who set out to write a systematic refutation of the Islamic tenets and customs. The title of his treatise *On the Faith of the Orthodox and of the Saracens* (*Περὶ τῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων καὶ τῶν σαρακηνῶν πίστεως*) is very suggestive of Rousanos' intentions. The editor of the text, the Church historian and philologist Ioannes Karmires, places the treatise among Rousanos'

[154] For an overview of the post-Byzantine polemical literature against Islam see A. Argyriou, "La littérature grecque post-byzantine de polémique et d'apologétique l'adresse de l'Islam," In *Actes du IIe Congrès international des études du sud-est européen (Athènes, 7-13 mai 1970)*, vol. 5: *Linguistique et literature*, ed. Titos Jochalas (Athens, 1978), 747–55; A. Argyriou, "La littérature greque de polémique et d'apologétique à l'adresse de l'Islam au XVe siècle." *Byzantinische Forschungen* 12 (1987): 253–77; A. Argyriou, "Ἡ ἑλληνικὴ πολεμικὴ καὶ ἀπολογητικὴ γραμματεία ἔναντι τοῦ Ἰσλὰμ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους τῆς Τουρκοκρατίας," *Θεολογία* 1 (2013): 133–65.

[155] For instance, this is the case in the enormously popular treatise of Anastasios Gordios. For an edition of the text see Gordios, "Σύγγραμμα περὶ Μωάμεθ καὶ κατὰ τῶν Λατίνων" in *Anastasios Gordios (1654/5-1729). Sur Mahomet et contre les Latins / Ἀναστασίου τοῦ Γορδίου (1654/5-1729). Σύγγραμμα περί Μωάμεθ και κατά των Λατίνων*, ed A. Argyriou, Hetaireia Stereoelladikōn Meletōn, Keimena kai Meletai 3 (Athens, 1983), 29–120. See also Asterios Argyriou, "Anastasios Gordios et la polémique anti-islamique post-byzantine," *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 43/1 (1969): 58–87.

dogmatic writings.[156] The approach Rousanos is using is new: observing the growing pressure to conversion to Islam among the Orthodox, he decides to discuss in parallel the main features of Orthodoxy as opposed to those of Islam, arguing for the superiority of the former. As Argyriou emphasized, Rousanos' innovation is that he is the first polemicist who approaches Orthodox Christianity and Islam in a comparative manner.[157] Furthermore, Rousanos is among the few post-Byzantine authors who inscribed his name on the treatise, thereby assuming responsibility for any kind of backlash he might face from the Muslim side.[158]

The date of the composition of the treatise is unknown, but in the introduction Rousanos alludes to some of his other dogmatic writings, which made Karmires suggest that the treatise was composed around 1550.[159] Also from the introduction, the reader discovers that the addressee of the treatise is a certain Christian intellectual, who seems to be an intimate friend of the author, who was seduced by "the poison of the serpent" (i.e. Islamic doctrine).[160] It is clear that this fellow Christian was not yet a convert to Islam, but it appears that he was inclined to become one. A debate emerged over the identity of the addressee among scholars. While some scholars suggested that the treatise is addressed to a certain Lesbios, others believed that in fact the treatise is addressed to more than one individual.[161] Still, the possibility of a fictional addressee must not be excluded. One of Rousanos' purposes was to combat the process of conversion to Islam and therefore the treatise was meant to highlight the dangers of converting, as well as to provide a first-hand systematic refutation of the Islamic tenets that could have been used as a teaching and reference material. In my opinion, the recipient could have been fictive, and creating a fictional addressee could have

---

[156].I. Karmires, Ὁ Παχώμιος Ῥουσάνος, 48–49.
[157] A. Argyriou, "Pachomios Roussanos et l'Islam," 155.
[158] Ibid.
[159] I. Karmires, Ὁ Παχώμιος Ῥουσάνος, 49.
[160] A. Argyriou, "Pachomios Roussanos et l'Islam," 155.
[161] See the discussion at Ibid.

been one of Rousanos' literary devices through which he attempted to lend more credibility to his endeavor.

Regarding its structure, the treatise is divided into four parts. In the introduction, Rousanos explains the reasons which drove him to write the treatise (i.e. conversion to Islam). He speaks about the addressee, outlines the contents and briefly indicates few of his sources. The first part of the treatise is apologetic in its content. Rousanos presents the Christian doctrine on God, as Creator of all seen and unseen, and on the Trinity and Christ while he enumerates the arguments against these Christian doctrines as presented in the Qur'an. The second part of the treatise is most polemical in tone. This part is dedicated to a comparison between Islam and Orthodoxy, between the Prophet Mohammed and Christ, between the Gospel and the Qur'an, and between Christian and Muslim morality. In the conclusion, Rousanos proclaims his attachment to faith in Christ, who opposes Muhammad, the Antichrist. This treatise must have been well received by the Orthodox communities, as the number of surviving manuscripts is not insignificant (copies exist in Oxford, Venice, Milan, and Mount Athos).

The sources Rousanos is using are numerous. They can be divided into two main corpora: 1) the Scriptures, and 2) the previous anti-Islamic works of Byzantine authors. As mentioned above, Biblical references are abundant in Rousanos' works. Due to the fact that he became very involved in polemics over the usage of the Scripture by the Orthodox and argued in favor of its utility, the present treatise contains no less than fifty Biblical quotations from both Old and New Testaments. In Rousanos' opinion, the Scriptures constitute the basis for any type of dogmatic argumentation. An interesting fact is that the second part of the treatise, dedicated to the comparison between Islam and Christianity, does not contain any Biblical quotations. The Scriptural references are replaced by the Qur'anic ones. As Asterios

Argyriou remarked, the difference between the two parts of the treatise is driven by the usage of sources rather than style.[162]

In the first part of the treatise, Rousanos uses extensively the four *Apologies* against Islam of the emperor-monk John Kantakouzenos.[163] He closely follows Kantakouzenos' argumentation when he attempts to refute the Qur'anic arguments against Trinity (i.e. against the Christian monotheism) and the divinity of Christ. Rousanos considered Kantakouzenos as an authority in matters of polemic. Clearly, in the late Byzantine period the *Apologies* garnered an influence and authority in the Orthodox world. In the post-Byzantine period, Kantakouzenos' works also acquired a certain degree of authority among the Orthodox people.[164] As Argyriou argues, beside this major source, Rousanos uses the works of renowned Byzantine polemicists such as John of Damascus (*The Fountain of Knowledge*), Niketas Byzantios (*Refutation of the Qur'an*), and Euthymios Zigabenos (*The Dogmatic Panoply*), but on a smaller scale.[165] This first part of Rousanos' treatise highlights one of the new features of the anti-Islamic polemical literature. Because of the political landscape, the post-Byzantine polemists tended to develop apologetic arguments even more than during the Byzantine period, when the tone of the treatises was mostly centered on dismissing Islam as a heresy. During this time, intellectuals like Pachomios Rousanos and Anastasios Gordios depart from the views of Byzantine polemists as John of Damascus, perceiving Islam not as a Christian heresy, but as a faith that has its own set of tenets, customs and adherents.

---

[162] Ibid., 156.

[163] For Kantakouzenos' *Apologies* see Kantakouzenos, "Ἀπολογίαι," in *Johannes Kantakuzenos. Christentum und Islam. Apologetische und polemische Schriften*, ed by Karl Förstel (Altenberge: Oros Verlag, 2005). For an analysis of Kantakouzenos' polemic against Islam see Klaus-Peter Todt, *Kaiser Johannes VI. Kantakouzenos und der Islam: Politische Realität und theologische Polemik im palaiologenzeitlischen Byzanz* (Würzburg / Altenberge: Echter / Oros Verlag, 1991).

[164] In the sixteenth century, the monk Meletios Syrigos (1586-1664) re-wrote Kantakouzenos' *Apologies* for a Greek audience. Also the *Apologies* have been translated in the fifteenth century into middle Bulgarian Church Slavonic, and in Romanian in 1669. See Klaus-Peter Todt, "John VI Cantacuzenus," in *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History*, vol. 5: *(1350-1500)*, ed. David Thomas and Alex Mallett (Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2013), 176.

[165] A. Argyriou, "Pachomios Roussanos et l'Islam," 157.

In the second part of the treatise, Rousanos bases his entire argumentation against the Qur'anic doctrine on only one source, which is the *Refutation of the Qur'an* (*Contra Legem Sarracenorum*) of the Dominican, Riccoldo da Monte di Croce (*c.* 1243-1320).[166] Rousanos did not know Arabic, so his knowledge of the Qur'an was almost entirely based on Riccoldo's work and his own experience gained from his interactions with Muslims. Indeed, Riccoldo's work, written around 1300, was translated into various languages, among which in Greek around 1360 by Demetrios Kydones.[167] Riccoldo's work became widely-known and authoritative source for most of the polemicists who wrote against Islam up to the end of the early modern period, since Riccoldo was one of the few Christian polemicists who knew Arabic, studied the Qur'an and other works of Islamic theology and, therefore, provided first-hand information on Islamic tenets and customs.

