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CHAPTER I
THE CHURCH AND THE PORTE

"On the day when the Turks took Constantinople, the sun was
darkened." Thus wrote the Georgian chronicler, Dlugosz. ¹ Whether
or not the sun was physically darkened, the psychological impact of
the fall of the second Rome cast a pall over all of Europe. From
the standpoint of the Greek Orthodox Church and, indeed, all of
Orthodoxy, it marked the end of one epoch and the beginning of an­
other. For the first time, the recognized leader of the Eastern
Orthodox Church² was no longer the subject and chief religious
advisor of a Christian emperor but, rather, the subject of a
Moslem sultan.

Even though the capture of Constantinople marked a funda­
mental change in the status and function of the ecumenical patri­
arch, it was not the first time that Christians had been subject

¹ Quoted in A.A. Vasiliev, History of the Byzantine Empire

² The terms "Eastern Orthodox" and "Orthodoxy" as used herein
refer to the Greek and Russian Orthodox Churches considered to­
gether and are synonymous. "Greek Orthodox" refers to those
Christians who recognize the ecumenical patriarch of Constan­
tinople as their primate. "Russian Orthodox" refers to those who
recognize the authority of Moscow. "Latin" refers to Roman Catholics and those who, while following the Eastern rites, ac­
cept papal supremacy.
to a Moslem ruler. The Monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai had come under Arab sovereignty almost at the onset of the wave of Arab conquest. Damascus and Jerusalem fell shortly after and their Orthodox Christian communities became subject to Arab governors. One after another, Byzantine strongholds with their Christian populations came under Moslem domination.  

When Turkish power continued the sweep of Moslem sovereignty into Anatolia and Southeastern Europe, even more Orthodox Christians were ruled by Moslems. By 1453, the only Greek Orthodox who were not under Turkish domination were those who lived in the Greek-speaking Venetian possessions and those who were living in the last pockets of Byzantine independence such as Trebizond and the southern Peloponnesus in Greece. Even these last were soon to join their brethren as Turkish subjects.  

As Moslem power came to dominate more lands and greater Christian populations, the position of these Christians became better defined by first Arabs and then Turks. Christians could, of course, become Moslems and there were always some individuals who did.  

---


4 Vasiliev, op. cit., p. 654  

But conversion, in itself, did not provide a solution to the basic problem, for there remained large Christian populations.

Muhammad himself laid down the fundamental principle which determined in broad outline the attitude of Islam toward its Christian and Jewish minorities. These people, so Moslem law came to declare, were "People of the Book." So long as their religious practices were confined to their own people and no attempt was made to proselytize and so long as they did not offend Moslem conscience and propriety, they would be allowed to keep their religion. There were certain disadvantages. They were subject to a special tax and were barred from military service, a serious disability in Moslem society. There might be other restrictions of civil rights and they might be required to wear distinctive dress or conform to other special regulations. But, in general, the "People of the Book" were spared what was in theory the only choice open to pagans, "Islam or death," and they might even hope to continue in their faith relatively free from molestation.

6 "The People of the Book" were those who possessed the Jewish and Christian Scriptures for Muhammad regarded the Torah, the Psalms, and the Gospel as messages sent from God, and considered those people to whom they were sent on a much higher level than the idolaters." Erich W. Bethmann, Bridge to Islam (Nashville: Southern Publishing Association, 1950), p. 84. For a more extended treatment, see Ibid., pp. 81-87.

While this was the general policy, specific implementation was required to apply it to particular areas. In 623, Muhammad had granted a charter to the Monastery of St. Catherine which, in effect recognized Mt. Sinai as holy ground and confirmed the monks in their traditional autonomy. In 636, as Omar was besieging Jerusalem, Sophronios, patriarch of Jerusalem, headed a delegation which offered the capitulation of the city in exchange for consideration by the Caliph. Omar promised to respect the patriarch's role as guardian of the Holy Places and to exact only the haraj, a kind of head tax. In return, the gates were opened.

Even though Christians, including the grandfather of John of Damascus, opened the gates of Damascus to the Arabs, the Syrians in 635 did not receive such lenient terms. In addition to the haraj, certain civil disabilities were imposed. Christians were forbidden

---


to ride horses, build churches, hold religious processions, ring bells or set crosses on graves. They were also denied the right to hold public office although Sergius, the father of John of Damascus, and John, himself, did serve the Caliph in important positions.

Turkish rulers followed these precedents. Berats or official charters had been granted by Murad to the citizens of Thessalonika and Ioannina in 1430 when these cities fell to Turkish armies. These berats formed the basis for the relationship which Mehmed II established with the head of the Greek Church.

The patriarchal throne in Constantinople was vacant as the city fell to the Turks. As soon as possible, a synod of the clergy was assembled and, upon Mehmed's recommendation, elected Gennadios Scholarios as the new ecumenical patriarch. Scholarios was an excellent choice. Although he had been a delegate to the Council of Florence in 1438-1439 and at the time had supported the Union of Florence, he soon reversed himself and had long been an ardent opponent of union with the West.

---


14 Stephanides, *op. cit.*, p. 634.

15 Vasiliev, *op. cit.*, p. 676.
As soon as the news of the election had been communicated to Mehmed II, the Conqueror sent for Scholarios, commended him on his election and presented him with a white horse and a purse of a thousand florins. He also granted a berat which stipulated the rights and privileges of the Orthodox. The patriarch, bishops and priests were proclaimed inviolate. The clergy were exempt from taxation although the haraj was levied on the general Greek population. Half of the churches of Constantinople were converted into mosques and the other half remained Christian churches. Canon law remained in effect for Orthodox and the internal administrative structure of the Church continued with the patriarchal synod still in existence and sharing with the patriarch administrative responsibilities in the Church. Orthodox were allowed to continue their religious observances including the solemn celebration of Easter.

The liberal conditions set forth in the berat did not continue. The person of the patriarch and the clergy were not considered inviolate and a long list of patriarchs including Joasaph, Raphael, Cyril Loukaris, Parthenios II, Parthenios III, Cyril Kontaris, Jeremias II, Jeremias III and Meletios II suffered humiliation, exile and,

17 The terms are preserved in the Chronicle of George Phrantzes and are summarized by Vasiliev, op. cit., pp. 675-676.
in some cases, death.\textsuperscript{18} The difficulties of the Greek patriarchs, however, were not materially greater than those of other officials of the Turkish state. During the reign of Selim I, for example, "vizirs and generals lost their heads at seemingly the slightest failure."\textsuperscript{19} Holding high office could be hazardous for both Turk and Greek. Internal autonomy in church administration which had been promised was also violated. Between 1466 and 1666, there were sixty-one changes on the patriarchal throne and fifteen patriarchs who had been deposed returned to office, between 1620 and 1702, there were fifty changes. Much of this interference came about because of the introduction of a new tax, the peskesi.\textsuperscript{20}

The example of the white horse which Mehmed II gave to the Patriarch Gennadios seems to have been forgotten, but the exchange of money upon the enthronement of a patriarch quickly assumed an important place in the election procedure. The formal sequence seems to have been as follows: the synod of the clergy met and elected the new patriarch. Next, he was consecrated and enthroned after which he immediately presented himself before the Sultan. The sultan,

\textsuperscript{18} Stephanides, \textit{op. cit.}, 634-635.

\textsuperscript{19} Fisher, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 206.

\textsuperscript{20} Lists of patriarchs are given by Stephanides, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 738-139.
exercising something of the prerogative of the Byzantine emperor whom he succeeded, then confirmed the election and presented the patriarch with a kaftan or staff as a token of his office. The patriarch then returned to the patriarchate mounted upon a horse. 21

Mehmed had given Gennadios a sum of money as a token of his good wishes. Thus, the precedent of a gift of money was established. This precedent was modified by Simeon I who was struggling to become patriarch in 1467. 22 He offered to pay to the sultan a sum of money in exchange for the kaftan and this payment became known as the peskesi or tip. The first peskesi had amounted to one thousand gold coins but the sum rapidly increased. In 1475, the peskesi had reached 2,500 coins and the newly elected patriarch, Raphael, was unable to raise the amount so he was thrown into chains and made to beg in the streets until all had been collected. 23 Frequently, the peskesi would be bid up by rival claimants to the patriarchal throne and, once increased, the peskesi was seldom reduced.

21 Ibid., p. 635.


23 Callinikos, op. cit., p. 108.
The peskesi was a payment made only once, upon the election and installation of a new patriarch. Opponents of Patriarch Dionysios I in 1474, were responsible for the application of the haraj to the clergy and particularly to the patriarch. They suggested an annual gift by the patriarch to the sultan as an attempt to embarrass and depose Dionysios but this assessment, too, quickly became a fixed practice. The amount was originally 2,000 coins but, like the peskesi, it was continually being increased. In order to maintain the fiction that the exemption granted in the berat of Mehmed II was being observed, this payment was not officially called haraj but was considered an annual allowance made by the patriarch. But it was demanded by the Turkish court just as if it had been officially haraj and non-payment could lead to the deposition of a patriarch.

The constant drain on the finances of the patriarchate meant a corresponding pressure on the bishops and metropolitans. Cash payments to the patriarchate were usually demanded in connection with the election of a bishop, the consecration of a metropolitan or even the selection of a patriarch of Alexandria Antioch or Jerusalem.

---

24 Stephanides, *op. cit.*, 635.


Beginning in the seventeenth century the Turkish state also applied the peskesi in such elections but on a far more modest scale than that levied upon the ecumenical patriarch. All the clergy were made subject to the haraj sometime in the seventeenth century.

Mention should be made of an attempt in the eighteenth century to reduce some of the financial pressure on the Church. This was the introduction in 1713 of the mukareti which resembled an annual peskesi of 500-1000 gold coins. It was hoped that this would reduce the pecuniary interest of the grand vizir (who by this time had replaced the sultan in the installation proceedings) in the great turnover of patriarchs. This was a later innovation, however, and does not affect the picture of financial relations between the patriarchate and the Porte in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the period primarily under consideration.

Even more disastrous to the integrity of Orthodoxy, however, was the application of the millet system to the Church and the Church's acceptance of it. Historically, the power of the Orthodox Church

---

27 Stephanides. op. cit., p. 635.
28 Ibid., p. 636.
29 Ibid., p. 635.
was sacramental and theological and there had never been the accumu-
lation of political power and authority which occurred in the West.30

There was no Eastern counterpart of Innocent III. But the millet
system of the Turks was based on the principle of a "religious
nation" in which the chief ecclesiastical figure would also be the
head of the nation.31 This gave to the patriarchs political power
that they never had exercised before.

The ecumenical patriarch was leader of the "Roman Millet" or
Greek Orthodox Christians. He was not ethnarch - the leader and
spokesman of the people chose: by the people themselves,32 -But in
effect, the authority of the state as it applied to the members of
his religious nation, He could be held personally responsible for
offenses committed by any Greek Orthodox individual and he was the
guarentor and enforcer of law and order among his people.33

Ecclesiastical courts were given secular juresdiction over matters
involving only Orthodox34 and it became difficult to distinguish the

31 Watson, op. cit., p. 138.
32 Stephanides, op. cit., p. 634.
strictly religious and the essentially secular functions of the church officials. Metropolitans became in effect civil governors enjoined by Mehmed II "to watch day and night over those entrusted to their guidance, to observe their conduct and to discover and report their lawless actions to my government."35

In order for the Ecumenical patriarch to be responsible for the entire Greek nation, the organization of the Church had to be centralized. Until the conquest of Constantinople, the Patriarch of Constantinople had been only "first among equals" although the prestige of being patriarch in the imperial capital gave him decided ascendance over the other historic patriarchates.36 Under the Turks, however, the ecumenical patriarch was clearly supreme and the patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem, while maintaining their theoretical independence were administratively quite subordinate. Only the patriarch of Constantinople could approach the Porte and only he could secure the berat for their nomination.37 The relative inferiority of the other patriarchs to the Ecumenical Patriarch is reflected in the comparatively modest peskesi expected

35 Quoted by Sherrard, op. cit., p. 102.
37 Sherrard, op. cit., p. 102.
for their berats contrasted to the ever increasing peskesi required for the enthronement of the patriarch of Constantinople.\textsuperscript{38}

In his administration of the affairs of the church, the patriarch was by no means absolute. During the period under consideration the ecumenical patriarch had the assistance of two administrative bodies. The Holy Synod was composed of bishops and deliberated matters of fundamental policy. The Holy Synod was also empowered to elect new patriarchs when the throne became vacant. The Ecclesiastical Council was a less important body and consisted of office holders who were responsible for the execution of policy on a daily basis.\textsuperscript{39} Effective administrative control of the ecclesiastical machinery, therefore, rested in the hands of the ecumenical patriarch and the two councils which assisted him.

The church's monopoly of civil authority among the Greek nation was complete. This monopoly attracted to church offices men who were neither worthy of ordination nor concerned about spiritual matters. They were concerned only to exercise the secular authority which was not attached to the patriarchal throne and the surrounding offices and councils. With the introduction of laymen into the administrative councils, the decline in piety was even more marked.

\textsuperscript{38} Stephanides, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 635-636.

\textsuperscript{39} Callinikos, \textit{pp. cit.}, pp. 113-114.
Not all bishops, metropolitans and patriarchs were unworthy, but the dual function of the ecumenical patriarch, symbolized by the double-headed eagle on his encolplion, corroded the spiritual nature of the office and contributed to strains and tensions within Orthodoxy.

No survey of the conditions of the Greek Church and people under Turkish rule could be complete without at least passing reference to the Turkish practice of forcibly recruiting children for service in the janissaries or the imperial civil service. This levy varied in frequency; under Mehmed II, it took place every four years. It was not uniformly applied throughout the Turkish empire, but where the practice of taking Christian children for Turkish service existed, its effects upon the Christian community were disastrous. The children were the brightest and healthiest and much of the vigor and administrative skill of the Turkish government rested upon these recruits who had once been Christian but had become devout Moslems. Much of the potential leadership of the Christian community was this drained away while, at the same time a substantial number of Greek families formally embraced Islam to retain their sons. This, in turn, further depleted the numerical and psychological strength of the Greek people.

Thus, under Turkish rule, the ecclesiastical structure of Orthodoxy an especially the ecumenical patriarch, had thrust upon them civil responsibilities and authority. Such power attracted to
the Church many who were in no way fitted for ecclesiastical office and it multiplied and intensified the problems of patriarchs and other administrators. The career of Cyril Loukaris unfolded against this background of political and financial pressure which was made more complex by self-seeking and mendacious bishops and priests.

And yet, with all its shortcomings and imperfections, the Orthodox Church struggled with some success to defend its people and to serve as their authentic spokesman. There were able patriarchs, metropolitans and bishops, and loyal clergy and laity. They, too, figured strongly in the life of Loukaris. It was the Orthodox Church, beset with pressures and difficulties as it was, which preserved a measure of national identification and cultural and historical heritage among the Greeks under Turkish rule. This role was further complicated, not simplified, by Orthodoxy's contacts with Christians in the West.
CHAPTER II
ORTHODOXY AND ROME

The time was July 6, 1439. The place was Santa Maria del Fiore, the Cathedral of Florence. Amid these stately surroundings, accompanied by appropriate services of thanksgiving, the Union of Florence was being read out in Latin and Greek. The documents had been signed the day before and they marked the formal reunion of Rome and Constantinople. It represented the conclusion of years of hard bargaining and the terms so favorable to Rome, reflected the desperate straits into which the Byzantine Empire and the Eastern church had come.

By 1430, most of the old Byzantine Empire lay in Turkish hands. The imperial capital itself was becoming increasingly hard pressed. Serbia and Bulgaria had been overrun. A powerful crusader army had been crushed at Nicopolis and now Thessalonica had fallen. If the remnant of Byzantine glory were to be saved, the rescue must come from the West. Accordingly, the Emperor John VIII Palaeologus had established diplomatic contacts with both the papacy and the rebellious Council of Basle. Against this background, the Council was formally opened by Pope Eugenius IV at Ferrara on January 8, 1438.

---

The delegations were especially impressive. In addition to the presence of the pope, the Latin party included the noted theologians Cardinal Julian Cesarini, later to preach a crusade against the Turks in Hungary, and Juan de Torquemada, later Cardinal and always confidant to Engenius. The Greek envoys were led by the emperor himself, John VIII, and his brother and included Joseph II the patriarch of Constantinople, Bessarion, archbishop of Nicaea, and Mark, bishop and metropolitan of Ephesus.² Isadore, metropolitan of Moscow, represented the Russian church.³ These luminaries were attended by a host of bishops, monks and minor dignitaries.