Rousanos might have had direct access to the Greek translation of Riccoldo's work. The Greek text of the *Refutation of the Qur'an* is preserved in several codices from Mount Athos (e.g. Vatopediou gr. 658; Lavra gr. 1854).[168] Rousanos borrowed his Qur'anic references from Riccoldo's work in its Greek translation and also the titles of the *surah*s and their Greek translation. Moreover, most of the anti-Islamic criticisms set forward by Rousanos in this part of the treatise are following the argumentative line of Riccoldo. Thus all this might seem to point to the conclusion that Rousanos' personal contributions to this part of the treatise are minimal; however, he did not use Riccoldo's work in a servile manner, but rather selectively, since his treatise is much shorter than Montecroce's. Nonetheless, it is not unusual that Rousanos chose this treatise as his main source: later Byzantine polemists such as John Kantakouzenos and Manouel Palaiologos also used Riccoldo's treatise in its Greek version as a primary source for their own works.

---

[166] Ibid., 157. For Riccoldo's life and works see Rita George-Tvrtković, *A Christian Pilgrim in Medieval Iraq: Riccoldo da Montecroce's Encounter with Islam* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012).

[167] Franz Tinnefeld, "Demetrius Cydones," in *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History*, vol. 5: (*1350-1500*), ed. David Thomas and Alex Mallett (Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2013), 241–42.

[168] For a list of manuscripts see Ibid., 243.

In the introduction Rousanos asks himself why the Orthodox people are mostly passive when it comes to their religion, while the Muslims are willing to do everything for theirs.[169] Rousanos argues that only the illiterate and poor are converting to Islam, indirectly alluding to the social and economic advantages available for the converts in the Ottoman world.[170] To Rousanos this is a curious thing because in the medieval times Muslims were apostatizing from Islam in order to convert to the Orthodox faith.[171] In the body of the treatise Rousanos especially elaborates the Trinitarian and Christological dogmas, as these were most contested by the Muslims. Also, it is these two tenets that constitute the foundation of Orthodoxy. Therefore, Rousanos tries to delineate the boundaries of the Orthodox faith by providing a correct exposition on the Trinity and Christ, polemicizing with the Islamic arguments stipulated by the Qur'an. In his attempt to explain the Trinitarian relations, Rousanos is following the Nicene Creed, stating that God created the universe by his Word (*Logos*) and his Spirit, who existed in him hypostatically.[172] During the medieval and early modern periods, the agenda of most of the Muslim polemists included a harsh criticism of the Trinity, accusing Christians of polytheism. Rousanos is arguing against precisely that, showing that God is one in Person but three in his manifestations (the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit).[173] Picking up from the Muslim surahs, Rousanos emphasizes in his treatise that the Son and the Spirit are referenced in the Qur'an.[174]

Regarding the Christological dogma, Rousanos mainly discusses two aspects: 1) the divinity of Christ, contested by the Qur'an; and 2) the Divine Incarnation of Christ as human. Rousanos emphasizes that the birth of Christ from the Virgin did not alter in any way his divinity. Obviously, Rousanos was arguing about the divine and human natures of Christ

---

[169] Rousanos, "Περὶ τῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων," 243.
[170] Ibid.
[171] Ibid.
[172] Ibid, 244.
[173] Ibid, 246–247.
[174] Ibid, 258.

doctrine, formulated in 451 A.D. at the Chalcedonian Church Council, which clearly stated that Christ is not *of* two natures but *in* two natures.[175] Further, regarding Christ's sacrifice at the Cross, Rousanos mentions that for the Christians it represents the foundation of their faith. Saying that Christ is not the Son of God, and, therefore, of divine in nature, is a blasphemy against Orthodox doctrine.[176] In his arguments on the divinity of Christ, Rousanos argued that the Apostles were witnesses for its presence in Christ's person.[177]

The second part of the treatise emphasizes more the differences between Orthodoxy and Islam. Rousanos starts by dismissing the Muslim claims according to which Muhammad's coming was foretold by the prophets of the Old Testament.[178] According to his argumentation, Islam is not a divinely inspired religion as Orthodoxy, whose founder is Christ, the one who has been mentioned by the prophets. Rousanos continues by disconnecting Muhammad's lineage from Abraham, underlining the fact that the Prophet was a simple Arab, a descendant of Ishmael who did not receive Abraham's blessing as his stepbrother Isaac did.[179] Following well-known arguments, Rousanos contests the presence of miracles in Islam by comparing the deeds of Muhammad with those of Christ. The abundance of miracles performed by Christ was witnessed by the Apostles, and recorded in the Holy Scriptures. Regarding the difference between the Christian Scriptures and the Qur'an, Rousanos polemicizes against the divine inspiration of the latter. While the Gospel and the prophetic books were preserved by people from all over the world in all languages, the Qur'an is written only in Arabic and, therefore, inaccessible to most people.[180] The Qur'an is not divinely inspired, as Muhammad is a pseudo-prophet.[181] Rising against Muslim claims

---

[175] For the *tomos* of the Chalcedonian Council see Giuseppe Alberigo et al., eds., *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta: Editio Critica*, vol. 1: *The Oecumenical Councils from Nicaea I to Nicaea II (325–787)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), 119–151.
[176] Rousanos, "Περὶ τῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων," 251.
[177] Ibid, 254.
[178] Ibid. 260.
[179] Ibid, 258.
[180] Ibid, 263.
[181] Ibid, 262–263.

that the Gospels were altered through the process of translation, Rousanos questions the Qur'an, arguing that it is a corrupted work and it is not preserved entirely. The Qur'an contradicts itself on many occasions.[182] For instance, in one place the Qur'an affirms that the Jews and the Christians are saved people, but in another only Muslims are those who are going to be redeemed.[183] Further, Rousanos argues that many of the Qur'anic teachings are lies (e.g. Muhammad divided the moon; the man was created through leaches; the explanation of the prohibition of wine and pork).

Regarding the Muslim and Orthodox customs, Rousanos criticizes the reason for which Muslims are following very strictly specific laws. He asserts that Muslims are blindly keeping their customs because Muhammad ordered them so, without having any reasoning behind their deeds, while the Christian customs (fasting, praying) are rooted in Christ's goodness.[184] In order to show the moral superiority of the Orthodox customs over those of Islam, Rousanos insists on the Qur'anic prescriptions regarding polygamy, marriage and divorce, by making a brief allusion to the exuberant sexuality of Muhammad, which is contrasted by the holiness of Christ.[185] From this point of view, Rousanos argues against Muslim claims that Islam is an easy-to-practice law, stating that the Qur'anic prescriptions regarding circumcision, consumption of wine, and prayers are heavy and the number of those who are truly following them strictly is low. Concerning the Orthodox customs, Rousanos emphasizes that Christ gave to the Christians a flexible law that is easy to keep and beneficial to the soul.[186]

---

[182] Ibid, 263.
[183] Ibid. 259.
[184] Ibid., 262.
[185] Ibid., 264.
[186] Ibid.

3.3. Conclusion

Concerned with the spiritual well-being of his fellow Orthodox Christians, Rousanos very carefully structured his material and treatises in ways that responded to the realities of his time. Regarding Islam, Rousanos was aware of the danger that conversion to Islam posed for his fellow Greeks and focused on this problem in many of his writings. When writing against Islam, Rousanos sought to reach a wide audience through different genres: hagiography, homilies, and polemical treatises. His works on neomartyrdom and Islam were meant to offer a model of true Orthodox behavior. Although Rousanos was not trained in Islamic theology, he managed to write about it following arguments put forth by renowned medieval polemists, and, at the same time, to study Islam directly in everyday life. He tried to revitalize the Orthodox faith and to define the boundaries of Orthodoxy against Islam by emphasizing the "deficiencies" of the latter compared to the revealed character of the former. As in his writings on Greeks, he appeals to tradition and associates Orthodoxy with a tradition of writing against Islam that began with John of Damascus and was developed by other polemists during the Byzantine times. Later post-Byzantine Greek polemists were indirectly influenced by his approach and might have considered Rousanos' side-by-side treatise as a template for their own.[187]

---

[187] A. Argyriou, "Pachomios Roussanos et l'Islam," 154.

Conclusion and Considerations for Further Research

This thesis is a contribution to the field of post-Byzantine Greek intellectual history as well as of that of Eastern Christian Studies. Pachomios Rousanos is one of the most renowned yet still understudied intellectuals of the post-Byzantine period. Very polemical in his approach, his works include a wide range of texts and genres. Writing in a period of intense confessional polarization, Rousanos is concerned with defining the boundaries of Orthodoxy and of the proper orthodox behavior of his co-religionists. Writing during the in the first half of the sixteenth century, he is alarmed by the pace of conversion to Islam and attempts to raise awareness among the Orthodox Greeks about the dangers of abandoning their faith. In order to do so, Rousanos is constantly defining and redefining the boundaries of O/orthodoxy in his writings by polemicizing against all the threats to the integrity of Orthodoxy coming from both inside and outside. Among the inside factors, he is particularly critical of uneducated and worldly-minded monks and clergy, the presence of popular religious practices in the Church, and the poor level of religious instruction. He perceives these issues as intertwined and of vital importance for the survival of Orthodoxy in the Ottoman Empire. Writing against Islam, Rousanos is using neomartyrologies in order to provide the people with examples of true Orthodox behavior in confrontation with apostasy. His systematic treatise against Islam shows puts the Orthodox and Muslim tenets and practices side-by-side, arguing for the intellectual and spiritual superiority of Orthodoxy.