The issues soon became obvious. The Greeks needed men, money and support for the defense of Constantinople against the Turks. The Latins demanded reunion on Latin terms which included acceptance of "Filioque" or the double procession of the Holy Spirit, use of unleavened rather than leavened bread in the Eucharist, agreement on the doctrine of purgatory, and acceptance of papal authority.⁴


³ Vasiliev, op. cit., pp. 672-673.

The "filioque" controversy was longstanding. The Third Council of Toledo in 589 had inserted the words "and the Son" or "Filioque" into the Nicene Creed and by 1000 the addition had become accepted in the West, but over the violent opposition of the Eastern Church. Eastern theologians argued that a local synod did not have the authority to make additions to an ecumenical creed and that to say that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the both Father and the Son did violence to the concept of the Trinity. Eastern rejection of "Filioque" had contributed strongly to the tenth and eleventh century schisms between East and West.

The matter of papal supremacy was equally important. From the Eastern viewpoint, the bishop of Rome was the patriarch of the West with authority over Latin Christians but only one of the five historic patriarchs. Rome's claim to be the exclusive Vicar of Christ was vigorously repudiated by the Eastern Church although the validity of Roman orders was never questioned.

Compared to "Filioque" and papal authority, the other issues dividing East and West were minor. It had become customary in the East to celebrate the Lord's Supper with leavened bread while unleavened bread was used in the West. The choice of bread became a tangible sign of allegiance to Rome or Constantinople. The doctrine of purgatory was not debated at Florence and a formula was included in the terms of union which was acceptable to all.
Within the Eastern delegation, brought to Ferrara and maintained there at papal expense, two parties developed. Bessarion and Isadore were in favor of union while Mark fought any compromise. The debate dragged on. After a year of discussion, the papal coffers could no longer afford to meet the expenses of the Council and the city of Florence offered to serve as host assuming the host's share of expenses. The Council was transferred to Florence and opened officially February 26, 1439. Thus, Florence was able to give her name to both the Council and the resulting Union.5

Working committees which had been appointed in Ferrara were soon able to reduce the chief points of conflict to two; the "Filioque" question and the primacy of the pope. Recognizing the political necessity of Union, Emperor John put extreme pressure upon Mark and his followers to accept the Latin terms and even suspended their votes occasionally.6 The questions of purgatory and unleavened bread had been settled according to Latin formulas and Bessarion had delivered a learned discourse to show that double Procession of the Holy Spirit was implied by some of the ancient Greek Fathers.7

6 Oxford Dictionary of the Church, p. 510.
But the most convincing argument was the Western offer of help against the Turks. Finally, the Greeks accepted papal primacy, but on vaguer terms than Rome desired and a compromise formula which read that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son. The weary Emperor John, who had once prepared to return empty-handed to Constantinople, was present when the bull "Laetentur Coeli", symbolically reminiscent of an earlier union document, was read in the Cathedral of Florence. Missing was the Patriarch Joseph who had died during the course of the Council and lay buried in the church of Santa Maria Novella. Only Mark of Ephesus refused his signature to the articles of Union. And so, against the background of a "Te Deum", the schism between East and West was healed.

---


10 Oxford Dictionary of the Church, p. 778.

11 Vasiliev, op. cit., 674.

As events were to prove, this represented only a most temporary and purely formal reunion since the terms of Florence were never accepted by the bulk of the Eastern Church. But for Rome, the Union of Florence has determined her policy toward the East ever since. Whether the pope were Clement VIII in the sixteenth century, Leo XIII in the nineteenth, or John XXIII in the twentieth the message has been the same; accept the Union of Florence and harmony will be restored.  

There were some individuals who remained faithful to the Union. Bessarion returned from his sea to Italy where he became a Cardinal and almost pope and gave powerful impetus to the Renaissance movement.  

Isadore proclaimed the Union in Moscow although he received scant support.  

Ironically, his appearance in Constantinople in December, 1452, five months before the fall of the city, to proclaim the Union and to celebrate the Union liturgy in Hagia Sophia represented almost all the support the Byzantines received.  

---

14 King, *op. cit.*, vol. II, pp. 5-6.  
15 Vasiliev, *op. cit.*, 674.  
But the overwhelming mass of Orthodoxy repudiated the Union. Vasili II, Grand Prince of Moscow called Isadore "no longer the shepherd and teacher of his flock but a ravening wolf" for his part in the Union and imprisoned Isadore in a monastery from whence he escaped to Rome.¹⁷ Lucas Notaras, a Byzantine Grand Duke who had originally supported the Union remarked as Constantinople was about to fall, "It is better to see on the city the power of the Turkish turban than that of the Latin tiara."¹⁸ Metrophanes who had been appointed by Emperor John to succeed Joseph as patriarch was deposed to placate the irate inhabitants of Constantinople; he was replaced by Athanasios II whose Orthodoxy was unquestioned. Mark of Ephesus became a hero and the defender of the true faith and many of those who had originally signed the Union withdrew their adherence to it.¹⁹ A synod held in 1450, ²⁰ 1451²¹ or 1472²² formally repudiated the Union and the actions of the Greek representatives in Florence.

¹⁷ Vasiliev, op. cit., 674.
¹⁹ Callinikos, op. cit., p. 85-86.
²⁰ There is no agreement concerning the date of this synod. For a discussion of the problem and the authority for the date 1450, see Vasiliev, op. cit., p. 675.
²¹ Callinikos, op. cit., p. 86.
Yet the Union continued to be the basis for the Roman program for the East. The Union of Brest in Poland and Lithuania in 1596 was simply the application of the principles of the Florentine Union to a local situation.23

In attempting to enforce the settlement of Florence the papacy utilized existing resources and created new ones. The monastery of Grottaferrara, near Rome, had been founded in 1004.24 From the beginning, it had a Byzantine character although many Latin customs had crept in by the seventeenth century. Yet it retained enough of its Greek atmosphere for a modern scholar to speculate that perhaps Pope Julius II wore a beard, the first pope since primitive times to do so, because he was commendatory archimandrite of the Grottaferrara.25 Bessarion once served as titular abbot of this monastery.26

A far more useful institution in papal efforts to bring the East back into reunion was the College of St. Athanasius in Rome.

26 Ibid., vol. II, p. 5.
Gregory XIII recognized the need for a seminary to train exceptional young Greeks to serve Rome in her relations with the East. While there is some question as to the exact date of its founding, by the end of the sixteenth century the Greek College of St. Athanasius had begun to make a solid contribution to Rome's efforts against Orthodoxy.

Direction for the papal program within the Orthodox world came from a special source within the Roman hierarchy. In 1573, Gregory VIII, the same pope who established the College of St. Athanasius, created the Congregatio do rebus Graecorum. This congregation had responsibility for the supervision of matters pertaining to the Greeks. Its duties were somewhat broadened and more sharply defined by Clement VIII who founded the Congregatio super negotiis fidei et religionis catholicae, in 1605. As the possibilities for greater activity in the East developed, the papal machinery developed as well.


28 King, op. cit., vol. I, p. 44.

29 Ibid., vol. I, p. 44.
The papal bull "Inscrutabili Divinae" issued by Pope Gregory XV on June 6, 1622, created the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide.\textsuperscript{30} This Congregation originally was composed of thirteen cardinals, two prelates, a secretary and a consultor. Its mission was to provide for the spiritual needs of the heathen and to supervise the spread of papal allegiance in Orthodox lands. In the words of "Inscrutabili", part of its goal was to work for "the conversion of the nations of the Turkish Empire, once glorious, and endowed with admirable divine gifts, that now lie sunk in a besotted condition and, having fallen to the level of wild beasts, only continue to exist in order to swell the multitudes of Hell, to the greater glory of Satan and his angels.\textsuperscript{31}" Its internal organization was developed by Urban VIII (1623-1644) who organized within the Congregation two commissions, one to deal with discipline and the other to prepare approved liturgical books to be used by the mission priests. He also provided the Congregation with a seminary in which to train its priests. The Collegium Urbanum was established in 1627.\textsuperscript{32}

\textsuperscript{30} Oxford Dictionary of the Church, p. 1112.


\textsuperscript{32} Oxford Dictionary of the Church, p. 1112
A prefect-general co-ordinated and administered the program of the Congregation. An effective instrument had been perfected to implement papal policy in Orthodox lands.

While the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide had been entrusted with the supervision of Roman activities in the East, it was in no sense an order with its own sources of personnel. To carry out its decisions and put its policies into action, it relied on several orders, chiefly the great instrument of the Counter Reformation, the Society of Jesus. The story of the Jesuits is too well known to need retelling. Its disciplined obedience, the impressive intellectual calibre of its priests and the rigorous training which they were given made the Jesuits renowned and, in some quarters, greatly feared. Jesuit interest in diplomacy, missions and particularly education made the order even further qualified to serve the interests of the Congregatio.

The Jesuits were well aware of the effectiveness of educational institutions in shaping the attitudes of a nation or locality. Their educational system in the Hapsburg domains, for

---

example, was largely responsible for the solidly Roman orientation of most of the Hapsburg empire. By the end of the seventeenth century, this system included six universities, fifty-five colleges and twenty-eight seminaries. The Society of Jesus began to appear in Greek-speaking lands about 1583. Here, too, they followed their practice of establishing schools. An outstanding example was the seminary in Galata, the Italian quarter of Constantinople which attracted many students including Cyril Kontaris, later ecumenical patriarch.

Jesuit activities in the East were not confined simply to educational activities. They performed diplomatic missions, organized intelligence networks to provide Rome with accurate information about the actions and attitudes of all important political and religious figures and, on occasion, were willing to use whatever coercive resources were available to carry out Roman objectives. Perhaps Callinikos overstates the case somewhat when he says, "Diplomacy

34 Grimm, op. cit., p. 495.
35 Callinikos, op. cit., p. 133.
and bribery, calumny and coercion, persuasion and disension, - these were the various weapons employed by the despotic Roman Church in her efforts to dominate her needy brethren. Still, Jesuit activities seem to have been sufficiently suspect to warrant their exclusion from Constantinople in 1629 and the temporary suppression of the entire order by Clement XIV in 1773.

The Congregatio de Propaganda Fide made use of other orders besides the Jesuits. When the Jesuits were expelled from Constantinople, they were replaced by the Capucins, the Ordo Fratrum Minorum S. Francisci Capuccinorum. The Capucins were an offshoot of the Franciscan order and, at first, had to contend against Franciscan opposition to their creation in 1529. Despite the defection of their third general, Bernardo Ochino, to Protestantism, the Capuchins quickly came to the forefront in Counter-Reformation activities. Their activities in Constantinople indicated that they were equally willing to carry out the directions of the propaganda.

38 Callinikos, op. cit., p. 133.
39 Strenopoulos, op. cit., p. 17.
Papal policy toward the East was founded upon the Union of Florence which may have been stillborn so far as the Easterners were concerned but which represented a practical program to Rome. In the carrying out of this policy which was essentially that of encouraging union-minded individuals and groups within Orthodoxy and attacking their opponents, popes from the late sixteenth century onward had an increasing array of resources. There were colleges and seminaries both in Rome and in Orthodox lands to train men devoted to their cause. There was the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide to direct and co-ordinate their efforts and there were orders such as the Jesuits and Capuchins available for effective and useful service in the East. Against the background of a resurgent, post-Tridentine Roman Catholicism and the basic Roman policy toward the East, the result could only be increased pressure on an already harassed Greek Church to accept terms which had been rejected in the fifteenth century and which were clearly repugnant to a large proportion of the Orthodox clergy and laity.

Correspondence between the pope and the ecumenical patriarch and formal contacts, even though they might be correct and proper from the standpoint of protocol, could not obscure the fact that the basic orientation and interests of their churches were in serious conflict.
CHAPTER III
LUTHERANS AND CONSTANTINOPLE

It must have seemed to people in sixteenth century Western Europe that they were living in an exploding universe. The steady stream of explorers and adventurers kept cartographers busy continually redrawing their maps. Playwrights, poets, painters and sculptors felt free to experiment and innovate, transforming in the process old art forms and creating new. The hammer blows of the reformers in Wittenberg, Zurich and Geneva had broken through the encrustations of tradition so that theological speculation and debate on Christian fundamentals flourished as it had not for a thousand years. Throughout Western Europe there was a stirring and excitement and change.

For men like Luther and Calvin, this broadening of intellectual and cultural horizons meant renewed interest in the Eastern Church. There had, of course, been an awareness of the existence of Orthodoxy standing in some sort of opposition to Rome. The Hussites had even attempted to exploit Greek Opposition to the Union of Florence to strengthen their own hand in Bohemia.

---

But in the opening decades of the sixteenth century there was little precise information about the current state of the Greek Church. The phrase "The Greek Fathers" normally referred to Athanasius, Chrysostom, Basil and the two Gregorys rather than Palamas, Scholarios or Photios. Luther's appeal to the example of the Greek Church in the Leipzig Debate of 1519 was most vague and there is no evidence that he had any knowledge of distinctively Orthodox teaching.\(^2\)

It fell to Luther's co-worker and chief lieutenant, Melanchthon, to establish personal contacts with the Greek Church and to facilitate the exchange of accurate information. As a fluent Greek scholar, he had the technical qualifications; as a humanist and a man of irenic temperament, he had the motivation and the personality for such a task; and, above all, he had the opportunity provided by Antonios Eparchos.

Antonios Eparchos was a Corcyran by birth and an ardent Greek nationalist. Driven from his homeland by the Turks, he found refuge in Venice and there had come in contact with the writings of the Wittenberg reformers. He wrote to Melanchthon in 1543 on behalf of ecumenical efforts to arrive at some sort of

\(^2\) The text of resolution 13 of the Leipzig disputation of 1519, Luther's confession of 1528 and the appropriate portion of Von den Konsiliis und Kirchen appear in Wort und Mysterium (Witten: Luther Verlag, 1958), p. 327.
Protestant-Catholic relationship such as had led to the conference at Regensburg in 1541. But Antonios' arguments were strictly political. The most important goal was the liberation of Greece from Turkish rule. This would be a mission of the Christian West and it could not be accomplished if Western Christians were divided and, hence, weak. The Reformation had, by bringing disunity, contributed to this weakness. So he recommended that all religious differences should be settled and prejudices laid aside that Western Christendom might be united in the face of Turkish power.

The argument was, of course, unacceptable to Melanchthon and his friends but it needed a reply which was given by Joachim Camerarius of Leipzig. He defended the right and need of the Reformation and denied that it was responsible for Western disunity against the Turks. Such weakness and disunity came from the selfishness and disunity of princes who, like Francis I of France, had even concluded treaties with the enemy to further their own ends. While Antonios saw theological questions entirely subordinate to political aims, Camerarius stressed that eternal truth, with which the Reformation was concerned, was far too important to be compromised for political objectives. Thus, the

---


4 A summary of the reply is given in Benz, *op. cit.* , pp. 18-27.
correspondence closed.

Melanchthon's growing interest in the East was deepened as he came to know Demetrios Mysos, a Serbian. Demetrios had been born in what was then Hungary but what is now probably a part of Yugoslavia. Ordained a deacon, he had served for several years under the Ecumenical Patriarch Joasaph II (1555-1565) and had come to Wittenberg in 1559 to learn more of the Reformation. Favorably inclined toward the Reformation, he may have come of his own accord or he may have been commissioned by the Patriarch. For about six months he stayed in Wittenberg as Melanchthon's guest and formed fast friendships not only with Melanchthon but with Melanchthon's son-in-law, Caspar Peucer, a physician and student of Slavic languages and affairs. Melanchthon had been corresponding with several Greek princes but it was only from Demetrios that he received a first hand report on the current state of affairs in the Greek church.

When the time came for Demetrios to return to Constantinople, Melanchthon prepared a letter to the patriarch. The letter was

5 Berthold F. Korte, "Early Lutheran Relations with the Eastern Orthodox" in The Lutheran Quarterly IX (1957), p. 55.
6 See the letters in Benz, op. cit., to Jacob Dissorinos, Lord of Doris, pp. 38-39, and Basilikos Markettios, Despot of Samos, p. 36.
7 Text in German translation is given by Benz, op. cit., pp. 63-64, and Word und Mysterium, p. 238.
polite and conciliatory and its chief function was to introduce the Augsburg Confession. Demetrios took with him from Wittenberg both the letter and a Greek translation of the Augsburg Confession which, Melanchthon hoped, would form the theological basis for an understanding between Wittenberg and the East.

From the moment of its presentation at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530, the Augsburg Confession had been the most comprehensive yet succinct statement of Lutheran belief available. In creedal significance, it ranked below only the three ecumenical creeds and was the most appropriate document to indicate concisely Lutheran faith and practice.

Melanchthon's pen had drafted the Confession as presented at Augsburg and he seems to have assumed that even though the 1530 document had been signed by a number of Lutheran princes and free cities, he had the right to make revisions. In 1540, he issued what is known as the "Variata" edition which considerably softened the distinctiveness of the original in the hope of finding some common ground with the Calvinists. The Variata was generally repudiated by Lutherans but its existence in 1559 raises the question as to which version of the Confession had been translated.

A related question concerns the identity of the translator. When the translation into Greek was published in 1559 in Basle, Paul Dolscius, a student of Melanchthon's, wrote the preface and
thus his name has been attached occasionally to the entire work. But the preface, which states that the purpose of the translation is to stimulate the study of Greek among Western theologians and to prove the close harmony between Lutherans and Orthodox, is so far from the real facts that it is obvious that Dolscius was unaware of the true significance of the work. The name of Melchior Kling is associated with the translation of the Acta but there is no reason to consider him the translator.

To the question of which version of the Augsburg Confession formed the basis of the translation, Benz answered that it seemed to be based on an early version of the Variata which Melanchthon wrote in 1531. It is not simply a literal translation but rather a reworking of the entire approach and tone of the original German and Latin.

From the tenth century onward, Eastern and Western theology in large measure went their separate ways. In the West, satisfaction and merit were central concepts and Luther and his followers understood justification primarily as a forensic act. But such a

---

8 Florovsky, loc. cit., p. 179.

9 Contents of Acta et Scripta are listed by Benz, op. cit., pp. 94-96.

10 Ibid., p. 96.

11 Ibid., pp. 100-103. See also Georges Florovsky, "The Greek Version of the Augsburg Confession" in Lutheran World VI, No. 2 (September, 1959), pp. 153-155.
legal approach was foreign to Eastern thinking where Greek theologians saw God as the healing doctor whose touch brought salvation. So the Greek translation of the Augsburg Confession stressed this concept of reconciliation rather than justification and used terms from the Liturgy and the Greek fathers to bridge as much as possible the differences between East and West.¹²

The evidence would seem to point to Melanchthon as the real translator of the Confession. Martin Crusius referred to Malanchthon as the translator and Crusius was a good friend of Camerarius who was kept well informed by Melanchthon on all matters pertaining to the Eastern Church.¹³ More fundamentally, Melanchthon seems to have been the only theologian who felt free to revise and adapt the version of the Confession which was presented in 1530 at Augsburg. He had done so in 1531 and again in 1540 and it is difficult to imagine anyone else but Melanchthon doing it in 1559.¹⁴

There is great significance in the identification of Melanchthon as the translator of the Augsburg Confession into Greek. After the death of Luther, Melanchthon had become the recognized leader of the Lutheran movement and he had labored diligently for a common understanding with Calvinism and an

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 122-126.
agreement with honor with Rome. The fact that he was willing to undertake what was in effect a complete rewriting of the Augsburg Confession in the hope that this would promote better relations with the East indicated that he recognized Orthodoxy as an integral segment of Christendom. The shift in theological emphasis apparent in the Greek translation showed that he recognized that there were subtle yet profound differences to be overcome. Had one of Melanchthon's students or colleagues undertaken the translation, the whole episode might have been interesting but peripheral. Melanchthon's own participation in the project underscored the fact that there were some very influential Lutherans who were eager to establish cordial relations with the Eastern Church, and, if possible, to find some meeting of minds concerning the nature and expression of the Christian Gospel.

Since Melanchthon was an able Greek scholar and a true student of the Greek fathers, he had the technical capabilities to translate the Augsburg Confession into Greek. Yet the vocabulary and phraseology of the translation would suggest the collaboration of someone familiar with the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, the liturgy of the Eastern Church. There is no record of Melanchthon having such knowledge but Demetrios, an ordained deacon, would certainly have been able to suggest felicitous phrases to make the Confession seem less exotic to Greek ears.15

15 Ibid., pp. 124-125.
It would appear, therefore, that the letter and translation of the Augsburg Confession which Demetrios carried with him as he left Wittenberg had been composed by Melanchthon with Demetrios himself helping in the translation of the Confession. Unfortunately, they never reached Constantinople.

Jacob Hereclide had established a principality along the Moldau in Wallachia. Hereclide was a well educated humanist who knew and admired Melanchthon. As part of his plans for enlightened government of his principality, Hereclide intended to introduce the Reformation into his realm. For success, this project required the assistance of someone who knew the Reformation and also Orthodoxy. Hereclide turned to Demetrios, Melanchthon's former student. Demetrios had left Wittenberg but had not returned to Constantinople. Instead, he was waiting in his native Serbia for word about a project of Hans von Ungnad. When word came that Hereclide needed Demetrios in Wallachia, he responded by hurrying to join Hereclide and work for the Reformation.

The Despotate of Wallachia was short lived, however. Although the Orthodox Church at first seems to have supported the Prince's reforming policy, opposition soon developed. Within

16 See, for example, the letter in Benz, op. cit., pp. 40-41.
17 Details in Benz, op. cit., pp. 34-58.
18 Ibid., p. 48.
two years after he had founded his principality, Hereclide found himself facing a revolt of the peasants led by Orthodox monks. Both the prince and Demetrios perished in battle. The letter and the Greek translation of the Augsburg Confession which Demetrios had intended to deliver to Constantinople were destroyed. Thus the hopes of Melanchthon for establishing friendly relations with the Eastern Church and the plans of Hereclide for erecting a reformed Christian state along the Moldau both came to nothing.

The collapse of the Despotate of Wallachia came about, not from Turkish conquest, but from internal revolt. The reforming policy of Hereclide and Demetrios met determined and violent opposition from Hereclide's Orthodox subjects. After a reign of two years, Hereclide's principality and life ended together as Wallachian peasants led by Orthodox monks rose in rebellion. The difficulties the peasants had been forced to endure had come, they felt, as judgment from God for turning from the ways of Orthodoxy, and Hereclide's overthrow was the result. Demetrios stood by his friend and leader in the turmoil and the fighting and lost his life, too. The letter and translation of the Augsburg Confession which Melanchthon had hopefully addressed to the Patriarch of Constantinople were probably destroyed along with Demetrios, and both the attempt to establish a reformed Christian state in Wallachia and to establish direct relations between Wittenberg and Constantinople came to nothing.
Demetrios had been waiting in Serbia for word from Hans von Ungnad when he received Hereclide's message. Hans von Ungnad, Baron of Sonneck, represented another attempt by the Lutherans to establish contact with Orthodoxy. 19 Ungnad had fought the Turks as a professional soldier and had advised a number of rulers in central Europe on measures they should take to combat Turkish expansion. Even though he had never concealed his interest in the Reformation and his sympathy for the teachings of Luther, he was appointed by Charles V captain general of Lower Austria, Croatia and adjacent lands. He was concerned that Christendom be united behind the exposed position he was trying to hold and he was dismayed by the division of Germany into Catholic and Protestant armed camps and by the administrative problems the resulting tensions raised for him. He felt obliged to carry out the policies of Emperor Ferdinand and yet, since many of the inhabitants in his lands were followers of the Reformation, he was sympathetic to their position. Finally, he resigned and devoted the rest of his life to a project which combined his hostility toward the Turks with his evangelical zeal.

The plan which Hans von Ungnad proceeded to put into operation was the literary penetration of the Slavic lands, especially those under Austrian domination, with the works of

19 For the full story, see Benz, op. cit., pp. 141-208. There is a short summary in Korte, loc. cit., pp. 57-59.
Luther and other reformers. Headquarters were set up at Urach in southern Germany. Vendors were to operate from Transylvania where the "Transylvanian Saxons" around Hermannsburg and Kronstadt were concentrated and from Lithuania where Prince Radziwiłł was favorable to the Reformation. Once books had been translated into languages using the Cyrillic alphabet, there seemed limitless possibilities, even including mission efforts among the Muscovites.

Ungnad saw this whole effort as an attempt to strengthen the Church and individual believers among the Orthodox rather than a bid to supplant Orthodoxy with a Lutheran ecclesiastical structure. Orthodox priests were used as translators and Demetrios joined enthusiastically in the work. In soliciting support from the princes and free cities of the Empire, Ungnad pointed out that Islam was a religious as well as a military force which had to be met on the religious plane as well as on the battlefield. Some support was forthcoming and tens of thousands of Testaments and copies of works of the Reformers were distributed, making this the most successful Lutheran project in the East thus far considered.


21 Benz, op. cit., p. 181.

22 For lists of requests and donors, see Benz, op. cit., pp. 204-208.
In 1573, a different Ungnad, David, Baron of Sonneck, was appointed Imperial Ambassador to the Sublime Porte. Before departing for Constantinople, he selected a Lutheran chaplain to accompany him and to minister to the spiritual needs of his embassy. He chose Stephen Gerlach, a graduate of Tubingen University. Gerlach, who later became a professor at Tubingen, was noted for his interest in the Greek Church and the East and his appointment as chaplain raised again the possibility of direct contact between Lutheran leaders and Greek Orthodoxy. Melanchthon had died thirteen years earlier, but Martin Crusius was teaching Greek and Latin at Tubingen and he had developed an interest in the East from Joachim Camerarius who had been a confidant of Melanchthon. Also interested in the project was the rector of the University, Jacob Andreae. Thus, when Gerlach left Tubingen, he carried letters from both Crusius and Andreae to Jeremias II, ecumenical patriarch of Constantinople.

Unlike the letter of Melanchthon to Joasaph II, these letters actually reached Jeremias. Crusius displayed, at least initially, little curiosity about ecclesiastical affairs and showed more concern for information about the current state of the Greek nation under Turkish rule. Andreae attested to Gerlach's

---

23 For excerpts of diary, see Ernst Benz, Die Ostkirche (Freiburg-Munchen: Karl Alber, 1952), pp. 24-29 and Wort und Mysterium, pp. 240-246.

24 Wort und Mysterium, pp. 29-32.
learning and piety.\textsuperscript{25} Jeremias replied in 1574\textsuperscript{26} in a tone friendly enough to warrant a joint letter from Crusius and Andreae introducing the Greek translation of the Augsburg Confession which Melanchthon and Demetrios had made fifteen years earlier.\textsuperscript{27} At last the Augsburg Confession in Greek had reached Constantinople and was receiving consideration by the patriarch.

The response to the Confession and the correspondence which had preceded and accompanied it indicated interest in better understanding from Constantinople as well as Tübingen. The extended reply of Jeremias was "the last doctrinal statement set forth in the East, in which little or no influence of Western tradition can be detected. It was, in some sense, an epitome of and an epilogue to Byzantine theology."\textsuperscript{28} In preparing this summary of Orthodox teaching, Jeremias drew upon the work of Nicolas Cabasilas, Symeon of Thessalonika and Joseph Bryennios, all Greek theologians of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and St. Basil the Great and St. John Chrysostom among the early Fathers. Various Greek scholars and church leaders co-operated in the preparation of the letter and Theodosius Zygomalas was probably the chief contributor,\textsuperscript{29} but Jeremias himself revised

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., p. 32.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., pp. 33-36.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., p. 37.
\textsuperscript{28} Florovsky, "Orthodox Churches and Ecumenical Movement," p. 178.
\textsuperscript{29} Philaretos Vafides, \textit{Enkathedurikí Istoría} (Constantinople: 1912), vol. III, part 1, pp. 51-52.
the final draft and considered himself personally responsible for the accuracy and completeness of its contents.

While the form of the letter was essentially a commentary on the Augsburg Confession, article by article, the substance was an exposition of Orthodox belief. The tone was irenic but there were differences of emphasis and some basic differences of belief. While the patriarch agreed in general with the Lutheran position on original sin, he stressed at the same time man's freedom and responsibility. Nothing, of course, can be done without divine initiative, but since the Christian freely receives God's grace, faith and works cannot be separated and contrasted as the Lutherans tried to do. Jeremias rejected the Lutheran view that there are only two sacraments, baptism and the Lord's Supper, and defended the Orthodox number of seven. The Eucharist was not only sacrament, as the Augsburg Confession taught, but also sacrifice. Penance, while subject to abuse, was extremely important in the spiritual strengthening and cure of the sinner. The patriarch also commented at length on the invocation of saints and monastic vows, practical matters


31 *Wort und Mysterium*, pp. 59-69, 105-112.

32 Ibid., pp. 69-73.

33 Ibid., pp. 77-78, 85-93.

34 Ibid., pp. 78-85.
which were extremely important to the Lutherans.\textsuperscript{35}

Strangely, Jeremias had little to say about the doctrine of the Church and nothing about eschatology, the doctrine of "last things". He seemed to feel that the vaguely worded statement in the Augsburg Confession that "unless he has been duly called and ordained to this function"\textsuperscript{36} was sufficient if understood in the Orthodox sense.

The Patriarch concluded by proposing that if the Lutherans were willing to accept the Orthodox teachings as he had explained them, he would be willing to accept them into communion with the Eastern Church and the union would be consummated.\textsuperscript{37} Since the letter had been amply buttressed with quotations from the Fathers and from Scripture and its tone was friendly and conciliatory, perhaps Jeremias actually felt that such a union might be possible.

The suggestion was, of course, unacceptable to Andreae and Crusius, and they were joined by Lukas Osiander in a reply dated

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., pp. 112-124.
\item\textsuperscript{36} Article XIV of the Augsburg Confession found in Concordia Triglotta (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921), p. 48.
\item\textsuperscript{37} Wort und Mysterium, pp. 52-53, 124.
\end{itemize}
June 18, 1577. They defended the Lutheran principle of *sola Scriptura* against the authority of the Fathers for determining doctrine and this evoked a shorter response two years later from Jeremias. The Tubingen theologians replied and finally, in 1581, the Patriarch restated briefly his position on the sacraments, invocation of saints and monastic vows and suggested that since there was nothing more to say, the correspondence be terminated. But even as he was remarking that from a dogmatic viewpoint, there was no point in continuing, he assured his correspondents of his lasting friendship. Thus ended the doctrinal correspondence between the theologians of Tubingen and the Patriarch Jeremias II.

Lutheran interest in the Eastern Church continued, especially in Poland where there was personal contact and in Russia where a delegation had visited as early as 1557. But

---


40 *Wort und Mysterium*, pp. 191-208.


42 Eduard Steinwand, "Lutheranism and the Orthodox Church" in *Lutheran World VI, No. 2* (September, 1959), pp. 122-139.

43 Florovsky, "Orthodox Churches and Ecumenical Movement," p. 177/
the conclusion of the correspondence between Constantinople and Tubingen marked the end of the first phase of contact between the Reformation and the East.\textsuperscript{44} What had been accomplished?

It was now obvious to the Lutherans that there was no realistic possibility of formal union between themselves and the Eastern Church. Even fundamental understanding of each other's position would be difficult, as the correspondence with Jeremias indicated. On the other hand, Lutheran knowledge of the Greek Church had increased tremendously in fifty years. Important documents such as the Augsburg Confession had been translated into Greek and a substantial body of literature now existed in Slavic languages thanks to the printing house founded by Hanns von Ungnad. These might be used in later contacts with the Orthodox. Thus, while some of the more optimistic expectations entertained in the beginning had given way to a more realistic appraisal of the position of Orthodoxy vis-a-vis both Lutheranism and Rome, the door still seemed to be sufficiently ajar to warrant further interest in and study of the Eastern Church by the Lutherans.

So far as the Orthodox Church was concerned, by far the most important result was the composition of further additions to the accepted doctrinal statements of the Eastern Church. The three

\footnote{\textsuperscript{44} There is a helpful summary by Gerhard Stratenwerth in \textit{Wort und Mysterium}, pp. 11-28.}
letters of Jeremias are considered among the symbolical books of Orthodoxy which correctly expound the faith and practice of the faithful and which may be used as a basis for the study of the true teachings of the Eastern Church. Thus, Orthodoxy has given its stamp of approval to the explanations and expositions of Jeremias.