The analysis of Rousanos' works on the Orthodox Greeks and Islam shows that he perceives Orthodoxy as more than a set of tenets that have been officially sanctioned by the Church through the Ecumenical Councils. To him, Orthodoxy is a tradition deeply rooted in specific practices which also extend to a linguistic tradition (*koine* Greek). Moreover,

Rousanos makes use of many authoritative texts and authors in his works in order to create a framework of argumentation. When discussing monasticism and clergy, Rousanos uses as sources texts of unquestionable authority that have been written in the formative period of Byzantine monasticism. For building his argumentation against the Islamic doctrines and practices, Rousanos turns to the polemical treatises written by the Byzantine polemists before him.

Placed alongside his contemporaries, Rousanos does not seem an atypical post-Byzantine intellectual at first sight. He is interested in the same ideas regarding the Orthodox communities and the Church as his contemporaries are. Rousanos is basically writing on the same issues, seeking to understand and to propose remedies in order to solve them. Still, his works are differentiating from those of his contemporaries in terms of content, quantity and quality. Regarding the content, in his works Rousanos incorporates various topics that are intertwined in his understanding of the matters. As well, Rousanos' writings are more polemical and problem-oriented in content than those of his contemporaries. He is not only an author who points to the problems he observes, but produces an analysis of them seeking to provide his audience with answers for solving those problems. Quantity-wise, Rousanos' writings are mostly short and belong to a wide range of genres. He is one of the few post-Byzantine intellectuals who embraced a global religious framework in his texts. Qualitatively, Rousanos distinguishes himself as an author who made extensive use of sources to sustain his arguments beside his critical spirit of observation of the religious phenomena occurring during his time and the situations he encountered in his travels.

As many scholars of the post-Byzantine period signaled, a comprehensive analysis of all Rousanos' texts is a must for understanding the complex period in which he lived and worked. Rousanos is not an interesting figure only for the scholars of the Orthodox Greek

world, but also for those of Eastern Christian and Ottoman studies as well. While Rousanos'
texts are preserved in manuscripts all around Europe and the Holy Land, historiography still
lacks proper modern editions of his corpus. As this thesis hopefully showed, such an
undertaking is necessary, as Rousanos' works promise to shed much needed light on a period
of complex religious transformations in the eastern Mediterranean.

.

Bibliography

A. Sources

Alberigo, Giuseppe, et al. eds. *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta: Editio Critica*. Vol. 1: *The Oecumenical Councils from Nicaea I to Nicaea II (325–787).* Turnhout: Brepols, 2006.

Diether Roderich Reinsch. *Kritoboulos Imbriotae Historiae*. Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 22. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1983.

Dositheos of Jerusalem. "Ὁμολογίας." In *Τὰ δογματικὰ καὶ συμβολικὰ μνημεία τῆς ὀρθοδόξου καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας*. Vol. 2. Second edition. Edited by Ioannes Karmires, 826–53. Graz: Akademische Druck, 1968.

Ganzer, K. ed. "Concilium Tridentinum." In *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta: Editio Critica*. Vol. 3: *The Oecumenical Councils of the Roman Catholic Church: From Trent to Vatican II (1545–1965)*. Edited by Giuseppe Alberigo et al., 1–178. Turnhout: Brepols, 2010.

Gordios, Anastasios. "Σύγγραμμα περὶ Μωάμεθ καὶ κατὰ τῶν Λατίνων." In *Anastasios Gordios (1654/5-1729). Sur Mahomet et contre les Latins / Ἀναστασίου του Γορδίου (1654/5-1729). Σύγγραμμα περί Μωάμεθ και κατά των Λατίνων*. Hetaireia Stereoelladikōn Meletōn, Keimena kai Meletai 3. Edited by Asterios Argyriou, 29–120. Athens: 1983.

Kantakouzenos, John. "Ἀπολογίαι." In *Johannes Kantakuzenos. Christentum und Islam. Apologetische und polemische Schriften*. Corpus Islamo-Christianum, Series Graeca 6. Edited by Karl Förstel, 1–177. Altenberge: Oros Verlag, 2005.

Rousanos, Pachomios. "Πρὸς τοὺς ἑλληνίζοντας καὶ τοὺς τὰ θεῖα μυστήρια βεβηλοῦντας, καὶ ὅτι οὐ δεῖ προσέχειν τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀσεβέσιν οὖσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς εὐσεβέσιν, κἂν ὀλίγοι ὦσι." Edited by Spyridon Lampros in "Ἀνέκδοτος λόγος Παχωμίου τοῦ Ῥουσάνου περὶ δεισιδαιμονιῶν καὶ προλήψεων κατὰ τὸν ΙΣΤ΄ αἰώνα." *Δελτίον τῆς Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος* 1 (1883): 105–12.

Rousanos, Pachomios. "Περὶ τῆς ἐκ τῶν θείων γραφῶν ὠφελείας καὶ ὅτι οὐκ αἴτιοι οἱ ταύτας συγγραψάμενοι τῆς ἀσαφείας, ἀλλ' ἡ ἡμετέρα ἀμάθεια καὶ ἀφέλεια, καὶ περὶ διδασκάλων." In *Κανέλλου Σπανού, Γραμματική της κοινής των Ελλήνων Γλώσση. Παχωμίου Ρουσάνου, Κατά χυδαϊζόντων και αιρετικών και άλλα του αυτού*. Edited by Ioannes Basilikos, 55–77. Tergeste: Typois tou Austriakou Loud, 1908.

Rousanos, Pachomios. "Περὶ Καρτανιτῶν αἱρετικῶν." In *Κανέλλου Σπανού, Γραμματική της κοινής των Ελλήνων Γλώσση. Παχωμίου Ρουσάνου, Κατά χυδαϊζόντων και αιρετικών και άλλα του αυτού*. Edited by Ioannes Basilikos, 77–80. Tergeste: Typois tou Austriakou Loud, 1908.

Rousanos, Pachomios. "Περὶ τῆς τῶν Καρτανιτῶν αἱρέσεως." In *Κανέλλου Σπανού, Γραμματική της κοινής των Ελλήνων Γλώσση. Παχωμίου Ρουσάνου, Κατά χυδαϊζόντων και αιρετικών και άλλα του αυτού.* Edited by Ioannes Basilikos, 80–81. Tergeste: Typois tou Austriakou Loud, 1908.

Rousanos, Pachomios. "Αἱ τοῦ καταράτου Καρτάνου αἱρέσεις καὶ φληναφίαι καὶ ἡ τούτων ἀνατροπὴ," In *Κανέλλου Σπανού, Γραμματική της κοινής των Ελλήνων Γλώσση. Παχωμίου Ρουσάνου, Κατά χυδαϊζόντων και αιρετικών και άλλα του αυτού.* Edited by Ioannes Basilikos, 81–115. Tergeste: Typois tou Austriakou Loud, 1908.

Rousanos, Pachomios. "Ὁμιλία πρὸς τοὺς ἀγροίκως τὴν θείαν Γραφὴν διασύροντας." Edited by Spyridon Lampros in "Ἐκ τῶν Ὁμιλιῶν τοῦ Παχωμίου Ῥουσάνου." *Νέος Ἑλληνομνήμων* 13 (1916): 56–67.

Rousanos, Pachomios. "Τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ (ιε' σεπτεμβρίου). Ἄθλησις τοῦ ἁγίου μάρτυρος Νικήτα τοῦ νέου." Edited by Hippolyte Delehaye in "Le martyre du saint Nicétas le jeune." In *Mélanges offerts a M. Gustave Schlumberger, membre de l'Institut, a l'occasion du quatre-vingtième anniversaire de sa naissance.* Vol. 1: *Histoire du Bas-Empire, de l'Empire Byzantin et d' l'Orient latin. Philologie Byzantine.* Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1924: 208–11.

Rousanos, Pachomios. "Περὶ τῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων καὶ τῶν σαρακηνῶν πίστεως." in *Ὁ Παχώμιος Ῥουσάνος καὶ τὰ ἀνέκδοτα δογματικὰ καὶ ἄλλα ἔργα αὐτοῦ.* Edited by Ioannes Karmires, 242–65. Athens: Verlag der Byzantinisch-Neugriechischen Jahrbücher, 1935).

Rousanos, Pachomios. "Λόγος ὑπεραπολογητικὸς καὶ ἠθικὸς πρὸς τοὺς δυσανασχετοῦντας πρὸς τὰς ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπαγομένας ἡμῖν θλίψεις καὶ τὴν Θείαν Πρόνοιαν λοιδοροῦντας." Edited by Ioannes Karmires in "Ὁ ἀνέκδοτος λόγος πρὸς τοὺς δυσανασχετοῦντας πρὸς τὰς ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπαγομένας ἡμῖν θλίψεις τοῦ Παχώμιου Ρουσάνου." *Ἐκκλησία* 16 (1938): 216–19 and 231–35.