In addition, Constantinople now had much more detailed information about this new anti-Roman movement which had consolidated its position in Central Europe. While there was nothing more to be said doctrinally, there might still be room for some local co-operation and, at any rate, the basic documents and some explanatory letters were available for study in the ecumenical patriarchate.45

45 The publication of the letters and relevant documents came about almost by accident. A copy of the patriarch’s first reply fell into the hands of Stanislaus Socolovius, a Polish priest who was chaplain to Stephen Batory, king of Poland. Socolovius published a Latin translation under the title Censura Orientalis Ecclesiae de Praecipuis Nostri Saeculi Haereticorum Dogmatibus in 1582. Since even Pope Gregory XIII commended Jeremias for his rejoinder to the “schismatics,” Crusius and Andreae felt compelled to publish the entire correspondence. The Acta et Scripta, published in 1584, was the result.
While Lutherans continued their interest in the East, the termination of the correspondence between Tubingen and Jeremias marked the end of a period in Protestant-Orthodox relations. Until 1585, contacts had been largely literary. Correspondence had been exchanged and books and documents had been translated and published. The Protestantism which the Eastern Church had encountered was Lutheran and German. This was soon to change.

The career of Cyril Loukaris exemplified some of the changes. Calvinists replaced Lutherans as the Protestants in most direct contact with the East. They were Dutch, Swiss and English rather than German. Their contact was personal rather than literary and the Protestant presence was very real in Constantinople by the early seventeenth century. In this second phase, some of the tensions and differences between Protestant and Orthodox which had been latent became active matters for consideration. Relations between Orthodox and Lutherans faded into the background. Relations between the Eastern Church and Calvinism were sharply focused in the person and the career of Cyril Loukaris.
CHAPTER IV
CONSTANTINE TO CYRIL - THE EARLY YEARS

The year was 1572. Sir Francis Drake had just begun his attacks upon Spanish ports in America. The Dutch had elected William of Orange stadtholder and begun their war of liberation from Hapsburg rule. It was the year in which French Protestants perished in the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre and John Knox died in Scotland and the Society of Antiquaries in London was founded. Maximillian II was Holy Roman Emperor and Jeremias II was succeeding Metrophanes III on the patriarchal throne in Constantinople. That was the year in which a son, Constantine, was born to the Loukaris family in Heraklion, Crete.

In 1572, Crete was still a part of the crumbling Venetian Empire. Cyprus had fallen the year before, but the Venetian flag still flew over Crete and the Venetian Candia still officially replaced the Greek name of Heraklion. Venice had made Crete a colony almost four hundred years earlier and she would not be driven finally from the island until 1718. The final pacification of Crete had taken a century and a half, and even when it had been completed, the veneer of Venetian culture was not particularly thick. In the cities and towns there were Latin bishops and monks and a semblance of Venetian ways, but even here the Venetians were becoming progressively Hellenized. In the countryside, Greek Orthodoxy prevailed and the solidly Greek population was relatively
little affected by the Venetian occupation.¹

Originally, Venice had prohibited the establishment of schools in her Greek possessions. But in 1550, she reversed her earlier decree and permitted the opening of schools throughout Crete, Cyprus, Chios, the Ionian Islands and the other Greek speaking territories under her control.² These schools, coupled with the University of Padua which had come under Venetian influence in 1405, made the Venetian empire the best place for a Greek Orthodox to receive an education, at the same time competent and liberal and also within his own Orthodox tradition.³

Young Lourkaris was fortunate, therefore, in being born in Crete. Little is known of Stephanos Loukaris, Constantine's father. Papakopoulos says that the family which came from the Dalamatian coast was of noble origin with some relationship to the imperial Palaeologi. According to Papadopoulos, the Loukaris family fell on hard times,  


became impoverished and moved from Dalmatia to Candia. Here, Stephanos worked as a butcher, his wife took in washing, and young Constantine was apprenticed to a fisherman. On a trip in the fishing boat to Alexandria, Constantine met his uncle, Meletios Pegas who informally adopted his nephew. Papadopoulos cites no source for his account and Hadjiantoniou casts a skeptical eye on the whole story. It is certain, however, that at some point early in his career, Loukaris became the protege of his illustrious uncle and that from the beginning he showed exceptional intellectual promise and received a superior education.

Constantine Loukaris began his education in the school of the monastery of St. Catherine in Candia. The teacher was a monk, Meletios Vlastos, who was famous for his own learning and the education he had imparted to many young Cretans. A warm personal relationship was established which continued throughout the years.


5 Hadjiantoniou, op. cit., p. 16-17.

6 This account of Loukaris early life as well as much of the narrative of his career is based on G.A. Hadjiantoniou, op. cit. and Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, Kýpiás Loukarís (2nd ed., Athens: 1939).
In 1584, at the age of 12, Loukaris was sent to Venice to continue his education. A member of the Greek intellectual community when Loukaris arrived in Venice was Maximos Margounios. Margunios had spent his family inheritance in Venice in a vain attempt to found a Greek-language printing house. Then his interest turned to the Orthodox church and he was elected Bishop of Cythera, an island off the southern tip of Greece, but the Venetian authorities who governed the island refused to let him assume his duties. Margounios thereupon went to Venice to secure permission from the proper authorities in Venice itself. The quality of Margounios' education is shown in his letters which have a classic stateliness to their style and reflect a cultured intellect. Luckily for Loukaris, Margounios agreed to serve as tutor for the boy from Crete.

The curriculum was Latin, classical Greek and Italian with some philosophy added. For four years, Margounios polished Constantine's prose style and linguistic abilities so that even he was no longer a student of Margounios, friends of Loukaris noticed "Margunizing" tendencies.

---

7 For full details see N.K. Papadopoulos, op. cit., II, pp. 264-265.

8 For example, see letters in Emile Legrand, Bibliographie hellenique ou description raisonnee des ouvrages publies par des Grecs au dix-septieme siecle (Paris: 1894-1896), vol. IV, pp. 180-184, 188-190.

Here again, a relationship was established which lasted for many years. When Loukaris was a student at Padua, his former tutor supervised his studies and, as with Vlastos, Loukaris continued correspondence down through the years.

In 1588, the Italian phase of Loukaris' life experienced an abrupt interruption. Most probably, financial difficulties of Stephanos Loukaris compelled the return of Constantine to Candia. At the age of sixteen, he found himself once again in his native city facing the real possibility that his formal education was at an end. But the intellectual drive and ambition which was to mark Loukaris' life showed itself. Margounios was a native of Candia, too, and he had left in Crete a small library. Constantine unearthed this library and continued his study by reading Plutarch, Cicero, Demosthenes, Flaminius, Eusebius and Aristotle. Within a year, however, Loukaris was on his way back to Italy. It is not clear whether it was the support of his parents, Margounios or Meletios Pegas, or perhaps a combination of several sources, that enabled Constantine to return to Italy, but soon he was enrolled as a student at the ancient University of Padua.


11 Hadjiontinou, op. cit., p. 17.

12 See letter of Margounios in Legrand, op. cit., IV, pp. 177-178.
Padua was one of the most influential and respected Universities in Europe. Its prestige had been enhanced in 1405, when Padua was annexed by Venice and the University confirmed in her traditional liberties and freedom. Although Venice was Catholic, its opposition to the Papacy and its commercial insights made it a bulwark against the restrictions of Rome as exemplified in the Holy Office of the Inquisition. Venice admitted the Holy Office only under protest and with strict civil control so that Venetian territory continued to be a haven for many kinds of intellectual refugees. Venetian presses published books which were burned by Roman authorities but hailed as important works by the international intellectual community.

The University of Padua was also a center for Hellenic studies and the source of Greek Orthodox higher education. In the fifteenth century, Padua and Venice had been in the forefront of the study of Greek and the "New Learning". In 1463, a chair of Greek was first established with Demetrios Chalcocondylis of Athens as professor. In 1497, Niccolae Lacnicaus Tomaeus, an Epirot, lectured on Aristotle from the original Greek instead of from Latin or Arabic translations. This event, the first of its kind, was hailed by Petritro Bembo.

13 Sherrard, op. cit., p. 172.
14 Hadjianou, op. cit., pp. 9-10.
15 Sherrard, op. cit., p. 173.
Greek editions were published by Zacharias Calliergis, and Aldus Manutius as well as other lesser known printers. Between 1572 and 1600, there were twenty Greek professors at Padua.\(^{16}\) Most of the teachers for the Greek schools throughout the Venetian empire were Paduan graduates and later, when Loukaris wished to improve the Patriarchal Academy and the educational system it represented, he chose a Padua Alumnus, Theophyllos Corydaleus, who promptly reorganized the Academy along the lines of the University of Padua.\(^{17}\)

Constantine Loukaris was seventeen when he matriculated at Padua and joined the extensive Greek "nation" of students from Crete, Cyprus and the other Greek-speaking lands. Two of his professors were Francis Piccolomini and Cesare Cremonini. Piccolomini was just concluding a long and distinguished career, and Cremonini was just coming to eminence. A neo-Aristotelian, Cremonini through his students influenced the shape of philosophical study throughout the Eastern Mediterranean.\(^{18}\)

While a student at Padua, Loukaris had the opportunity to follow the theological debates between Margounios and Sevros,

\(^{16}\) Ibid., p. 175.

\(^{17}\) Ibid., p. 176.

Metropolitan of Philadelphia. It was Sevros who introduced Constan
tantine to the German scholars, David Hoschel and Friederich
Sylberg. Here, too, a friendship developed and marked Loukaris' first treal contact with scholars who were neither Greek nor Italian.19

Loukaris also came into contact with the Society of Jesus.20 The Jesuits had attempted to place professors in the University of Padua in order to limit intellectual freedom and experimentation and to bring it more into line with the official policies of the counter-Reformation. A committee headed by Cremonini and Piccolomini secured from the Venetian Senate a decree limiting Jesuit instruction to "Literae Humaniores." Only Padua could have so restrained one of the most influential orders of the Church, and the effect was to enhance Padua's reputation as a center of intellectual freedom.

Loukaris spent six years studying at Padua. Throughout, Margounios supervised his studies and his conduct. The years of study were marked by no great, dramatic incidents but reflect, rather, the story of a good student absorbing a superior education.


At last, he had passed his final examinations, received the degree of "laureatus" and bade goodbye to his friends.²¹

What sort of education did Loukaris receive in Venice and Padua? More important in view of his later career, how much exposure to Protestantism had Constantine experienced? His course of study seems to have emphasized languages, particularly Latin, Italian and Greek grammar and literature and philosophy. The philosophy of Cremononi, especially was materialistically Aristotelian. Under his teaching, "Neo-Aristotelianism entered its last phase, attention being directed altogether away from such questions as the nature of the soul, and focused exclusively on the exterior phenomena of nature and empirical facts - on, that is, the purely natural sciences."²² Theology he studied under the direction of Margounios who seems to have displayed no great attraction toward any form of Protestantism. The important friendships with Protestant theologians, churchmen and diplomats which mark Loukaris' later career were all formed after he left Italy.²³ It would appear, therefore, that whatever Protestant influences came

²¹ Hadjiyantoniou, op. cit., p. 23.

²² Sherrard, op. cit., p. 175.

²³ This point is emphasized by Chrysostomos Papadopoulos in Πατριαρχικά Πατησίων (Alexandria: Patriarchal Press 1935), p. 669.
to bear on Loukaris began at a later point in his life, and his studies were not particularly unusual for a Greek student at Padua, in itself a rather common occurrence.\(^4\)

But this does not mean that the years spent in formal education were unimportant for Loukaris. The training which he had received clearly marked Loukaris for leadership in the Greek nation. More important, by his zeal for study Loukaris had shown a commitment to the principle of education. This love for learning and an understanding of the power of education marked his career to its very end. In Poland and in Constantinople, Loukaris time and again sacrificed much to further the educational opportunities of his people. Loukaris' early years were not the beginning of his Calvinism but the expression of an even more important principle; - his lifetime concern for education, his parents. Then, in response to a call from Meletios Pegas,\(^5\) he continued to Alexandria where he would be ordained a priest and take a new name, Kyrillos or Cyril, as a token that his life as a student had ended and he was about to enter the service of his Church.\(^6\)

\(^4\) Hadjiantoniou, op. cit., pp. 10-11.


\(^6\) C. Papadopoulos believed that Loukaris was ordained in Alexandria. See Aoukaris, p. 15. Hadjiantoniou disagreed and believed that Loukaris was ordained in Constantinople, op. cit., p. 25.
"Is he worthy?" asked Meletios Pegas, Patriarch of Alexandria. "He is worthy," replied the assembled congregation. And thus the ordination of Constantine Loukaris proceeded to its climax. The information surrounding Loukaris' ordination is so scanty that there is no agreement concerning either the time or the place. Hajiandiaiou was sure that Constantinople was the site, whereas Germanos, following Papadopoulos, asserted flatly that Loukaris had been called by Meletios Pegas to Egypt where, in 1593, he was ordained a Deacon and Presbyter at the age of 21. The majority opinion would seem to favor Alexandria as the place and, whether Egypt or Constantinople, the year was 1593. One other fact is certain. Upon his ordination to the priesthood, Loukaris exchanged his baptized name of Constantine for the ecclesiastical name Cyril. The name Cyril is, of course, gloriously associated with the history of the Patriarchate of Alexandria, and it is as Cyril that history knows Loukaris who was to ascend successively the patriarchal thrones of Alexandria and then Constantinople.

1 G. A. Hadjiantoniou, Κύριλλος Λουκάρης (Athens: 1954), pp. 24-25
Within months after his arrival in Egypt, Loukaris was on his way to Constantinople for an extremely important Synod. Jeremias II, the Ecumenical Patriarch who had corresponded with the Tübingen theologians, had traveled to Russia in 1588. The chief purpose of his visit was to ask alms to restore the shattered treasury of the patriarchate. In this he was ultimately successful and returned to Constantinople with considerable financial support, but the trip had far more important repercussions in both Russia and Poland.

In 1547, Ivan III was crowned Tsar of Russia instead of retaining the traditional title, Grand Prince of Moscow. And from that moment, the Russians looked toward the day when the Metropolitan of Moscow might be raised in a similar way to the status of Patriarch. The arrival of Jeremias, the first ecumenical patriarch ever to visit Russia, seemed to herald that day. Jeremias was royally received and honored as a most eminent person. The contrast between his precarious and tumultuous existence in Constantinople must have contrasted starkly with the honor and devotion lavished upon him in Moscow. He was thus receptive to the proposal made by the Russians that he remain with them and be their patriarch.

---

Jeremias' initial acceptance of the suggestion established the principle that Russia was entitled to a patriarch. But reasons then were advanced which made the dismissal of Job, reigning Metropolitan of Moscow, impossible and Jeremias was offered, instead, the see of Vladimir. But as Jeremias remained longer in Russia, there were features of Russian life which seemed less attractive. The food was strange and the services long. It was Jeremias himself who suggested that Job, the incumbent Metropolitan, be consecrated Patriarch of Russia and, accordingly, the new patriarch was installed on January 26, 1589. In the installation charter, the clause appeared, "Because the old Rome has collapsed on account of the heresy of Apollinarius and because the second Rome, which is Constantinople, is now in possession of the godless Turks, thy great kingdom, O pious Tsar, is the third Rome. It surpasses in devotion every other, and all Christian kingdoms are now merged in thy realm. Thou art the only Christian sovereign in the world, the master of all faithful Christians." But in order for the elevation of Job to be considered fully canonical, the consent of the Orthodox patriarchs was needed. The conservative nature of Orthodoxy seemed to preclude the creation of

4 Ibid., P. 70
5 Ibid., p. 70-71
7 Quoted by Zernov, op. cit., p. 71.
any addition to the historic four patriarchates, but negotiations and substantial gifts and financial subventions to the impoverished patriarchates helped to create a more favorable attitude.  

The Synod of Constantinople in 1593 was the formal result of such negotiation and activity. The patriarchs of Jerusalem and Antioch joined Meletios of Alexandria and Jeremias of Constantinople in agreeing that Job was, indeed, Patriarch of All Russia. This was the most significant official action of the Synod. One of the most important topics of discussion, however, was the critical situation of the Orthodox Church in Poland and Lithuania.

The religious picture in Eastern Europe in the latter half of the sixteenth century was most complex. Lutherans and Calvinists had established themselves in Poland and Greater Lithuania (or Ruthenia, as it is often called in Roman Catholic circles) and were contending for adherents against an anti-trinitarian group which was led by Fausto Paolo Sozzini or Socinus. Orthodoxy had been present since the founding of the see of Kiev in the tenth century. Latin Christianity arrived at almost the same time and

---

8 Latourette, op. cit., p. 905
had now been revitalized by the Counter Reformation.\(^1\) The competition among these groups for favor and protection was further complicated by national and dynastic factors. The Protestants traditionally looked toward the German-speaking lands for support and the Orthodox toward the East. But the throne of Poland, had become a source of strength to the Roman Catholics.\(^2\)

Under Sigismund Augustus, the last king of the Yagellon dynasty and the most liberal of Polish and Lithuanian kings, the two countries of Poland and greater Lithuania were made one state in 1569. Political power was vested by the Treaty of Lublin in the elected king and the gentry who elected him.\(^3\) Religious freedom was also provided, but the Orthodox Church was still on the defensive. The Jesuits had first entered the combined kingdom in 1560, and they quickly established a network of schools culminating in the College of Vilna which made devout Roman Catholics of the sons of many Polish and Lithuanian nobles.\(^4\) Stephen Batory, by his conversion to Catholicism, had given a further important advance to the Roman Catholic cause and the accession of his successor, Sigismund III Vasa, marked complete Catholic ascendancy.

\(^1\) Latourette, *op. cit.*, pp. 873-874
\(^2\) Grimm, *op. cit.*, pp. 504
\(^4\) Zernov, *op. cit.*, pp. 84
Sigismund had been educated by the Jesuits and he was determined to bring his Orthodox subjects under papal obedience.

Jesuit schools received royal favor. Roman Catholic nobles and bishops were welcomed at the court. Perhaps the most important single measure adopted by Sigismund was the exclusion of Orthodox bishops from the Senate of the realm. This, in effect, deprived the Orthodox hierarchy of any political influence and put them at a most decided disadvantage compared to their Latin counterparts. 15

Internally, the Orthodox Church in Ruthenia had serious problems. The educational level of both laity and clergy was low and compared unfavorably with the well trained Latin clergy. The scandal of the Bishop of Lovtsk who was charged with immorality compromised the moral position of the entire clergy, since not all of the priests and bishops exhibited the piety and purity their offices would have seemed to demand. 16

Partly in reaction, lay brotherhoods came into existence. The first of these brotherhoods was organized in Lvov and soon others would be found in Kiev, Luck, Przemysl, Vilno, Minsk and Mogilev. 17 They received official standing in 1588. In connection

15 Ibid., p. 85
16 Hadjisntoniou, op. cit., pp. 27-28
17 Zernov, op. cit., pp. 87-88
with his trip to Russia, Jeremias visited Poland. In Kiev and in Galicia he granted special charters to these brotherhoods which led to administrative chaos but which, in the long run, perhaps saved Orthodoxy in those areas. The brotherhoods were given administrative control not only over their own members but over parish clergy and, to some extent, over bishops as well. This gave laymen a direct interest and responsibility in the administration of the church. Furthermore, the brotherhoods were authorized to establish schools for the Orthodox, a belated recognition of Jesuit success in this area.\(^{18}\) Thus, an organization outside the hierarchy was established through which a man like Prince Constantine Ostragsky could rally the Orthodox faithful. An educational system was founded which could serve as some sort of counterweight to the attractions of the Jesuit academies.

In view of the preferment of the Roman Catholic hierarchy and the corresponding disabilities of the Orthodox bishops, it is not surprising that efforts were begun to secure the submission of Orthodox bishops to papal authority along the lines of the Union of Florence.\(^{19}\) The provisions of the Union continued to be the official policy of Rome. When Rome's well placed intelligence sources reported a growing interest on the part of the Orthodox bishops to a local union on the same basis, emissaries were dispatched to Poland to stimulate this interest and, if possible,

\(^{18}\) Ibid., p. 87.

\(^{19}\) Halecki, op. cit., pp. 240-241.
to bring the project to fruition.\textsuperscript{20}

The Orthodox leaders in the endeavor were two bishops, Ignatius Pociey and Cyril Terlecki.\textsuperscript{21} Pociey had been successively a Calvinist and a Roman Catholic before his Orthodox ordination and he still retained many contacts among the Latins. Terlecki had long been in favor of Polish Orthodox submission to Rome and had circulated petitions privately among most of the Orthodox hierarchy to that end. In 1594, these two bishops prepared a petition which set forth the willingness of the Orthodox bishops to accept papal supremacy on about the same terms as the Union of Florence.

An overwhelming majority of the Orthodox bishops supported the petition and at the national synod held at Brest in 1595, they voted to send Pociey and Terlecki to Rome with the offer of a Union.\textsuperscript{22} While this was done with the full knowledge of papal representatives in Poland and Rome and with at least tacit support from Sigismund, it was kept secret from the general Orthodox membership. The shroud of secrecy was not complete, however, and Prince Constantine Ostrogsky, the leading Orthodox layman,

\textsuperscript{21} Zernov., op. cit., pp. 86
\textsuperscript{22} Halecki, op. cit., pp. 287-291
learned of the project.\textsuperscript{23}

Prince Constantine tried to rouse his co-religionists against the possible union and three of the bishops who had secretly agreed now publically opposed any submission to Rome.\textsuperscript{24} This, however, did not deter Pociey and Terlecki who travelled to Rome and presented the union offer. It was warmly accepted and Clement VIII had a special medal struck to commemorate the event.\textsuperscript{25} The two bishops returned to Poland and the stage was set for a second Synod of Brest in 1596.

While the intelligence system of the ecumenical Patriarch did not equal that of the pope yet, Jeremias was aware of the possibility of such a union movement developing in Poland, and it was a matter of earnest discussion at the Synod of Constantinople.\textsuperscript{26} The patriarchs had no money, political power or Jesuit-type organization with which to influence the Polish situation, but they decided to send representatives to see what might be accomplished at that late hour. Meletios Pegas would have undertaken the task but urgent business kept him in Constantinople so two exarchs or foreign representatives were chosen. Nikephoros Parschos Kantakouzinos

\begin{itemize}
\item Zernov, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 86
\item Halecki, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 331-333
\item \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 327-333
\item Hadjiantoniou, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 28
\end{itemize}
was selected as exarch of the ecumenical patriarch and Cyril Loukaris was made exarch of the patriarch of Alexandria.\textsuperscript{27}

They arrived in Poland at an especially stormy time. The Ruthenian hierarchy assembled at Brest for their synod. The atmosphere was tense with bitterness and the split within the Church soon became apparent.\textsuperscript{28} Prince Constantine led the forces opposed to union and he was supported by two bishops, Balaban of Lvov and Kopystenski of Przemysl and the two exarchs. The other bishops all followed Pociey and Terlecki.

Pociey was bishop of Brest and he and his followers assembled in his cathedral. Constantine's followers assembled in "the private home of an antitrinitarian layman."\textsuperscript{29} Mikephoros presided as representative of the ecumenical patriarch. The patriarch of Constantinople was the ecclesiastical superior of Ragosa, metropolitan of Kiev, primate of the Orthodox Church in Poland and Greater Lithuania. When the group which had assembled in the cathedral, with Ragosa presiding, accepted the results of Pociey's and Terlecki's trip to Rome, the anti-union group

\footnotesize
27 Zernov, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 86
28 Halecki, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 366--368
29 \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 369
pronounced the sentence of excommunication. The pro-union synod replied in kind. The result, therefore, of the Synod of Brest in 1596 was to split the Orthodox Church in Poland into two factions. The majority of bishops, but only a small minority of clergy and laity accepted the Union of Brest which made them subject to the papacy, but which allowed them to retain their rites and customs. Ironically, they did not receive their coveted representation in the senate. On the other hand, Prince Constantine, supported by two Ruthenian bishops, the mass of clergy and laity and the various patriarch, repudiated the Union and set about rallying his forces to face the persecution, confidently expected.

Opposition did, in fact, arrive. Sigismund III accepted the formal action of the pro-union Synod as legally binding and declared that since there was no longer a Greek Church out of communion with Rome, the constitutional provisions for religious liberty did not apply to Constantine and his followers. Because of his prestige, power, and position as leading Orthodox layman, Constantine could withstand the force of the king's displeasure. But Nikephoros

30 Zernov, op. cit., pp. 86
31 Halecki, op. cit., pp. 380-382
32 Ibid., pp. 382-382
33 Zernov, op. cit., pp. 87
34 Pastor, op. cit., pp. 138-139
was captured, charged with being a Turkish agent, and starved to death.\textsuperscript{35} Loukaris who had played a less prominent part in the proceedings of the Synod escaped arrest and remained free to help in the rebuilding of the Orthodox church in Poland.

The poor educational background of most of the Orthodox clergy and laity placed them at a tremendous disadvantage in their relations with their Roman Catholic opponents. Loukaris, therefore, immediately set about improving Orthodox educational standards. He served for twenty months as rector of the Greek Orthodox school which existed in Vilna\textsuperscript{36} and then he moved to Lvov where he founded a similar school. At Vilna, he organized a printing house which issued authentic and unfalsified texts of Orthodox scholars and churchmen such as Meletios Pegas.\textsuperscript{37} In view of the widespread perversion of texts which the Jesuits were spreading in their efforts to make the Union a reality, such a printing house was extremely important. By this time, the royal attempts to suppress the anti-union forces had resulted in the death of Nikephoros and Loukaris was feeling greater danger and more severe pressure himself.\textsuperscript{38} Realizing that he could accomplish little more in

\textsuperscript{35} Zernov, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 86
\textsuperscript{36} Hadjianontiou, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 31
\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., pp. 31-32
\textsuperscript{38} Strenopoulou, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 11
Poland at the moment, he reported back to Meletios Pegas in Constantinople.

The Patriarch Theophanes Karykes who had succeeded Jeremias II in 1596 had died the following year. Meletios Pegas was obviously the most able Orthodox churchman and the logical choice for the ecumenical throne, but the patriarchal treasury was empty and Meletios himself could not provide the necessary peskesi. The throne, therefore, was declared vacant and Meletios was appointed locum tenens or "Supervisor of the Ecumenical Throne". As the representative of patriarchal authority, Meletios had received a letter from Sigismund III in which the Polish king pointed out the effects of the Union of Brest and urged that for the sake of unity, Meletios and the Orthodox Church submit to Rome. Meletios replied negatively. And he selected Loukaris, who had just arrived from Poland a few months ago, to carry the answer to Sigismund.

Diplomatic immunity had not yet been fully established in international law, but Cyril seems to have been able to deliver Meletios' letter to Sigismund in 1599. In connection with this trip, he took part in a very important conference in Vilna. Here,

39 The text has been published by Georg Hofmann, S.J., "Die Patriarch Meletios Pegas" in Orientalia Christiana XXV, No. 76 (March 1932), pp. 261-262
40 Strenopoulos, op. cit., p. 11
Lutherans, Calvinists, Polish Brethren and loyal Orthodox had assembled under the leadership of Prince Constantine Ostrogsky to consider joint action in the face of royal and Roman Catholic oppression and to discover if any unity of faith existed. The various groups agreed to co-ordinate their efforts toward religious liberty and established a confederation for that practical purpose. But the proposal by Simon Turnovsky, President of the Brethren Church in Poland, that an attempt be made to achieve complete religious unity was greeted coolly by Loukaris and the Orthodox representatives. The only result was a letter with questions for further discussion which was transmitted to Meletios for comment. The patriarch of Alexandria was non-committal for he did not wish to endanger the practical co-operation which seemed established nor did he wish to offend unnecessarily the Polish government. Soon, Loukaris was on his way from Eastern Europe home to Crete and then to Egypt. His Polish labors were finished.

In the broad picture of the struggles of Orthodoxy in the commonwealth of Poland and Lithuania, Loukaris accomplished

---


42 Ibid., p. 182

43 Ibid., p. 182
relatively little. Even if he had been on the scene many years earlier, it is doubtful if he could have altered the outcome of the 1596 Synod of Brest. But these years in Ruthenia were important in Cyril's personal development. His first hand contacts with the Society of Jesus engendered a suspicion of the order and a hatred of its methods of operations which were strengthened by his later experience as patriarch of Constantinople. Yet, even as he bitterly opposed the Jesuits, Loukaris paid them the compliment of attempting to reproduce their educational and publishing institutions. In this, the young Cretan was continuing the concern for educational opportunities which he had shown in his own educational career.

The years in Poland and Lithuania were significant for another reason. Here, for the first time, Loukaris had entered into working relationships with Protestants. He had heard Lutheran and Brethren theology debated in assembly. Orthodox including Loukaris realized that they needed to co-operate closely with Polish Protestants if any of them were to withstand Latin pressure. This experience also made a deep impression on Cyril Loukaris.

The warmth of Cyril's personality attracted many friends. Personal contacts were established with Orthodox communities in Poland and Ruthenia which continued throughout Loukaris' life. There were always churchmen, nobles and simple laymen in those communities who followed Cyril's career with a sense of personal
interest and concern. While Loukaris' sojourn in Poland may not have been important in the history of the Church there, those years left an indelible impression on the man who was about to ascend the throne of the patriarch of Alexandria.
"His Beatitude Cyril III, pope and Patriarch of the Great City of Alexandria and All Africa." This was the official title of Cyril Loukaris after September, 1601. Meletios Pegas had called his nephew from his work in Eastern Europe to Alexandria in order that uncle and nephew might share a few moments before Meletios' death. 1 Loukaris arrived on September 11, 1601, and Meletios died on September 13. 2 The obvious choice for the vacant throne was Cyril, and thus the young man who was just turning thirty ascended to the dignity of the patriarch of Alexandria.

The history of the patriarchate was glorious and the title of the patriarch was resounding, but the actual situation in 1601 was a different matter entirely. No longer were the see and city of Alexandria foremost in the civilized world. The city had sunk to merely provincial status with scarcely a trace of its former glory remaining. 3 The patriarchate was hard pressed by resurgent Copts and Nestorians on the one hand and Rome on the other. Its coffers

1 This letter is quoted in Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, Ιστορία τῆς Ἐκκλησίας Ἀλεξανδρείας  (Alexandria: Patriarchal Press, 1935), p. 671.
2 Ibid., p. 671.
were empty. If the patriarch of Alexandria were to have any influence in the affairs of the Eastern Church, that influence would need to come from his personal qualifications, for his position was little more than a title.

The faithful in Egypt were hard pressed on several fronts. The Nestorians and Copts held doctrines concerning the nature of Christ which had been formally condemned in the fifth century. The churches, however, continued to exist throughout the Medieval period. Their fortunes varied and by the beginning of the sixteenth century, the once-flourishing Nestorian church had almost disappeared in Egypt. In the hundred years before Loukaris became patriarch this trend was reversed and by 1600, Nestorians were again numerous.\(^4\) The Arab-speaking Copts had flourished and they, too, were experiencing a renewal of power. Emessaries from Rome, usually Jesuits, were working with these groups in an attempt to bring them into communion with the Latin Church.\(^5\)

As soon as possible after his election, Loukaris, therefore, convened a synod in Cairo which was to organize Orthodox defenses against the inroads of the Copts, Nestorians, and their Roman friends.\(^6\)


\(^5\) Papadopoulos, *'Αλεξανδρία*, p. 671.

\(^6\) Ibid., p. 671.
The educational level of Orthodox clergy and laity in the see of Alexandria was, if anything, lower than the scandalous average of the Eastern Church. In a vigorous effort to combat some of this ignorance and superstition, the new patriarch further intensified his heavy preaching activities. There are, for example, fifty-two sermons preserved, preached in Cairo in 1609 and 1610. One of the most reliable ways of tracing Loukaris' travels, in fact, is to consult the list of dates and places of his sermons.

Since Cairo was the center of Egyptian life rather than Alexandria, Loukaris had moved his residence there in order to enjoy its better communications and to have access to government officials. But the patriarchal property was in serious disrepair. In order to gather money for the building program which Cyril felt was essential, he sent one of his monks, Maximos Peloponnesios, to Greece and Russia to collect funds. Maximos met with initial success and some of the buildings were begun, but when Maximos was captured by pirates, the flow of funds stopped and was not resumed.

---


8 Papadopoulos, *Alexandrias*, pp. 672-673.


10 Ibid., p. 40.
Upon his release, Maximos became a candidate for the position of archbishop of the Monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai, much against Loukaris' wishes.\(^{11}\)

Cyril encountered many of the problems which are the common burden of administrators. But he did not confine himself exclusively to Egyptian affairs. He was active in the Cypriote Church, in Constantinople, and in correspondence with Western churchmen.