Rousanos, Pachomios. "Μηνὶ Σεπτεμβρίῳ κθ'. Ἀκολουθία ψαλλομένη εἰς τοὺς ὁσίους πατέρας τοὺς ἐν Στροφάσιν ἀναιρεθέντας καὶ εἰς ἅπαντας τοὺς παραπλήσιον τέλος λαχόντας." Edited by Eutychios Sarmanes in "Ἀκολουθία τῶν Στροφάσιν ἀναιρεθέντων ὁσίων πατερῶν ὑπὸ Παχωμίου Ῥουσάνου συντεθείσα." *Θεολογία* 68/1-2 (1997): 269–83.

Rousanos, Pachomios. "Ἐπιστολὴ Ἀθανασίῳ Ναυπάκτου." In *Ἑλληνομνήμων ἡ Σύμμικτα Ἑλληνικά.* Republished edition. Edited by A. Moustoxydes, 452–58. Athens, 1965.

Scholarios, Gennadios. "Lamentation de Scholarios sur les malheurs de sa vie." In *Oeuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios.* Vol. 1. Edited by Mgr. L. Petit, X. A. Sidéridès and M. Jugie, 283–94. Paris: Maison de la bonne presse, 1928.

Scholarios, Gennadios. "Κατὰ τῆς σιμονιανῆς αἱρέσεως ἢ ἀπιστίας." In *Oeuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios.* Vol. 3. Edited by Mgr. L. Petit, X. A. Sidéridès and M. Jugie, 239–51. Paris: Maison de la bonne presse, 1930.

Scholarios, Gennadios. "Sur la rareté des miracles au temps present." In *Oeuvres complètes de Gennade Scholarios*. Vol. 3. Edited by Mgr. L. Petit, X. A. Sidéridès and M. Jugie, 368–90. Paris: Maison de la bonne presse, 1930.

Stoudites, Damaskenos. "Διάλογος Δαμασκηνοῦ ἐπισκόπου Ῥεντίνης. Τὰ δὲ πρόσωπα ὁ αὐτὸς ἐπίσκοπος καὶ ὁ τῆς Ἁγίας Ἀναστασίας ἡγούμενος." Elenes Kakoulide-Panou, ed. In "Δαμασκηνού Στουδίτη «Διάλογος»." *Δωδώνη. Επιστημονική Επετηρίς της Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής του Πανεπιστημίου Ιωαννίνων* 3 (1974): 446–58.

B. Secondary literature

Ahmed, Shahab. *What is Islam? The Importance of Being Islamic*. Princeton / Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2016.

Alexiou, Margaret. *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*. Second edition. Revised by Dimitrios Yatromanolakis and Panagiotis Roilos. New York / Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2002.

Alouche, Adel. *The Origins and Development of the Ottoman-Safavid Conflict (906–962 / 1500–1555)*. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1983.

Argyriou, Asterios. "Anastasios Gordios et la polémique anti-islamique post-byzantine," *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 43/1 (1969): 58–87.

Argyriou, Asterios. "Pachomios Roussanos et l'Islam." *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 51 (1971): 143–64.

Argyriou, Asterios. "La littérature grecque post-byzantine de polémique et d'apologétique l'adresse de l'Islam." In *Actes du IIe Congrès international des études du sud-est européen (Athènes, 7-13 mai 1970)*. Vol. 5: *Linguistique et littérature*. Edited by Titos Jochalas, 747–55. Athens, 1978.

Argyriou, Asterios. *Ιδεολογικά ρεύματα στους κόλπους του Ελληνισμού και της Ορθοδοξίας κατά τα χρόνια της Τουρκοκρατίας*. Larissa, 1980.

Argyriou, Asterios. *Les exégèses greques de l'Apocalypse à l'époque turque (1453-1821). Esquisse d'une histoire des courants idéologiques au sein du peuple grec asservi*. Seira Philologikē kai Theologikē 15. Thessaloniki: Hetaireia Makedonikōn Spoudōn, 1982.

Argyriou, Asterios. *Anastasios Gordios (1654/5-1729). Sur Mahomet et contre les Latins / Αναστασίου του Γορδίου (1654/5-1729). Σύγγραμμα περί Μωάμεθ και κατά των Λατίνων*. Hetaireia Stereoelladikōn Meletōn, Keimena kai Meletai 3. Athens: 1983.

Argyriou, Asterios. "La littérature greque de polémique et d'apologétique à l'adresse de l'Islam au XVe siècle." *Byzantinische Forschungen* 12 (1987): 253–77.

Argyriou, Asterios. "La Bible dans le monde orthodoxe au XVIe siècle." In *Les temps des Réformes et la Bible*. Edited by Guy Bedouelle and Bernard Roussel, 385–400. Paris: Beauchesne, 1989.

Argyriou, Asterios. "Ἡ ἑλληνικὴ πολεμικὴ καὶ ἀπολογητικὴ γραμματεία ἔναντι τοῦ Ἰσλὰμ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους τῆς Τουρκοκρατίας." *Θεολογία* 1 (2013): 133–65.

Arnakis, Georgiades. "The Greek Church of Constantinople and the Ottoman Empire." *The Journal of Modern History* 24/3 (1952): 235–50

Atçıl, Abdurrahman. *Scholars and Sultans in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Bakalopoulos, Apostolos. *Ιστορία του νέου Ελληνισμού*, vol. 2/1: *Τουρκοκρατία, 1453–1669: Οι ιστορικές βάσεις της νεοελληνικής κοινωνίας και οικονομίας*. Thessaloniki, 1964.

Bakalopoulos, Apostolos. *Η ανασύνταξη του ελληνισμού και οι αγώνες του επί Τουρκοκρατίας (1453-1669). Πανεπιστημιακές παραδόσεις*. Thessaloniki, 1974.

Balivet, Michel. *Romanie byzantine et pays de Rûm turc: Histoire d'un espace d'imbrication gréco-turc*. Istanbul: The Isis Press, 1994.

Barbounes, M. "Ἡ καθημερινη ζωη στο Ἅγιον Ὅρος κατά τον 16ο αιώνα και ο Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος." In *Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος. 450 χρόνια ἀπὸ τὴν κοίμησή του (†1553). Πρακτικά Διεθνούς Ἐπιστημονικοῦ Συμποσίου (Ἀρχονταρίκι Νέας Πτέρυγας Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Στροφάδων καὶ Ἀγίου Διονυσίου, Ζάκυνθος 9-12 Ὀκτωβρίου 2003)*. Edited by Demetrios Gones, 196–198. Athens: Hiera Mētropolis Zakynthou kai Strophadōn, 2005.

Barbour, H. *The Byzantine Thomism of Gennadios Scholarios and His Translation of the Commentary of Armandus de Bellovisu on the De Ente et Essentia of Thomas Aquinas*. Studi Tomistici 53. Vatican, 1993.

Binns, John. *An Introduction to the Christian Orthodox Churches*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Blanchet, Marie-Hélène. *Georges-Gennadios Scholarios (vers 1400-vers 1472). Un intellectuel orthodoxe face à la disparition de l'Empire Byzantin*. Archives de l'Orient Chrétien 20. Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 2008.

Boyarin, Daniel. *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism*. Stanford: California 1999.

Brady, Thomas. "Confessionalization–The Career of a Concept." In *Confessionalization in Europe, 1555–1700: Essays in Honor and Memory of Bodo Nichan*. Edited by J. M. Headley, Hans Hillerbrand and Anthony Papalas, 1–20. Burlington: Ashgate, 2004.

Braude, Benjamin and Lewis, Bernard (eds.). *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire. Functioning of a Plural Society*. Vol. 1: *The Central Lands*. New York / London: Holmes & Meier Publishers Inc., 1982.

Braude, Benjamin. "Foundations Myths of the Millet System." In *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire: Functioning of a Plural Society*. Vol. 1: *The Central Lands*. Edited by Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis, 69–88. New York / London: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1982.

Burak Guy. "The Second Formation of Islamic Law: the Post-Mongol Context of the Ottoman Adoption of a School of Law." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 55/3 (2013): 579–602..

Burak, Guy. *The Second Formation of Islamic Law. The Ḥanafī School in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge Studies in Islamic Civilization. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Burke, Peter. *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*. New York / Hagerstown / San Francisco / London: Harper Torchbooks, 1978.

Buzov, Snjezana. *The Lawgiver and His Lawmakers: The Role of Legal Discourse in the Change of Ottoman Imperial Culture*. PhD Thesis. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2005.

Calder, Norman. "The Limits of Islamic Orthodoxy." In *Intellectual Traditions in Islam*. Edited by F. Daftary, 66–86. London: IB Tauris, 2000 [republished with the same title in *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Islam: Critical Concepts in Islamic Studies*. Vol. 1. Edited by Maribel Fierro, 242–56. London / New York: Routlege, 2014].

Castellani, Carlo. "Pacomio Rusano, grammatico greco del secolo XVI e I manoscritti autografi delle sue opere," *Atti R. Instituto Veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti*, seventh series, 6 (1894-95): 903–10.

Christopoulos, Georgios. ed. *Ο ελληνισμός υπό ξένη κυριαρχία (περίοδος 1453-1669). Τουρκοκρατία - λατινοκρατία*. Athens: Ekdotikē Athenōn A. E., 1974.

Chrysochoides, Kriton. ed. *Ο Ἄθως στους 14ο-16ο αιώνες / Mount Athos in the 14th-16th Centuries*. Athens, 1997.

Chrysochoides, Kriton. "Τό βιβλιογραφικό ἐργαστήριο τῆς Μονῆς Ἰβήρων στίς πρῶτες δεκαετίες τοῦ 16ου αἰῶνα." In *Η ελληνική γραφή κατά τους 15ο και 16ο αιώνες / The Greek Script in the 15th and 16th Centuries*. Ed. Kriton Chrysochoides, 523–68 . Athens: Sophia ΠΑΤΟΥΡΑ, 2000.

Chrysochoides, Kriton. "Ὁ Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος στὸν Ἄθω." In *Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος. 450 χρόνια ἀπὸ τὴν κοίμησή του (†1553). Πρακτικά Διεθνούς Ἐπιστημονικού Συμποσίου (Ἀρχονταρίκι Νέας Πτέρυγας Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Στροφάδων καὶ Ἁγίου Διονυσίου, Ζάκυνθος 9-12 Ὀκτωβρίου 2003)*. Edited by Demetrios Gones, 203–28. Athens: Hiera Mētropolis Zakynthou kai Strophadōn, 2005.

Constantelos, Demetrios. "The 'Neomartyrs' as Evidence for Methods and Motives Leading to Conversion and Martyrdom in the Ottoman Empire." *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 23 (1978): 216–34.

Crane, Howard. "The Ottoman Sultan's Mosques: Icons of Imperial Legitimacy." In *The Ottoman City and Its Parts: Urban Structure and Social Order*. Edited by Irene A. Bierman, Rifa'at A. Abou-El-Haj, Donald Preziosi, , 173–243. New York: Aristide D. Caratzas, 1991.

Delehaye, Hippolyte. "Le martyre du saint Nicétas le jeune." In *Mélanges offerts a M. Gustave Schlumberger, membre de l'Institut, a l'occasion du quatre-vingtième*

anniversaire de sa naissance. Vol. 1: *Histoire du Bas-Empire, de l'Empire Byzantin et d' l'Orient latin. Philologie Byzantine*, 205–11. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1924.

Dressler, Marcus. "Inventing Orthodoxy: Competing Claims for Authority and Legitimacy in the Ottoman Safavid Conflict." In *Legitimizing the Order: The Ottoman Rhetoric of State Power*. Edited by H. Karateke and M. Reinkowski, 151–76. Leiden: Brill, 2005 [republished with the same title in *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Islam: Critical Concepts in Islamic Studies*. Vol. 1. Edited by Maribel Fierro, 99–117. London / New York: Routlege, 2014].

Efthymiadis, Stephanos and Kalogeras, Nikos. "Audience, Language and Patronage in Byzantine Hagiography." In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography*. Vol. 2: *Genres and Contexts*. Edited by Stephanos Efthymiadis, 247–84. Farnham: Ashgate, 2014.

Flemotomos, Dionyses. "Μιὰ λογοτεχνικὴ ἀνάγνωση τῆς Ἀκολουθίας τοῦ Παχωμίου Ρουσάνου εἰς τοὺς ἐν Στροφάσιν ἀναιρεθέντας Ὁσίους Πατέρας." In *Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος. 450 χρόνια ἀπὸ τὴν κοίμησή του (†1553). Πρακτικά Διεθνούς Ἐπιστημονικού Συμποσίου (Ἀρχονταρίκι Νέας Πτέρυγας Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Στροφάδων καὶ Ἁγίου Διονυσίου, Ζάκυνθος 9-12 Ὀκτωβρίου 2003)*. Edited by Demetrios Gones, 399–420. Athens: Hiera Mētropolis Zakynthou kai Strophadōn, 2005.

Fotić, Aleksandar. "Athonite Travelling Monks and the Ottoman Authorities (16th-18th Centuries)." In *Perspectives on Ottoman Studies. Papers from the 18th Symposium of the International Committee of Pre-Ottoman and Ottoman Studies (CIEPO)*. Vol. 1. Edited by Ekrem Causevic, Nenad Moacanin and Vjeran Kursar, 157–65. Berlin / Münster / Wien: LIT Verlag, 2010.

Gamillscheg, Ernst et al., eds. *Repertorium der Griechischen Kopisten, 800–1600*. 3 Vols. in 9 fascicles. Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Byzantinistik, Band III / 1A–3C. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981–97.

Geanakoplos, Deno John. "A Byzantine Looks at the Renaissance: The Attitude of Michael Apostolis toward the Rise of Italy to Cultural Eminence." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 1/2 (1958): 157–62.

Geanakoplos, Deno John. *Byzantine East and Latin West: Two Worlds of Christendom in Middle Ages and Renaissance: Studies in Ecclesiastical and Cultural History*. Hamden: Archon Book, 1976.

Geanakoplos, Deno John. *Interaction of the "Sibling" Byzantine and Western Cultures in the Middle Ages and Italian Renaissance (330–1600)*. New Haven / London: Yale University Press, 1976.

Geanakoplos, Deno John. *Constantinople and the West: Essays on the Late Byzantine (Palaeologan) and Italian Renaissances and the Byzantine and Roman Churches*. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.

Gedeon, Manouel. *Χρονικά της Πατριαρχικής Ακαδημίας: Ιστορικαί ειδήσεις περί της Μεγάλης του Γένους Σχολής 1454-1830*. Constantinople: Ek tou Patriarchikou Typographeiou, 1883.

George-Tvrtković, Rita. *A Christian Pilgrim in Medieval Iraq: Riccoldo da Montecroce's Encounter with Islam*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2012.

Goffman, Daniel. "Ottoman Millets in the Early Seventeenth Century." *New Perspectives on Turkey* 11 (1994): 135-58.

Gones, Demetrios (ed.). *Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος. 450 χρόνια ἀπὸ τὴν κοίμησή του (†1553). Πρακτικά Διεθνούς Επιστημονικού Συμποσίου (Ἀρχονταρίκι Νέας Πτέρυγας Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Στροφάδων καὶ Ἁγίου Διονυσίου, Ζάκυνθος 9-12 Ὀκτωβρίου 2003)*. Athens: Hiera Mētropolis Zakynthou kai Strophadōn, 2005.

Gones, Demetrios. "Ο Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος χθες, σήμερα, αύριο." In *Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος. 450 χρόνια ἀπὸ τὴν κοίμησή του (†1553). Πρακτικά Διεθνούς Επιστημονικού Συμποσίου (Ἀρχονταρίκι Νέας Πτέρυγας Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Στροφάδων καὶ Ἁγίου Διονυσίου, Ζάκυνθος 9-12 Ὀκτωβρίου 2003)*. Edited by Demetrios Gones, 19–32. Athens: Hiera Mētropolis Zakynthou kai Strophadōn, 2005.

Greene, Molly. *A Shared World. Christians and Muslims in the Early Modern Mediterranean*. Princeton / New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Greene, Molly. *Catholic Pirates and Greek Merchants: A Maritime History of the Mediterranean*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Greene, Molly. *The Edinburgh History of the Greeks, 1453 to 1768. The Ottoman Empire*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015.

Gregory, Brad. *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Grig, Lucy. *Making Martyrs in Late Antiquity*. London: Duckworth, 2004.

Harington Joel and Smith, Helmuth. "Review: Confessionalization, Community, and State Building in Germany, 1555–1870." *The Journal of Modern History* 69/1 (1997): 77–101

Harris, Jonathan. *Greek Emigres in the West, 1400–1520*. Camberley / Surrey: Porphyrogenitus, 1995.

Harris, Jonathan and Porfyriou, Heleni. "The Greek Diaspora: Italian Port Cities and London, c. 1400–1700." In *Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe*. Vol. 2: *Cities and Cultural Exchange in Europe, 1400–1700*. Edited by Donatella Calabi and Stephen Turk Christensen, 65–86. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Hasluck, Fredrick. *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*. Edited by M. Hasluck. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1929.

Henderson, John. *The Construction of Orthodoxy and Heresy: New-Confucian, Islamic, Jewish, and Early Christian Studies* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998.

Hinterberger, Martin. "Byzantine Hagiography and its Literary Genres: Some Critical Observatios." In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography*. Vol. 2: *Genres and Contexts*. Edited by Stephanos Efthymiadis, 25–60. Farnham: Ashgate, 2014.