There is a letter in the Vatican Archives dated October 28, 1608, (November 7, new style) written in Loukaris' miserable handwriting from Alexandria.\(^{12}\) In this letter, the patriarch of Alexandria seemed to accept papal supremacy based on Petrine succession. He wrote that he had become convinced from a study of the Fathers that Roman teaching was true and he awaited the salvation of the Greek East through the intervention of the Vicar of Christ. It was a most remarkable letter for a Greek patriarch to write, especially in view of Loukaris' activities in Poland. There, he had been the victim of a forged confession, a part of the efforts of the Jesuit Peter Skarga to compromise Cyril's effectiveness.\(^{13}\)

\(^{11}\) Papadopoulos, *\textit{Alexandria*}, p. 674.


But the autograph of the 1608 letter has been published in facsimile and its authenticity is unquestioned. The most plausible explanation is that Loukaris was feeling the pressure of Jesuit activity in Egypt and he hoped that a show of submission to Rome might subdue openly anti-Orthodox Jesuit activity in Egypt as it had for a time before the Union of Brest in Poland.

From March until May of 1608, Cyril was absent from Egypt. He was participating in the consecration of a new patriarch of Jerusalem, Theophanes. It was his first visit to Palestine and he visited Damascus and the Holy Places. As have many tourists, he remarked that the Holy Sepulcher might more fittingly have been left as a simple stone grotto rather than an ornate marble edifice. The relationship between Cyril and Theophanes soon deepened into friendship and mutual respect and throughout his life, Loukaris could count on Theophanes as an ally.

Relations between Cyril and two ecumenical patriarchs, Raphael II and Neophytos were less cordial. Custom decreed that upon his election, a patriarch would write a "letter of peace" to the three other patriarchs. Raphael had broken protocol by omitt-
ing such a letter in 1603 and his successor, Neophytoς, had done the same in 1607. The real reason for the coolness between the patriarchs, however, lay in differing attitudes toward Rome. Both Raphael and Neophytoς belonged to the pro-Roman party and Cyril’s activity in Poland had marked him as an opponent of the papacy and its Jesuits.

Through correspondence, Loukaris maintained his contacts with the Orthodox communities in which he had worked in Poland and Moldavia. He was even asked to intervene in a dispute over who should be bishop of Lvov. Isaiah Valavanos had been elected but Isaiah Tessarovioς occupied the chair. After hearing the evidence, Loukaris decided in favor of Valavanos, but referred him to Constantinople for satisfaction.

Tensions were especially strong in Constantinople in 1612 when the ecumenical throne became vacant once again. Factions and parties contended for the position, and the most effective device was to promise to the grand vizir a larger peskesi than rival claimants. Loukaris had been appointed locum tenens in February and

17 Papadopoulos, *Αλεξάνδρεια*, pp. 672-673.
19 Papadopoulos, *Αλεξάνδρεια*, p. 675.
20 Ibid., p. 676.
was a candidate with considerable support. But he refused to offer a higher peskesi than his chief rival, Timotheos of Patras, and Timotheos became patriarch. The rivalry and intrigue which had characterized the pre-election struggle continued after Timotheos had been enthroned and Loukaris found the atmosphere in Constantinople dangerous. He left, therefore, to visit old friends in Wallachia and Moldavia and to strengthen the Orthodox communities there. Although his trip was against the wishes of Timotheos, he wrote a letter to the patriarch reporting in gloomy terms the conditions as he saw them in that part of Orthodoxy. After he felt that passions had somewhat cooled, Cyril started for Egypt but interrupted his trip with a sojourn among the monasteries of Mt. Athos.

21 Hadjiantoniou, op. cit., p. 47. Strenopoulos, op. cit., p. 13, contends that Loukaris was not a candidate.

22 Edward Grimston, A Continuation of This Present History included in sixth edition of Richard KnoUes, The Turkish History from the Origin of That Nation to the Growth of the Ottoman Empire (London: 1687), vol. II, p. 917.

23 Hadjiantoniou, op. cit., p. 47, says that Loukaris went first to Athos and then to Vlachia.

Here he barely escaped an attack on his life and after an absence of over three years, he hurried back to the comparative safety of Cairo and Alexandria.

Before returning to Alexandria, Loukaris added to the thick file of his correspondence with the Orthodox in Eastern Europe. Early in 1616, he wrote to the congregation of Turgovitza and to the Voivoda Radel urging them strongly to maintain their Orthodoxy against Jesuit proselytizing. He also wrote several pamphlets. In "Against the Supremacy of the Pope" and "A Friend of Truth and a Zealot", the latter in dialogue form, Loukaris criticized Roman teachings severely. Both pamphlets were widely circulated among his friends in Eastern Europe.

From Alexandria, Cyril wrote to the ecumenical patriarch, Timotheos, to defend himself against the charges of Neophytos. Neophytos, a member of the pro-Roman party had been deposed and sent into exile in Rhodes. Loukaris and Neophytos had never been friendly, and now the former patriarch of Constantinople accused Loukaris of being a Lutheran. Loukaris had come into contact with Lutheran theologians

---

and churchmen in Poland who presented Lutheran teachings. It would have been far more reasonable, however, for Neophytos to have charged Loukaris with being a Calvinist, for Cyril had displayed far more interest in Calvinism than Lutheranism.

In 1602, Loukaris had met on the island of Paros the representative of the Netherlands, Cornelius Haga. Haga, who was later Dutch ambassador in Constantinople, and Loukaris formed a fast friendship and the patriarch asked that Haga might send him some books. In due course, writings of Protestant Calvinistic theologians began arriving in Alexandria.

It was through Haga that Loukaris began corresponding with Jan Uytenbogaert. Uytenbogaert was the leader of the Arminians who contended with the Calvinists over free will and predestination. The Arminians held that God willed all men to be saved while the Calvinists insisted that God willed that only the elect be saved.

---


Two letters from Loukaris to Uytenbogaert are extant. In the first, Cyril defended Orthodoxy vigorously and praised it for having kept a primitive faith against the innovations, particularly of Rome. In the second, he set forth the dogmas of the church, but adopted a mediating position between Reformed and Orthodox teachings. The sacraments were two in number, he said, but he insisted on the necessary unity of faith and sacrament for efficacy. Both elements were necessary for fulfillment. He made it clear that he accepted the concept of the Lord’s Supper which taught that the bread and wine became the Body and Blood of Christ. He conceded that there were erroneous practices within Orthodoxy, but he insisted that, contrary to Rome, these were not of the essence of the church. In neither letter did Loukaris comment in any specific manner on the question of predestination.

David le Lew de Wilhelm, a Dutch theologian and statesman, was another correspondent of Loukaris. Here, too, the ostensible purpose of the exchange was books, but de Wilhelm seemed to have hoped to convert Loukaris to Calvinism. From Cyril’s letters, it would seem that he made some progress. In Loukaris' second letter, he stated that he and de Wilhelm were in agreement in the

30 Jean Aymon, *Monuments authentique de la religion des Grecs*; The Hague; 1706
31 Aymon, op. cit., pp. 142-143.
32 Strenopoulos, op. cit., p.15.
fundamentals of faith, in the fifth and sixth letters he agreed with Calvinist positions on the Lord's Supper and in the twelfth of the series of fourteen letters, Loukaris conceded that Orthodoxy was in need of reform, but he seriously doubted the possibility of this happening.

In 1618, Loukaris wrote to Mark Antonio de Dominis, a former Roman Catholic archbishop of Spoleto who had become an Anglican. He told de Dominis that he had come to recognize the truth of Reformed doctrines after three years' study of the Fathers and Scripture and that he now held the doctrine of the real presence of the Lord in the Eucharist against Roman teaching of transubstantiation on the one hand and Luther's doctrine of ubiquity on the other. He also rejected the invocation of saints as dimming the glory of God.

33 Aymon, op. cit., pp. 175-176.
34 Ibid., pp. 181-182.
The genuineness of this correspondence is unquestioned while the Calvinistic trend is pronounced. Germanos could only conclude that although Cyril had read widely in Protestant theology, he had not understood the fundamental differences which separated Orthodoxy and Protestantism in many areas of belief.37

Against the background of his contacts with Lutherans in Poland and especially his correspondence with Reformed theologians, Loukaris chose to defend himself against Neophytos by citing his vastly superior knowledge of Western theology.38 His opponent was generally stupid and particularly ignorant of Luther's teaching which Loukaris' erudition was an ornament to the Church. "But what to say, what to answer to a senseless and stupid man? Does this man not see that the brilliance of my Orthodoxy shines throughout the Church?"39 Instead of issuing some kind of statement of Orthodox faith, Loukaris offered to defend himself before a synod and continued, "And as for the accusation that I am a Lutheran, it is not to be wondered at that he who neither knows, nor has dreamed of Luther's religion and wisdom, and does not know in what points the

37 Strenopoulos, op. cit., p. 15.

38 This letter is dated June 4, 1613 and is printed in Legrand, op. cit., vol. IV, pp. 279-280.

39 Ibid., p. 279.
Greek Orthodox Church agrees and in what it disagrees with the Lutherans, has fallen into a pit.\(^{40}\)

Correspondence of a less theological nature was exchanged between the patriarch of Alexandria and the archbishop of Canterbury. Archbishop Abbot and Patriarch Cyril had come to know each other by 1616,\(^{41}\) when Loukaris apologized for delay in answering a letter from Abbot because Cyril had been in Poland working with the Orthodox there. Through the kind offices of Sir Thomas Rowe, a scholarship had been provided for a Greek student. During his visit to Mt. Athos, Loukaris had met a young monk from Verria in Macedonia named Metrophanes Kritopoulos.\(^{42}\) Cyril had made Metrophanes his protégé and protosyngellos when, in 1616, the formal scholarship offer was made. In a letter dated March 1, 1616, Loukaris wrote to Archbishop Abbot announcing that he had selected Metrophanes to study in England.\(^{43}\) He arrived in the middle of 1617,\(^{44}\) and for five years

\(^{40}\) Ibid., p. 280.

\(^{41}\) Papadopoulos, \textit{Eleni}, p. 678.

\(^{42}\) Hadjian toni ou, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 48.


\(^{44}\) Ibid., p. 679.
Metrophanes studied at Oxford. Then, to Abbot's chagrin, he followed a leisurely path across Western Europe back to Egypt. On his way, he lectured at various universities and prepared in 1625, in the form of a confession, a statement of the faith of the Eastern Church for the Lutherans at Helmstadt. In Geneva, he discussed the possibility of closer relations between Protestants and Orthodox.

Metrophanes' years of study in England gave considerable stimulus to English interest in the Eastern Church. The concern on the part of the Church of England which had led to the offer of a scholarship for a Greek student was greatly increased by the presence of the gifted young priest. Kritopoulos not only stimulated Anglican consideration of the Eastern Church but he achieved some success among Lutherans and Calvinists as well. His lectures in the German universities were well attended and his confession was accepted as an authentic testimony of the Eastern Church. Metrophanes' con-

45 Hadjiantoniou, _op. cit._, p. 49.
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versations in Geneva awakened an interest in the East which ultimately led to the sending of Antoine Leger to Constantinople.\textsuperscript{48}

His intellect, his personality and his foreign study combined to insure an important role in Orthodoxy for Kritopoulos. That career reached its peak when, in 1636, Metrophanes was elected patriarch of Alexandria, a position once held by his friend and mentor, Cyril Loukaris. But Loukaris then had no use for his old throne. He had been elected years before to the position of ecumenical patriarch in Constantinople.

CHAPTER VII

DIPLOMATS AT THE PORTE

When Cyril Loukaris ascended the ecumenical throne, he was already aware of the general diplomatic scene within the Turkish empire. In carrying out his duties and working toward his goals as patriarch of Constantinople, he was obliged to make use of diplomatic friendships and rivalries. Any understanding of Loukaris' actions and program, therefore, would be virtually impossible without at least some impression of diplomatic policies in Constantinople in the early seventeenth century.

Papal policy was committed to the overture of Loukaris and the destruction of his program. In the implementation of this policy, Rome could rely upon the active co-operation of France.\(^1\) Louis XIII was personally a dedicated son of the Church but, even more important, French interests in the Levant were of long standing. Francis I had signed a treaty with Sulieman the Magnificent in 1536,\(^2\) which included in its provisions the recognition of the King of France as protector of Latin Christians in the Turkish Empire. French kings cited this clause in claiming

---
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protective rights over the Holy Places in Palestine and attempted
to assert proprietary interest in the election and deposition of
patriarchs. These claims were only the more dramatic aspects of
a determined effort to dominate trade within the Turkish realm.

Throughout their history, Turks had been excellent warriors and
acceptable shepherds and farmers, but little interested in commerce.
By the beginning of the seventeenth century, trade, both domestic
and foreign, was largely in non-Turkish hands. Greeks and Armenians
were prominent, particularly the Greeks of Constantinople. If
opposed to French commerce, this Greek community could represent
a formidable barrier; if favorable to France, an important ally. Thus, Cezy, the French Ambassador, considered it fundamental to
the successful execution of his instructions to be fully informed as
to the likes and dislikes of all Greek leaders and to exercise his
influence to secure advantages to the Greek friends of France.

The role of Rudolph Schmid, Ambassador of Austria, was
somewhat different. The Hapsburg domins had a long history of
Turkish incursions and even when there were no formal hostilities,

3 Ibid., p. 73
4 Pastor, op. cit., p. 233
5 Germanos Strenopoulou, Kyrillos Loukaris (London: S.P.C.K.,
1951), p. 17
relations between Austria and Turkey were never particularly
cordial.\(^6\) Schmid, therefore, was not appointed in 1629 to
promote Austria's virtually non-existent trade with Turkey but
rather to gauge accurately the rumors circulating around the
bazaars and diplomatic salons and to report to Vienna the newest
favorites in the harem or the most recent appointment to the
Divan and the significance of each event for Austro-Turkish relations.
He did this with great success.\(^7\) Schmid could be counted upon to
courage whatever opposition to Loukaris he could. The Catholic
representative of a conservative Catholic power, he was personally
opposed to an energetic Orthodox leader.\(^8\) Moreover, Hapsburg
lands would probably be more tranquil and easily ruled by Catholic
emperors if the ecumenical patriarch of Orthodoxy concerned
himself with liturgical correctness instead of entertaining a
program for ecclesiastical revitalization as Loukaris might do.

If relations between Turkey and Austria were sometimes
unfriendly, relations between Turkey and Poland were generally
hostile. Poles and Turkes fought alone or with allies but
always bitterly.\(^9\) Nikephoros had been executed by Sigismund as

\(^6\) See, for example, Sidney Nettleton Fisher, *The Middle East, a
History* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1959), pp. 222-224

\(^7\) Strenopoulos, *op. cit.*, pp. 17-18

\(^8\) Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, *Κυριλλος Νουκαρης* (2nd edition:
Athens: 1939), pp. 106-107

\(^9\) See, for example, Fisher, *op. cit.*, p. 240
a Turkish agent and, for most Poles, this act was a capital crime. Since Loukaris had as patriarchal representative opposed the policies of Sigismund and the Jesuits, he rightly expected only hostility from the Polish ambassador. Cyril freely admitted trying to promote an alliance between Turkey and Russia and trying to persuade Russia to attack Poland.\[10\] Perhaps there was some truth to Dom Guepin's charges that Loukaris was instrumental in bringing about a coalition of Turkey, Russia, and Sweden against Poland.\[11\] Both Loukaris and Sultan Murad seem to have agreed that Poland was Turkey's most formidable European foe.

Venice in 1503 had been the first to secure permission from the sultan for a resident diplomatic representative in Constantinople.\[12\] The Venetian Vailo kept himself informed of political affairs and intrigues and knew of the politics around the Ecumenical Throne. But even more than the French Ambassador, Contarini, the bailo, was concerned about trade.\[13\] Venice remained largely neutral during most of Loukaris' career. Only at the end did Contarini join Cyril's enemies and suggest in 1634 as patriarch

\[10\] Strenopoulos, *op. cit.*, p. 18


\[12\] Fisher, *op. cit.*, p. 216

\[13\] Strenopoulos, *op. cit.*, p. 18
Athanasios III Patellarios of Crete, a fanatical opponent of Loukaris.¹⁴

The remaining important European Catholic country, Spain, had interests in the Eastern Mediterranean but no resident ambassador. Thus, Philip IV did not figure significantly in the diplomatic history of Turkey or in any way in the career of Loukaris.