Hunger, Herbert. "Gebrauchsschriften und Stilisierungsversuche in griechischen Handschriften des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts." In *Η ελληνική γραφή κατά τους 15ο και 16ο αιώνες / The Greek Script in the 15th and 16th Centuries*. Edited by Kriton Chrysochoides, 11–30. Athens: Sophia ΠΑΤΟΥΡΑ, 2000.

Imber, Colin. *Ebu's-su'ud. The Islamic Legal Tradition*. Stanford / California: Stanford University Press, 22009.

Inalcık, Halil. "Ottoman Methods of Conquest." *Studia Islamica* 2 (1954): 103-29 [republished in Halil Inalcık. *The Ottoman Empire. Conquest, Organization and Economy*. London: Variorum Reprints, 1978. Study I].

Inalcık, Halil. "The Policy of Mehmed II toward the Greek Population of Istanbul and the Byzantine Buildings of the City." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 23-24 (1969-70): 231–49 [republished in H. Inalcık. *The Ottoman Empire: Conquest, Organization and Economy: Collected Studies*. London: Variorum Reprints, 1978. Study VI].

Inalcık, Halil and Kafadar, Cemal (eds.). *Süleymân the Second and His Time*. Istanbul: The Isis Press, 1993

Inalcık, Halil. ed. *The Survey of Istanbul, 1455: The Text, English Translation, Analysis of the Text, Documents*. Istanbul: Türkiye Bankası / Kültur Yayınları, 2010.

Iorga, Nicolae. *Byzance après Byzance. Continuation de l' 'Histoire de la vie byzantine'*. Bucharest: Association Internationale d'Études du Sud-Est Europén, 1971.

Ivanyi, Katharina Anna. *Virtue, Piety and the Law: A Study of Birgivī Meḥmed Efendī's* al-Ṭarīqa al-Muḥammadiyya. PhD Thesis. Princeton University, 2012.

Jedin, Hubert. *A History of the Council of Trent*. Vol. 1: *The Struggle for the Council*. Translated by Dom Ernest Graf. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1957.

Jedin, Hubert. *A History of the Council of Trent*. Vol. 2: *The First Sessions at Trent, 1545–1547*. Translated by Dom Ernest Graf. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1961.

Jeffreys, Michael. "Ioannikios Kartanos. *Βιβλίον πάνυ ὠφέλιμον.*" *Ἑλληνικά* 50/1 (2000): 45–53.

Kafadar, Cemal. *Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Kafadar, Cemal. "A Rome of One's Own: Reflections on Cultural Geography and Identity in the Lands of Rum." *Muqarnas* 24 (2007): 7-25.

Kafescioğlu, Çiğdem. *Constantinopolis / Istanbul: Cultural Encounter, Imperial Vision, and the Construction of the Ottoman Capital*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009.

Kakoulidi-Panou, Elene. *Ἰωαννίκιος Καρτάνος: Παλαιά τε καὶ Νέα Διαθήκη. [Βενετία 1536]*. Thessaloniki: Kentro Ellenikes Glosas, 2000.

Karmires, Ioannes. *Ὁ Παχώμιος Ῥουσάνος καὶ τὰ ἀνέκδοτα δογματικὰ καὶ ἄλλα ἔργα αὐτοῦ*. Texte und Forschungen zur Byzantinisch-Neugriechischen Philologie 14. Athens: Verlag der Byzantinisch-Neugriechischen Jahrbücher, 1935.

Karmires, Ioannes. "Ἀνέκδοτος ὁμιλία τοῦ Παχωμίου Ρουσάνου." *Θεολογία* 14 (1936): 30–41.

Karmires, Ioannes. "Παχωμίου Ρουσάνου ὁμιλία εἰς τινὰ τῶν ῥητῶν τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαίον Ευαγγελίου." *Νέα Σιών* 31 (1936): 343–49, 395–402, 456–66, 521–24;

Karmires, Ioannes. "Παχωμίου Ρουσάνου ἀνέκδοτος γραμματικὴ συγγραφή." *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher* 14 (1937-38): 340–47.

Karmires, Ioannes. "Ὁ ἀνεκδοτος λόγος πρὸς τοὺς δυσανασχετοῦντας πρὸς τὰς ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπαγομένας ἡμῖν θλίψεις τοῦ Παχώμιου Ρουσάνου." *Ἐκκλησία* 16 (1938): 215–19 and 231–35.

Karmires, Ioannes. *Τὰ δογματικὰ καὶ συμβολικὰ μνημεία τῆς ὀρθοδόξου καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας*. Vol. 2. Second edition. Graz: Akademische Druck, 1968.

Knös, Börje. *L'histoire de la littérature néo-grecque. La période jusqu'en 1821*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 1. Stockholm / Göteborg / Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1962.

Knysh, Alexander. "'Orthodoxy' and 'Heresy' in Medieval Islam: An Essay in Reassessment," *The Muslim World* 83 (1993): 48–67 [republished with the same title in *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Islam: Critical Concepts in Islamic Studies*. Vol. 1. Edited by Maribel Fierro, 48–67. London / New York: Routlege, 2014].

Konortas, Paraskevas. *Les rapports juridiques et politiques entre le Patriarcat Orthodoxe de Constantinople et l'Administration ottomane, de 1453 à 1600 (d'après documents grecs et ottomans)*. PhD Thesis. Paris: Universite Paris I Pantheon–Sorbonne, 1985.

Konortas, Paraskevas. "From Tâ'ife to Millet: Ottoman Terms for the Greek Orthodox Community." In *Ottoman Greeks in the Age of Nationalism: Politics, Economy and Society in the Nineteenth Century*. Edited by Dimitri Gondicas and Charles Issawi, 169–79. Princeton / New York: The Darwin Press Inc., 1999.

Krstić, Tijana. "Illuminated by the Light of Islam and the Glory of the Ottoman Sultanate: Narratives of Conversion to Islam in the Age of Confessionalization." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 51/1 (2009): 35–63.

Krstić, Tijana. *Contested Conversions to Islam. Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire*. Stanford / California: Stanford University Press, 2011.

Krstić, Tijana. "From Shahāda to 'Aqīda: Conversion to Islam, Catechization and Sunnitization in the Sixteenth Century Ottoman Rumeli." In *Islamisation: Comparative Perspectives from History*. Edited by Andrew Peacock, 296–314. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2017.

Kunt, Metin and Woodhead, Christine. *Süleyman the Magnificent and His Age. The Ottoman Empire in the Early Modern World*. London / New York: Longman, 1995.

Kursar, Vjeran. "Non-Muslim Communal Divisions and Identities in the Early Modern Ottoman Balkans and the Millet System Theory." In *Power and Influence in South-Eastern Europe, 16th-19th century*. Edited by Maria Baramova, Plamen Mitev, Ivan Parvev and Vania Racheva, 97–108. Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2013.

Laitila, Teuvo. "Infidel Orthodox? Patriarch Gennadios II (1454–1456) and the Making of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in the Context of Sultan Mehmed II's Policy." *Byzantium and the North* [Acta Byzantina Fennica] 4 (1988-89): 51–76.

Lampros, Spyridon. "Ἀνέκδοτος λόγος Παχωμίου τοῦ Ῥουσάνου περὶ δεισιδαιμονιῶν καὶ προλήψεων κατά τὸν ΙΣΤ΄ αιώνα." *Δελτίον τῆς Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος* 1 (1883): 101–12.

Lampros, Spyridon. "Ἀντιβολή κωδίκων περιεχόντων τὸν ἀνέκδοτον λόγον Παχωμίου τοῦ Ῥουσάνου." *Δελτίον τῆς Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος* 1 (1883): 367–69

Lampros, Spyridon. "Ἐκ τῶν Ὁμιλιῶν τοῦ Παχωμίου Ῥουσάνου." *Νέος Ἑλληνομνήμων* 13 (1916): 56–67.

Lampsiades, O. "Ὁ Παχώμιος Ῥουσάνος καὶ ὁ βίος τῶν συγχρόνων τοῦ." *Ἐπετηρίς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 13 (1937): 385–92.

Langer, Robert and Simon, Udo. "The Dynamics of Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy: Dealing with Divergence in Muslim Discourses and Islamic Studies." *Die Welt des Islams* 48 (2008): 273–88 [republished with the same title in *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Islam: Critical Concepts in Islamic Studies*. Vol. 1. Edited by Maribel Fierro, 201–12. London / New York: Routlege, 2014].

Laurent, Vitalien. "Notes critiques sur de récentes publications." *Échos d'Orient* 31 (1932): 97–123.

Laurent, Vitalien. "Les premiers patriarches de Constantinople sous la domination turque (1454-1476). Succession et chronologie d'après un catalogue inédit." *Revue des études byzantines* 26 (1968): 229-63.

Lauxtermann, Marc. "'And many, many more': A Sixteenth-Century Description of Private Libraries in Constantinople, and the Authority of Books." In *Authority in Byzantium*. Edited by Pamela Armstrong, 269–84. Farnham: Ashgate, 2010.

Layton, Evro. *The Sixteenth Century Greek Book in Italy: Printers and Publishers for the Greek World*. Venice: Library of the Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies, 1994.

Lewis, Bernard. "Some Observations on the Significance of Heresy in the History of Islam." *Studia Islamica* 1 (1953): 43–64 [republished with the same title in *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Islam: Critical Concepts in Islamic Studies*. Vol. 1. Edited by Maribel Fierro, 118–31. London / New York: Routlege, 2014].

Liddell, Henry George & Scott, Robert ed. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Revised by Henry Stuart Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Loomis, Louise Ropes. "The Greek Renaissance in Italy." *The American Historical Review* 13/2 (1908): 246–258.

Louth, Andrew. "Introduction." In *Byzantine Orthodoxies: Papers from the Thirty-Sixth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Durham, 23–25 March 2002*. Edited by Andrew Louth and Augustine Casiday, 1–14. Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum, 2006.

Louth, Andrew. *Maximus the Confessor*. London / New York: Routlege, 1996.

Lowry, Heath W. "A Note on the Population and Status of the Athonite Monasteries under Ottoman Rule (ca. 1520)." *Wiener Zeitschrift für Kunde des Morgenlandes* 73 (1981): 115–35 [republished in H. Lowry. *Studies in* Defter*ology. Ottoman Society in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*. Analecta Isisiana 4. Istanbul: The Isis Press, 1992. Study XII]

Lowry, Heath W. *The Nature of the Early Ottoman State. SUNY series in the Social and Economic History of the Middle East*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003.

Maloney, George. *A History of Orthodox Theology since 1453*. Belmont / Massachussetts: Nordland Publishing Company, 1976.

Maras, Anastasios. "Ὁ Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος καὶ η εποχή του: Κατά Αγιοκατηγόρων." *Μνημοσύνη* 13 (2013): 315–28.

Martin, John. *Venice's Hidden Enemies: Italian Heretics in a Renaissance City*. Berkeley / Los Angeles / London: University of California Press, 1993.

Manou, Lamprine. *Δαμασκηνός ο Στουδίτης, ο βίος και το έργο του*. Athens: Syndesmos tōn en Athēnais Megaloscholitōn, 1999.

Mastrantonis, George. *Augsburg and Constantinople: The Correspondence between the Tübingen Theologians and Patriarch Jeremiah II of Constantinople on the Augsburg Confession*. Brookline / Massachusetts: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1982.

Mergiali-Sahas, Sophia. "Crossing the Paths of Each Other: Renaissance Italy and Byzantium." *Βυζαντινά* 32 (2012): 227–44.

Metallenos, "*Πρωτοπρεσβύτερος. Κριτικὲς ἐπισημάνσεις στὸ ἔργο τοῦ Π. Ρουσάνου Κατὰ Ἁγιοκατηγόρων.*" In *Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος. 450 χρόνια ἀπὸ τὴν κοίμησή του (†1553). Πρακτικὰ Διεθνοῦς Ἐπιστημονικοῦ Συμποσίου (Ἀρχονταρίκι Νέας Πτέρυγας Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Στροφάδων καὶ Ἁγίου Διονυσίου, Ζάκυνθος 9-12 Ὀκτωβρίου 2003)*. Edited by

Demetrios Gones, 353–64. Athens: Hiera Mētropolis Zakynthou kai Strophadōn, 2005.

Minkov, Anton. *Conversion to Islam in the Balkans. Kisve Bahası Petitions and Ottoman Social Life, 1670-1730*. The Ottoman Empire and Its Heritage, 30. Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2004.

Monfasani, John. *Byzantine Scholars in Renaissance Italy: Cardinal Bessarion and Other Emigrés: Selected Essays*. Aldershot: Ashgate / Variorum, 1995.

Monfasani, John. *Greeks and Latins in Renaissance Italy: Studies on Humanism and Philosophy in the 15th Century*. Aldershot: Ashgate / Variorum, 2003.

Mousouras, Dyonisios. *Αι μοναί Στροφάδων και Αγίου Γεωργίου των Κρημνών Ζακύνθου (Μελέτη φιλολογική και παλαιογραφική)*. Athens: Ekdosis Ieras Monēs Strofadōn kai Agiou Dionysiou, 2003.

Moustoxydes, Andreas. "Παχώμιος." In *Ἑλληνομνήμων ἢ σύμμικτα ἑλληνικά: Σύγγραμα ἑλληνικόν* 10 (1847): 624–32; 11 (1852): 633–96; and 12 (1853): 697–712.

Necipoğlu, Gülrü. *Architecture, Ceremonial and Power: The Topkapı Palace in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*. New York: Architectural History Foundation, 1991.

Oikonomides, Nicolas. "Monastères et moines lors de la conquête ottomane." *Südost-Forschungen* 35 (1976): 1–10.

Olympiou, Nikolaos. "Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος καὶ Παλαιὰ Διαθήκη. Ἑρμηνευτικὲς προσεγγίσεις." In *Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος. 450 χρόνια ἀπὸ τὴν κοίμησή του (†1553). Πρακτικὰ Διεθνοῦς Ἐπιστημονικοῦ Συμποσίου (Ἀρχονταρίκι Νέας Πτέρυγας Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Στροφάδων καὶ Ἁγίου Διονυσίου, Ζάκυνθος 9-12 Ὀκτωβρίου 2003)*. Edited by Demetrios Gones, 499–526. Athens: Hiera Mētropolis Zakynthou kai Strophadōn, 2005.

Pantanzopoulos, Nikolaos. *Church and Law in the Balkan Peninsula during the Ottoman Rule*. Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1967 [republished: Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1984].

Papademetriou, Tom. *Render unto the Sultan. Power, Authority, and the Greek Orthodox Church in the Early Ottoman Centuries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Papadopoullos, Theodore. *Studies and Documents relating to the History of the Greek Church and People under Turkish Domination*. Bibliotheca Graeca Aevi Posterioris 1. Brussels, 1952 [republished with supplementary material: Aldershot / Hampshire: Variorum, 1990].

Papadopoulos-Kerameus, A. "Πατριαρχικοὶ κατάλογοι (1453-1636)." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 8 (1899): 392–401.

Patrineles, C. *Ὁ Θεόδορος Ἀγαλλιανὸς ταυτιζόμενος πρὸς τὸν Θεοφάνην Μηδείας καὶ οἱ ἀνέκδοτοι λόγοι του*. Athens, 1966.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*. Vol. 2: *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600–1700)*. Chicago / London: The University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Pelikan Jaroslav and Hotchkiss, Valerie. eds. *Creeds & Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition*. Vol. 1/2: *Eastern Orthodox Affirmations of Faith*. New Haven / London: Yale University Press, 2003.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *Credo: Historical and Theological Guide to Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition*. New Haven / London: Yale University Press, 2003.

Petmézas, Socrate. "L'organization ecclésiastique sous les ottomans." In *Conseils et mémoires de Synadinos prêtre de Serrès en Macédoine (XVIIe siècle)*. Edited by Paolo Odorico, 447–569. Paris: Editions de l' Association 'Pierre Belon', 1996.

Phileta, Christophoros. *Περί Ιωαννικίου Καρτάνου, Δαμασκηνού του Στουδίτου και Παχωμίου Ρουζάνου. Επιστολιμαία διάλεξις*. Kerkyra: Ek tēs Typographias tēs Kybernēseōs, 1847.

Pitsakis, Konstantinos. "Ζητήματα Κανονικοῦ Δικαίου στὸν Παχώμιο Ρουσάνο." In *Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος. 450 χρόνια ἀπὸ τὴν κοίμησή του (†1553). Πρακτικά Διεθνούς Ἐπιστημονικού Συμποσίου (Ἀρχονταρίκι Νέας Πτέρυγας Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Στροφάδων καὶ Ἁγίου Διονυσίου, Ζάκυνθος 9-12 Ὀκτωβρίου 2003)*. Edited by Demetrios Gones, 557–70. Athens: Hiera Mētropolis Zakynthou kai Strophadōn, 2005

Podskalsky, Gerhard. *Griechische Theologie in der Zeit der Türkenherrschaft, 1453-1821. Die Orthodoxie im Spannungsfeld der nachreformatorischen Konfessionen des Westens*. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1988.

Podskalsky, Gerhard. "Pacôme Rhousanos et la Sainte Ecriture." In *Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος. 450 χρόνια ἀπὸ τὴν κοίμησή του (†1553). Πρακτικά Διεθνούς Ἐπιστημονικού Συμποσίου (Ἀρχονταρίκι Νέας Πτέρυγας Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Στροφάδων καὶ Ἁγίου Διονυσίου, Ζάκυνθος 9-12 Ὀκτωβρίου 2003)*. Edited by Demetrios Gones, 493–98. Athens: Hiera Mētropolis Zakynthou kai Strophadōn, 2005.

Ritter, Max. "Life of Nicetas the Younger." In *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History*. Vol. 5: *(1350-1500)*. Edited by David Thomas and Alex Mallett, 709–11. Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2013.

Rothman, Natalie. *Brokering Empire: Trans-Imperial Subjects between Venice and Istanbul*. Ithaca / London: Cornell University Press, 2012.