The Sublime Porte was at almost the opposite corner of Europe from the Court of St. James', yet England maintained an important and well staffed embassy in Constantinople. The English ambassador was usually an able and influential man and often a leader among Protestant diplomats in Turkey. English commercial interests had been defined in a treaty in 1580 which, in effect, gave England trading rights equal to those enjoyed by France and other European states.¹⁵ The protection of those rights was one of the tasks of the ambassador.

Related to this responsibility was that of establishing friendly relations with the ecumenical patriarchate. The fact that the Catholic nations were commercial rivals to England and that their ambassadors led the opposition to Loukaris made a warm alliance between the English embassy and the patriarchate highly

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 18
¹⁵ Hadji Antoniou, op. cit., p. 59
desirable. The personalities of Loukaris and Sir Thomas Rowe made it most pleasant.\textsuperscript{16} By the early seventeenth century, the Church of England had become more aware of the Eastern Church and, during most of Loukaris' career, greatly desired to strengthen and improve friendly contacts.\textsuperscript{17}

In effect, Rowe placed the resources of his embassy and himself at Loukaris' disposal. He protected him against accusations of the Turks and he provided a haven for the printing press which had been imported through Rowe's intervention. Cyril's presentation of Codex Alexandrinus to James I was probably in appreciation for the friendship and support shown by Rowe.\textsuperscript{18}

Rowe's successor, Sir Peter Wych, who arrived in 1628, continued the personal friendship but was more hesitant with official support. Religious policy in England was undergoing a change with Roman Catholicism receiving royal support. Repercussions of this re-orientation reached Constantinople and thus the

\textsuperscript{16} Strenopoulos, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 19-20

\textsuperscript{17} See the example of Metrophanes Kritopoulos, below, pp. and Loukaris' correspondence with Archbishop Abbot in Papadopoulos, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 61-64

\textsuperscript{18} R.M. French, \textit{The Eastern Orthodox Church} (London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1951), pp. 86-87
English embassy figures much less in Loukaris' career after the departure of Rowe.\footnote{19}

The early seventeenth century marked the apogee of Dutch power and glory. Her painters were at the height of their creativeness and her merchants were prospering as never before. The magnificent homes and civic buildings which still stand attest to the significance of Dutch commerce during this period and it was essential that the Netherlands be represented in Constantinople. A treaty was signed in 1612 admitting the Netherlands to the commercial privileges which the Porte had conferred on France and England.\footnote{20} The establishment of the Dutch embassy with Cornelius Haga as ambassador, dated from that year.

The Dutch ambassador played a most energetic role in promoting the interests of his country, but the name of Antoine Leger, chaplain to the ambassador, was more important in the story of Protestantism and the Eastern Church. A Swiss Calvinist, Leger established an extremely close relationship with Loukaris and through him, the Dutch embassy became intimitely involved with the affairs of the patriarchate in general and Loukaris in particular. The details of this involvement belong, however, to a later chapter.

\footnote{19}{Strenopoulos, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 20}
\footnote{20}{Hadjiantoniou, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 59}
Sweden, the dominant Protestant power in the North, was represented in Constantinople after 1632. Six years earlier, Loukaris had begun correspondence with Gustavus Adolphus and the Swedes were favorably disposed toward Cyril. When the Swedish ambassador arrived in Constantinople, he was received in private audience by the patriarch and among his credentials was a letter from Gustavus. While relations between Sweden and Turkey were cordial and the ambassador was friendly toward Loukaris, the Swedish embassy was not a particular source of strength to Cyril in his struggles.

The diplomatic corps in Constantinople in the early seventeenth century was divided into two camps. The Roman Catholic, Southern and Central European powers might be at odds among themselves but they were united in opposition to Loukaris and his policies. This opposition was first led by Cezy, the French ambassador and later by the Austrian, Schmid. Commercial rivalries, religious differences and personal friendships made the Northern, Protestant states and their ambassadors friends of Cyril. The English and Dutch ambassadors, especially, kept Loukaris informed of the plans against him and sometimes they were able to thwart such plans. While these ambassadors were, after all, diplomats in a foreign land and did not have unlimited freedom of action, they were,

---

21 Papadopoulos, *op. cit.*, p.110
22 Strenopoulos, *op. cit.*, p.20
in general, reliable in the diplomatic and political aspects in the struggle between Cyril Loukaris and his opponents.
CHAPTER VIII

THE LATER LIFE AND THE DEATH OF PATRIARCH CYRIL

The peskesi had been paid and the kaftan, the staff of office, had been bestowed and Cyril Loukaris had exchanged his robes as Patriarch of Alexandria for those of Ecumenical Patriarch. Now he sat upon the throne in Constantinople. It was November 4, 1620.1

There was important work to be done immediately. Conditions in Russia and Poland continued to be critical for the Orthodox there, and Theophanes, Patriarch of Jerusalem was dispatched as Loukaris' personal representative to strengthen Orthodoxy in Eastern Europe.

There were other problems even closer home. The election of Loukaris had aroused the particular opposition of the Latin party around the ecumenical throne. This group consisted largely of graduates of the College of St. Athanasius in Rome and the Jesuit seminary in Galata. The strength of this party can be gauged by the fact that a graduate of the College of St. Athanasius, Raphael II, had served as patriarch of Constantinople from 1603 until 1607 and a product of the seminary in Galata, Cyril Kontaris,

would serve later as patriarch. Working closely with the Jesuits, these elements had begun a program designed to have Cyril deposed by the Holy Synod. This initial effort to combat Loukaris through ecclesiastical procedure was nullified, however, by public sermons in which Cyril indirectly attacked his enemies and by the sentence of excommunication against Gregory of Amasia who was the patriarchal candidate of the Latin party.²

Loukaris' opponents then determined to work through Turkish channels to secure the downfall of the Patriarch. They approached the grand vizir with the accusation that Loukaris had been inciting the Florentine pirates in the Aegean and corresponding with Russia. Contact with Moscow was suspect because Turkey and Russia were on particularly unfriendly terms at the moment. This attack was sufficient to cause Loukaris to be deposed by the end of 1622 and sent into exile in Rhodes.³

Gregory of Amasia was then designated patriarch, but he was unable to gather the money for the peskesi and was never formally enthroned. Instead, the anti-Loukaris party put forward Anthimos, metropolitan of Adrianople, who was duly elected and installed.

Anthimos reigned only three months, however, since Haga and Rowe had been able through the distribution of rich presents in the harem to secure the recall of Loukaris. As soon as the news of Cyril's impending return reached the Patriarchal Palace, Anthimos resigned and Loukaris re-ascended the throne on October 2, 1623. The second term as Patriarch would last considerably longer than had the first.

The news of Loukaris' return as ecumenical patriarch must have displeased Roman authorities, for earlier they had received a letter from De Cezy, the French ambassador, reported on his successful efforts to have Cyril removed as patriarch and it seemed that the problem had been solved. Now, the entire question was open again. The Congregatio de Propaganda Fide was given the responsibility for co-ordinating the efforts to dispose of Loukaris. At a meeting on December 10, 1623, the Congregatio decided to ask King Louis XIII for his support and to utilize the position of De Cezy in Constantinople as much as possible. In the following months, however, it became obvious that De Cezy and the resources available to him in Constantinople would be insuffi-
cient to secure the downfall of Loukaris. The Latin party within the Orthodox Church could not muster sufficient strength to have the patriarch desposed and, while the ambassador and the Jesuits had been able to have Cyril exiled in 1622, they were unable to prevent his return, and their efforts since had been effectively countered by Loukaris and the British and Dutch ambassadors.

In February, 1625, therefore, the Congregatio decided to take a more direct hand in the proceedings by dispatching its own agents to Constantinople. A Greek Jesuit named Berillus was sent to complain to the Sublime Porte that Loukaris had been in contact with the Cossacks with whom the Turks were, at that time, engaged in hostilities. Far more important, Rome sent a priest of the Byzantine rite, Cannachio Rossi, with an ultimatum to Loukaris. Rossi arrived in July, 1625, and demanded that Cyril accept, in essence, the Union of Florence. Loukaris had no intention of accepting, but he protracted the negotiations and seems to have avoided a flat refusal which would only have annoyed Rome even further. De Cezy objected to Rossi's intervention and the Congregatio agreed to designate De Cezy as the one in charge.

---

8 Hadjiantoniou, op. cit., p. 74.
of negotiations but it refused to recall Rossi.\textsuperscript{10} Rowe and Haga were able to convince the Turkish authorities of the falsity of Berillus' charges and once again the efforts of Rome had not accomplished their intended aims.

An effort was made toward the end of 1626 to establish a more effective Latin hierarchy in the Eastern Mediterranean. A suffragan of the Pope was dispatched together with a number of bishops who were to hold sees in the Aegean islands. The party was received with splendor at Naxos and then at Chios. The suffragan had been provided with ample authority from the Pope and funds from the \textit{Propaganda} and had been met by De Cezy, but for some reason, the project collapsed.\textsuperscript{11}

On November 13, 1627, the Congregatio \textit{de Propaganda de Fide} met at the palace of its prefect, Cardinal Bandini. It heard unsatisfactory reports of conditions in the East and decided on energetic measures.\textsuperscript{12} Zacharias Gerganos, a Greek student in Germany, had published in 1622 a catechism which had Protestant tendencies.\textsuperscript{13} The Congregatio had authorized in 1623 the printing of a refutation by a Jesuit, Andreas Eudaemon, and now it requested

\textsuperscript{10} Ibid., p. 231.
\textsuperscript{11} Hadjiantoniou, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 85-86.
\textsuperscript{12} Summary of the meeting may be found in Pastor, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 232-233.
\textsuperscript{13} Hadjiantoniou, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 72.
that this book be examined by J. M. Caryophyllus before it be
generally circulated, but it wanted a refutation of Protestantism
published in Greek. It authorized at this time the reprinting
and general circulation of the letter which Cardinal Bessarion
had written. Bessarion had been one of the important members of
the Greek delegation to the Council of Florence and he later be­
came a Roman Catholic, explaining his reasons for doing so in
the letter which the Congregatio wished to be widely circulated.

The Congregatio decided on more than simply literary efforts.
The nuncio to France was to use all his influence to interest
the king personally in the matter of Loukaris and especially to
point out the dangers which would occur to France if there should
be an alliance between the Greek Church and England, Holland and
the German Protestants. In Constantinople, De Cezy was to be
ordered to use all his resources to have Loukaris deposed. Cyril
was to be openly condemned as a preacher of Calvinism, and economic
pressure was to be brought against Greek shipowners to denounce
the Patriarch. Finally, the Turkish authorities were to be urged
to close down the printing press which had been established by
Loukaris.

It was this printing press which especially irritated the
Congregatio. The considerable attention given in Rome to the
publishing of books reflected the concern felt for effective
polemic literature. The Propaganda had established its own Greek
press which had begun to issue books most useful to Latin apologists.

But the press of the Propaganda had the field to itself for only a short while. In June, 1627, a printing press had arrived in Constantinople for the use of the ecumenical throne.\(^\text{14}\)

Loukaris had not been idle between the assaults made on him by his Latin enemies. His very energy had been one of the reasons for the bitterness with which he had been attacked.

The concern for education which had marked his earlier career showed itself again. The Ecumenical Patriarch was responsible for educational facilities among the Greeks. There had been a Patriarchal Academy in Constantinople since the days of Hereclius (610-641) and, under, Loukaris, it grew in importance.\(^\text{15}\) As rector of the Academy, the Patriarch in 1625 asked Theophilos Corydalleus, a graduate of Padua, to reorganize the school. Corydalleus was described by Hajiandiniou\(^\text{16}\) and the Synod of Constantinople of 1691\(^\text{17}\) as a Calvinist. More probably, he did not consider any theology particularly important for he understood his role in a different light.

\(^\text{14}\) Papadopoulos, op. cit., pp. 86-88.


\(^\text{16}\) Hadjianantoniou, op. cit., p. 79.

Corydaleus became the leading agent of Western thought and culture in the Greek East, and perhaps more than any other single individual was responsible for the reforging of the intellectual links, broken for centuries, between the two halves of Europe. A fanatic devotee of neo-Aristotelianism, he reorganized the Academy of the Patriarchate along the lines of Padua University, and imposed the new philosophy as the basis of higher education, completely secularizing the latter and — under the sponsorship, it may be remembered, of the Patriarch Cyril Loukaris — emancipating it from its connexion with theology. His course embraced the whole cycle of the neo-Aristotelian studies, including Logic, Physics, and the study of Generation and Corruption. In this way, Corydaleus displaced the center of Greek culture from Italy to Constantinople and established the pattern of philosophical and scientific instruction which was to dominate Greek schools for the next century and a half. 18

The reform of education required, Loukaris well knew, publishing facilities. He had seen the relationship between the two during his labors in Poland, but it was more difficult to establish a Greek printing house in Constantinople than it had been in Lvov. Nevertheless, through the intervention of Sir Thomas Rowe, Loukaris was able to have a press shipped from England accompanied by Nicodemus Metaxas, a trained printer. The press was set up under Rowe's protection and began the publication of a number of Orthodox apologetics and theological treatises. 19 One of the first was the reprint of a book by Meletios Pegas, and Loukaris, himself, contributed a small volume on the Jews.

18 Sherrard, op. cit., p. 176.

19 Papadopoulos, op. cit., pp. 86-87.
Since the press and Metaxas were both under diplomatic protection, the Congregatio had some difficulty in carrying out its aim of ending Greek printing in Constantinople. The Jesuits were entrusted with this mission and they felt that they had their opportunity in the publication of Cyril's book on the Jews. In this book, the Patriarch seemed to be mildly critical of Moslems, too, and the Jesuits complained to the Porte that Loukaris was spreading insults to the Koran. The grand vizir referred the book to a committee of mullahs, but before their opinion could be delivered, the Jesuits decided on direct action. They had bribed a company of janissaries and, on January 8, 1628, they broke into the printshop and did serious damage, effectively ending the printing venture.\(^\text{20}\)

There were, however, serious repercussions for both the Jesuits and their protector, De Cezy. When the mullahs reported that the Jesuit charges did not seem to be supported by Loukaris' book, the Order was summarily expelled from Constantinople and their place in the struggle against Loukaris was taken by French Capuchins.\(^\text{21}\) The Congregatio, feeling that the French ambassador had been singularly unsuccessful in his efforts against Loukaris, decided to begin looking for another ambassador. Ultimately, their choice fell upon the representative of the emperor of Austria.

\(^{20}\) Hadjiantoniou, op. cit., pp. 87-97.

\(^{21}\) Ibid, pp. 97-103.
The Congregatio meeting on July 21, 1628, voted substantial funds for use in overthrowing Loukaris after being assured that the King of France would also contribute liberally toward this cause. It also asked that the head of the Capuchins, Pere Joseph Leclerc de Tramblays, personally visit Constantinople in order to direct activities there. This he declined to do, since he felt that, as a trusted associate of Cardinal Richelieu, his presence in France would be more important. The Capuchins, however, labored vigorously against Loukaris.

At a meeting a few days later, on July 25, the pope, Urban VIII, himself joined the Congregatio in deliberating on possible courses of action. Cyril might be arraigned before the Inquisition; he might be charged before the Orthodox bishops and hierarchy; or he might be deposed by bribing Greek and Turkish officials. The second alternative was unlikely to succeed, but before the third possibility could be explored, the Congregatio decided to ask the Holy Office whether it could legitimately be employed. It took the Inquisition many months to complete its proceedings, and it was only on March 23, 1629, that the Congregatio was informed that it was indeed proper to use bribery to secure Cyril’s deposition. This policy, therefore, would be followed,

22 Pastor, op. cit., p. 234.

23 Ibid., pp. 234-235.

24 Ibid., p. 236.
and Rudolph Schmid, the Austrian ambassador who had just succeeded Hans Ludwig von Kufstein, would be the agent to carry out the Congregatio's plans.25

While the Congregatio was consolidating its plans against Loukaris, an event was taking place which would raise a continuing storm of controversy. There had been several changes in the diplomatic corps in Constantinople. In the spring of 1628, Sir Thomas Rowe was succeeded by Sir Peter Wych as representative of the Court of St. James's at the Sublime Porte. This meant a distinct loss for Loukaris, for although he and Wych established cordial personal relations, the English Embassy was no longer the source of support to the Patriarch that it had been under Rowe.26

In the early autumn of the same year, a more important change took place. Antoine Leger, a Calvinist pastor from Piedmont, arrived in Constantinople as the chaplin for the Dutch Embassy.27 Leger quickly presented himself to Loukaris and the two became fast friends. The precise relationship between the two has been debated, particularly concerning the influence which the Calvinist had on Cyril's theological position, but there is no doubt that Leger helped to make Haga's support of Loukaris even more effective.