Runciman, Steven. *The Great Church in Captivity. A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquests to the Greek War of Independence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Salisbury, Joyce Ellen. *The Blood of Martyrs: Unintended Consequences of Ancient Violence*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Sariyannis, Marios. "Aspects of 'Neomartyrdom': Religious Contacts, 'Blasphemy' and 'Calumny' in 17th-Century Istanbul." *Archivum Ottomanicum* 23 (2005-2006): 249–62.

Sarmanes, Eutychios. "Ἀκολουθία τῶν Στροφάσιν ἀναιρεθέντων ὁσίων πατερῶν ὑπὸ Παχωμίου Ῥουσάνου συντεθεῖσα." *Θεολογία* 68/1-2 (1997): 265–83.

Schilling, Heinz. "Confessionalization and the Rise of Religious and Cultural Frontiers in Early Modern Europe." In *Frontiers of Faith: Religious Exchange and the Constitution of Religious Identities, 1400–1750*. Edited by Eszter Andor and István György Tóth, 21–36. Budapest: Central European University / European Science Foundation, 2001.

Schilling, Heinz. "Confessionalization: Historical and Scholarly Perspectives of a Comparative and Interdisciplinary Paradigm." In *Confessionalization in Europe 1555–1700*. Edited by J. M. Headley, H. J. Hillerbrand and A. J. Papalas, 21–36. Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate, 2004.

Schilling, Heinz and Tóth, István György. "From Empires to Family Circles: Religious and Cultural Borderlines in the Age of Confessionalization." In *Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe*. Vol. 1: *Religion and Cultural Exchange in Europe, 1400–1700*. Edited by Heinz Schilling and István György Tóth, 25–46. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Scribner, R. *Popular Culture and Popular Movements in Reformation Germany*. London / Ronceverte: The Hambledon Press, 1987.

Serges, Manoles. *Ο Ζακύνθιος μοναχός Παχώμιος Ρουσάνος και ο λαϊκός πολιτισμός του 16ου αιώνα*. Athens, 2000.

Serges, Manoles. *Εκκλησιαστικός λόγος και λαϊκός πολιτισμός τον 16ο αιώνα: Η περίπτωση του Παχωμίου Ρουσάνου*. Athens: Ekdotikos Oikos, 2008.

Speake, Graham and Ware, Kallistos. ed. *Mount Athos: Microcosm of the Christian East*. Oxford / New York / Vienna: Peter Lang, 2012.

Surace, Domenico. "Copisti greci in tre codici sconosciuti della Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale di Roma (S. A. Valle 100, 102-103)." *Νέα Ῥώμη* 8 (2011): 219–304.

Şahin, Kaya. *Empire and Power in the Reign of Süleyman. Narrating the Sixteenth-Century Ottoman World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Talbot, Alice-Mary. "Idiorrhythmic monasticism." In *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*. Vol. 2. Edited by Alexander Kazhdan, 981–82. New York / Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Terzioğlu, Derin. "How to Conceptualize Ottoman Sunnitization: A Historiographical Discussion." *Turcica* 44 (2012-2013): 301–38.

Terzioğlu, Derin. "Where ilmi-i hal Meets Catechism: Islamic Manuals of Religious Instruction in the Ottoman Empire in the Age of Confessionalization." *Past and Present* 220 (2013): 79–114.

Tinnefeld, Franz. "Georgios Gennadios Scholarios." In *La Théologie byzantine et sa tradition*. Vol. 2: (*XIIIe–XIXe s.*). Edited by Carmelo Giuseppe Conticello and Vassa Conticello, 447–541. Turnhout: Brepols, 2002.

Tinnefeld, Franz. "Demetrius Cydones." In *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History*. Vol. 5: *(1350-1500)*. Edited by David Thomas and Alex Mallett, 239–49. Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2013.

Todt, Klaus-Peter. *Kaiser Johannes VI. Kantakouzenos und der Islam: Politische Realität und theologische Polemik im palaiologenzeitlischen Byzanz*. Würzburg / Altenberge: Echter / Oros Verlag, 1991.

Todt, Klaus-Peter. "John VI Cantacuzenus." In *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History*. Vol. 5: *(1350-1500)*. Edited by David Thomas and Alex Mallett, 165–78. Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2013.

Tov, Asaph Ben. "'Turco-Graecia': German Humanists and the End of Greek Antiquity." In *The Renaissance and the Ottoman World*. Edited by Anna Contadini and Claire Norton. 181–95 Farnham: Ashgate, 2013.

Tzedopoulos, Giorgos. *Ορθόδοξοι νεομάρτυρες στην Οθωμανική Αυτοκρατορία: Η συγκρότηση της. πρακτικής και της ερμηνείας του ομολογιακού θανάτου*. PhD Thesis. Athens: Kapodistrian University, 2012.

Tzoga, Basilike. *Μελέτιος Πηγάς (1550–1601), Πατριάρχης Αλεξανδρείας: βίος - δράση - εργογραφία*. PhD Thesis. Athens: Kapodistrian University, 2009.

Turner, C.J.G. "The Career of George-Gennadius Scholarius." *Byzantion* 39 (1969): 420–55.

Tzoga, Basilike. *Μελέτιος Πηγάς (1550–1601), Πατριάρχης Αλεξανδρείας: βίος - δράση - εργογραφία*. PhD Thesis. Athens: Kapodistrian University, 2009.

Vaporis, Michael Nomikos. "The Price of Faith: Some Reflections on Nikodemos Hagiorites and His Struggle against Islam, Together with a Translation of the 'Introduction' to His New Martyrologion." *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 23/3-4 (1978): 185–215.

Vaporis, Michael Nomikos. *Witnesses for Christ: Orthodox Christian Neomartyrs of the Ottoman Period, 1437–1860*. Crestwood / New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2000.

Vryonis, Speros. *The Decline of the Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh to the Fifteenth Century*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1971.

Watt, Montgomery. *Islamic Creeds* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1994.

Wendebourg, Dorothea. *Reformation und Orthodoxie. Der theologische Briefwechsel zwischen der Leitung der württembergischen Kirche und dem Ökumenischen Patriarchen Jeremias II. in den Jahren 1574–1581* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986

Wensinck, Arent. *The Muslim Creed: Its Genesis and Historical Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932.

Wilson, Brett. "The Failure of Nomenclature: the Concept of 'Orthodoxy' in the Study of Islam." *Comparative Islamic Studies* 3/2 (2007): 169–94 [republished with the same title in *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Islam: Critical Concepts in Islamic Studies*. Vol. 1. Edited by Maribel Fierro, 153–76. London / New York: Routlege, 2014].

Wilson, Nigel. *From Byzantium to Italy: Greek Studies in the Italian Renaissance*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.

Yılmaz, Huseyin. *The Sultan and the Sultanate: Envisioning Rulership in the Age of Süleyman the Lawgiver (1520–1566)*. PhD Thesis. Cambridge / Massachusetts: Harvard University, 2004.

Zachariadou, Elizabeth. "The Neomartyr's Message." *Kentro Mikrasiatikon Spoudon* 8 (1990-91): 51–63 [republished in: E. Zachariadou. *Studies in Pre-Ottoman Turkey and the Ottomans*. Ashgate: Variorum Reprints, 2007. Study XXI].

Zachariadou, Elizabeth. "'A Safe and Holy Mountain': Early Ottomans." In *Mount Athos and Byzantine Monasticism: Papers from the Twenty-Eight Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Birmingham, March 1994*. Edited by Anthony Bryer and Mary Cunningham, 127–34. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1996.

Zachariadou, Elizabeth. *Δέκα τουρκικά έγγραφα για την Μεγάλη Εκκλεσία (1483-1576) / Ten Turkish documents concerning the Great Church (1483-1576)*. Athens: Institute for Byzantine Research, 1996.

Zachariadou, Elizabeth. "Les notables laïques et le patriarcat oecuménique après la chute de Constantinople." *Turcica* 30 (1998): 119–33 [republished in: E. Zachariadou. *Studies in Pre-Ottoman Turkey and the Ottomans*. Ashgate: Variorum Reprints, 2007. Study XXII].

Zachariadou, Elizabeth. "Constantinople se repeuple." In *1453: Η άλωση της Κωνσταντινούπολης και η μετάβαση από τους μεσαιωνικούς στους νεώτερους χρόνους*. Edited by T. Kioussopoulou, 47–59. Herakleio: Crete University Press, 2005 [republished in E. Zachariadou. *Studies in Pre-Ottoman Turkey and the Ottomans*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007. Study XXIII].

Zachariadou, Elizabeth. "Mount Athos and the Ottomans c. 1350-1550." In *The Cambridge History of Christianity*. Vol. 5: *Eastern Christianity*. Edited by Michael Angold, 154–68. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Zachariadou, Elizabeth. "The Great Church in Captivity, 1453-1586." In *The Cambridge History of Christianity*. Vol. 5: *Eastern Christianity*. Edited by Michael Angold, 169–86. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Zeses, Theodoros. *Γεννάδιος Β' Σχολάριος: Βίος, Συγγράμματα, Διδασκαλία*. Analekta Blatadon 30. Thessaloniki: Patriarhikon Idruma Paterikōn Meletōn, 1980.