25 Papadopoulos, op. cit., p. 101
26 Strenopoulos, op. cit., p. 20.
27 For background of Leger, see Hadjiantoniou, op. cit., pp. 104-105.
Shortly after Leger arrived, Loukaris commissioned Maximos Kallipolitis to prepare a translation of the New Testament into modern Greek. This was consistent with Cyril's policy of emphasis on the use of vernacular Greek in the Church and his concern generally for improved literacy and education. The project required nine years and the translation was finally published only on the eve of Loukaris' death.28

More significant for Loukaris' reputation was the publication in March, 1629, of the Confessio Fidei Reverendissimi Domini Cyrilli Patriarchae Constantinopolitani Nomine et Consense Patriarcharum Alexandri et Ierosolymitani Aliorumque Ecclesiarum Orientalium Antistitum Scripta. This was the famous Confessio Fidel, published in Latin in Geneva at the behest of Leger.29

As published in 1629, the Confessio consisted of eighteen short chapters.30 In its treatment of important doctrines, particularly God's activity, the foundations of salvation, the

28 Ibid., p. 158-159.

29 Within a year, French, English and German translations appeared.

30 An English translation of the Confessio together with citations for the text are given in Appendix A.
nature of the sacraments and the Church, and the place of Scripture, the Confessio strongly reflects the Calvinism of the Confessio Fidei Gallicana, the Confessio Belgica and Calvin's own Christianae Religionis Institutio.

In its statement concerning the inner relationship of the persons of the Trinity, the Confessio Fidei followed the formula of Florence in asserting that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father through the Son. Inasmuch as this wording never was accepted in the East, its presence in the Confessio must be considered evidence of Western influence. Far stronger evidence of Western and particularly Calvinistic teaching could be found in the third chapter of the Confessio. Here, Calvin's doctrine

31 The Gallican Confession was written by Calvin and his follower De Chandieu and adopted by a series of assemblies between 1559 and 1571. Written in French, it was translated into Latin in 1566 and German in 1562. The text is in Philip Schaff, Creeds of Christendom (6th edition; New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1931), vol. III, pp. 356-382.

32 The Belgic Confession was written in French by Guy de Eres in 1561 and adopted by several synods, the most important being the Synod of Dort in 1619. It was translated into Latin in 1581 and a Greek edition was published in 1635. The text is in Schaff, op. cit., pp. 383-436.

33 There are many English editions and translations. One of the better is by John Allen (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1936). A bibliography of American editions appears on pp. lxi-lxiii.

34 Confessio, chapter I.
of double predestination—i. e., predestination of the elect to eternal reward and predestination of the damned to eternal punishment—was set forth as clearly as in Calvin's *Institutes*, the Belgic Confession and the Gallican Confession.

The *Confessio Fidei* presented a different concept of the relationship between faith and works than the one commonly accepted within Orthodoxy. The *Confessio* emphasized the utter inability of sinful man to do any work which God might judge good. Salvation rested exclusively and completely upon the merits of Jesus Christ applied through faith to the individual believer. While the Eastern Church agreed that the Christian's salvation rests upon Christ's atoning work, Orthodoxy gave greater worth to good works. Patriarch Jeremias II had pointed out this difference in emphasis in his letters to the Lutherans written fifty years earlier. The *Confessio's* insistence on *sola gratia* was further reflected in the eighteenth chapter which flatly denied the doctrine of purgatory since "the time of grace is the present life."


37 See above, p. 44
Protestant teaching could be discerned in the prominence which the Confessio gave to Scripture. Again, Orthodoxy had never denied that Holy Scripture deserved a central place in the Church. But the Eastern Church also valued highly the teachings of the Fathers and accepted the canons of the ecumenical councils as expressing the will of God. No mention is made of either tradition or the councils in the Confessio. In fact, "The witness of the Holy Scripture is of higher authority than that of the Church".

Orthodoxy, like Rome, recognized seven sacraments. In flat contradiction, the Confessio listed only two, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. These were precisely the two accepted by Calvin, the Belgic Confession and the Gallican Confession. Moreover, the Lord's Supper was presented by the Confessio in a completely Calvinistic manner. Transubstantiation was rejected together with the interpretations of the Fathers. Instead, the Confessio said, "For the Body of Christ is not that which is seen with the eyes and received in the mystery but that which

---

38 Confessio, chapter II. See also Questions 1, 2 and 3.
39 Confessio, chapter II.
40 Confessio, chapter IV.
42 Confessio, Chapter XVII.
faith spiritually apprehends, presents and bestows to us. By way of comparison, the Belgic Confession stated, "Jesus Christ... nourishes and strengthens the spiritual life of believers, when they eat him, that is to say, when they apply and receive him by faith, in the Spirit."44

The Confessio disagreed with Orthodoxy concerning the essence of the Church. Eastern theologians, in referring to the Church as Holy and Apostolic, denied that the Church could err. The Confessio, on the other hand, was quite definite. "The Church while on its way is liable to err and to choose falsehood instead of truth."45 Furthermore, the Eastern Church considered an episcopacy standing in apostolic succession was essential to the true Church. The Confessio reflected the Protestant reaction against bishops by stating, "Jesus Christ is sole head since a mortal man can in no way be head, and He holds the rudder and is at the helm governing the Church."46

The Greek translation of the Confessio added four questions and answers to the original eighteen chapters. The Calvinistic influence continued. Scripture was again emphasized. The Bible

43 Confessio, chapter XVII.

44 Article XXXV, Schaff, op. cit., 429.

45 Confessio, chapter XII.

46 Confessio, chapter X.
should be read by everyone in their own language\textsuperscript{47} and they should use the clearer passages to explain the more complicated and difficult verses.\textsuperscript{48} The canon of Scripture was drawn to exclude the Apocrypha and to conform to the Protestant list of Biblical books.\textsuperscript{49}

In its comments on icons, the \textit{Confessio} rejected the traditional Orthodox position and implied that the believer's faith might be stronger without icons but that the practice of keeping sacred pictures was not harmful unless the icons received worship. Then, the practice was simply idolatry.\textsuperscript{50}

Naturally, this Calvinistic document created a furor. The Orthodox of Jassy were greatly disturbed and wrote to Theophanes, patriarch of Jerusalem, for his opinion of Loukaris' theology. Early in 1630, he defended Cyril's orthodoxy saying "neither the patriarch nor any other of the Greeks have admitted community of faith with the Lutherans or Calvinists, albeit we are often in friendly communion with the ambassadors and other persons here, such being the necessity of the times".\textsuperscript{51} The Jesuits in Poland

\textsuperscript{47}\textit{Confessio}, question 1.
\textsuperscript{48}\textit{Confessio}, question 2.
\textsuperscript{49}\textit{Confessio}, question 3. Compare with Gallican Confession, article III, Schaff, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 360-361
\textsuperscript{50}\textit{Confessio}, question 4
\textsuperscript{51} Strenopoulos, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 25-26
and the Capuchins in Constantinople, of course, quickly condemned Loukaris as a heretic.\(^{52}\)

About the same time that the *Confessio* was being printed, Loukaris was corresponding with Prince Gabriel (or Gabor) Bethlen. Prince Bethlen was a Hungarian who became ruler of Transylvania with the support of the sultan against the wishes of Austria. A master statesman, he maneuvered his way through the complexities of central European politics so that his principality was continually strengthened. He was also a dedicated Calvinist, an avid Bible reader and a hymnwriter. He had conceived the idea of absorbing the Orthodox among his subjects into one Calvinistic church and he wrote to Loukaris about the matter. Cyril replied by stating his vigorous opposition to the proposal.\(^{53}\) There was a basic and fundamental difference between Protestantism and Orthodoxy, he declared, and even if the ignorant Vlach peasants had sunk into superstition or irreligion, their joining a false religion like Calvinism would profit them nothing. But he added that although he was unable to give his open adhesion to such a movement, secrecy sometimes had its uses. He concluded by saying, "Let us not divulge what has been secretly written".\(^{54}\) Loukaris felt that as primate of the Greek Orthodox Church he could not

\(^{52}\) Pastor, *op. cit.*, p. 237.

\(^{53}\) Text is printed in Papadopoulos, *op. cit.*, pp. 116-119.

\(^{54}\) Ibid., pp. 118-119
give approval to conversion of the Vlachs to Protestantism. But Loukaris had privately shown an openness toward Calvinism while he was still patriarch of Alexandria. This, together with his close working relationship in Constantinople with the Protestant ambassadors, would make it extremely awkward for Cyril if his letter to Prince Gabriel were widely circulated. The cryptic ending allowed for the interpretation that the sentiments expressed in the letter - i.e., unconditional opposition to Protestantism - represented his real sentiments which he found it expedient to conceal. It also allowed the interpretation that Loukaris was truly a Calvinist and that this fact was known to Haga and others who would accuse Cyril of duplicity if the letter to Bethlen were widely circulated.

Loukaris, however, had little time in which to contemplate the Confessio. Schmid had begun to mobilize his forces far more effectively than De Cezy had. The metropolitans of Sophia and Ochrid arrived in Constantinople from Rome with the rumor that Loukaris was indeed a heretic and that Rome was going to purchase permanent possession of the patriarchal throne by means of an annual peskesi. The opposition to Loukaris reached the point

55 This interpretation is given by George P. Michaelides, "The Greek Orthodox Position on the Confession of Cyril Lkaris" in Church History XII (1943), p. 124.
56 This is the position of Strenopoulos, op. cit., p. 26
57 Hadjiantoniou, op. cit., p. 130.
that in May, 1630, Isaac of Chalcedon was almost placed on the Patriarchal throne.58

The matter of the Confessio was far from ended. In 1631, a Greek translation was published which amplified the original Latin version by adding four questions at the end. It was probably this edition which the new French Ambassador showed to Loukaris. De Cezy had been recalled in disgrace in 1631 and replaced by Count de Marcheville, a most tactless and undiplomatic person.59 De Marcheville invited the Patriarch to dinner and there confronted him with the Confessio and asked Loukaris to repudiate it. Cyril very correctly replied that he was under no obligation to give an account of his belief either to the Pope or to the French ambassador and that he was prepared to defend his beliefs on the basis of Scripture and the Church Fathers before a properly constituted Synod of Orthodox clergy.60

The Confessio was mentioned in a letter which Loukaris wrote Deodati, a professor of theology, dated April 15, 1632.61 In this letter, Loukaris spoke of the Orthodox Church as being plunged in darkness and, apparently in reply to a question concerning publications, recognized the Confessio published by

58 Strenopoulos, op. cit., p. 27.
59 Pastor, op. cit., pp. 239-240
60 Hadjiantonion, op. cit., pp. 115-116
61 Text in J. Aymon, Lettres anecdotes de cyrille Lucaris (Amsterdam; 1718), pp. 27-36.
Leger as his own and expressed surprise at the Roman Catholic furor. He remarked that he had autographed and authenticated copies of the Confessio. (One of those authenticated copies is in the library of Geneva together with the autograph of the Confessio.)

Once again Loukaris began to feel the pressure of Roman opposition. Where De Cezy had been ineffectual although bitter, Schmid was far more efficient and was joined by a Greek bishop who had the deepest personal hatred for Loukaris. Cyril Kontaris had been bishop of Verria in Syria and had been appointed locum tenens to the vacant see of Thessalonica. When Loukaris appointed Athansaios Patellarios metropolitan instead of Kontaris, the latter determined upon revenge. Kontaris was sent to Russia on another fund raising expedition, but he used the money collected toward the peskesi and had himself elected patriarch. In October, 1633, therefore, Loukaris found himself deposed once again, but only briefly. Kontaris was unable to secure all the money needed and after enjoying the Patriarchal Throne for seven days, he in turn was deposed and exiled to Tenedos.

The efforts of Schmid and the French Ambassador had succeeded in having the Turkish ban on the Jesuits reversed, and the

Jesuits returned to Constantinople. Again using bribery as their main weapon, they were able to have Loukaris deposed. This time, Athanasios Patellarios whom Loukaris had appointed Metropolitan of Thessalonica, was the candidate of the pro-Roman party. He was duly elected and enthroned. Loukaris was sent to join Kontaris on Tenedos, but the Holy Synod resisted Athanasios who resigned after twenty two days as Patriarch. Loukaris was recalled and enthroned for a fourth time in June, 1634.

The Confessio remained as a troublesome counterpoint to the difficulties Loukaris was experiencing at the hands of his Latin enemies. The Orthodox community at Leontopolis had been inquiring concerning Cyril's true beliefs, and he wrote them in 1634. In this letter which was designed for all the Orthodox of Ruthenia or Little Russia, Loukaris rather strongly affirms his orthodoxy and seems to condemn the teachings of the Confessio. This letter has, in fact, sometimes been called Loukaris' Apologia. It seemed to have satisfied its recipients, but it has not stood as an unequivocal denial of the authorship of the Confessio.

---

63 Papadopoulos, *op. cit.*, p. 129.
64 Text in Papadopoulos, *op. cit.*, pp. 131-134.
Kontaris, still in Tenedos had asked Loukaris to forgive him and release him from exile. This Loukaris agreed to do, and Kontaris returned to Constantinople again in 1634. Rivalry quickly replaced gratitude, however, and Kontaris worked closely with Schmid and his friends to regain the Patriarchal Throne. Money from Rome provided the peskesi and in March, 1635, Loukaris was once again deposed and succeeded by Kontaris. 66

According to the plans of Loukaris' enemies, this trip into exile was to be different. The ship carrying him was to be intercepted by corsairs in the Aegean who would take Cyril either to Rome or Malta, safely out of the Orthodox world and removed from all friends and influence. Haga, the one ambassador left to support Loukaris, discovered the plot and arranged a counter plan. By bribing the crew, the ship carrying Loukaris landed at Chios instead where the Turkish governor, a personal friend of Loukaris, dismissed the bishop who was conveying Cyril into exile and set the deposed Patriarch free. He remained in exile for over a year, part of the time at Chios and later at Rhodes. During this time, he was in constant contact with Haga and the Holy Synod who continued to support and encourage him. 67

In March, 1636, Kontaris called a Synod for the express

---

66 Hadjiantoniou, op. cit., p. 140.

67 Ibid., pp. 140-144.
purpose of proclaiming Loukaris anathema. This Synod, however, brought to a head the discontent of the bishops with the administration of Kontaris and he, himself, was again deposed in July, 1636. The Latin party was strong enough to prevent the re-election of Loukaris, but a compromise was reached.

Loukaris was allowed to return from exile but Neophytos, Metropolitan of Heracleia, was elected Patriarch. Actually, this meant the return to power of Loukaris for Neophytos had served under Loukaris in Alexandria and the two men were close friends. Neophytos asked Loukaris to assist in the administration of patriarchal affairs but after about six months, money was found for the peskesi again, Neophytos resigned, and Loukaris once more became patriarch.68

The future, however, was ominous. The power of Loukaris' enemies was increasing while his friends were dwindling. Antoine Leger had left for Geneva not long after Cyril had returned to Constantinople and only Haga remained of those who had stood beside Loukaris in his struggles.69 Yet Cyril's personality was so engaging and forceful that Schmid and Kontaris felt the need to wait until the sultan would be away from Constantinople before they proceeded. They feared that Cyril's personal charm might

68 Papadopoulos, op. cit., pp. 136-137.
69 Ibid, p. 137
secure the direct intervention of the Sultan in favor of the Patriarch.

Murad had been impressed by Loukaris' abilities and was favorably disposed toward the Patriarch, but Schmid and Kontaris felt that it might still be possible to secure the orders for Loukaris' execution. The opportunity presented itself when Murad IV led his armies out in the spring of 1638 against the Persians. Bairam Pasha, the grand vizir, had already been influenced by Schmid and Kontaris and the conspirators waited until the imperial column had reached Konia. Then they sent an unscrupulous priest named Lamemos to accuse Loukaris of stirring up the Cossacks to attack Azov while Murad was fighting the Persians. Bairam Pasha lent his weight to the support and the sultan ordered the dethronement and execution of Loukaris. 70

The orders were carried out with great secrecy. Loukaris was arrested and imprisoned, being succeeded on the Throne by Cyril Kontaris. After about a week in the fortress of Rumeli Hisar, Loukaris, alone and under heavy guard, was placed on a small boat and told that he was being taken to a larger ship which would take him into exile. Instead, the boat landed on the shore of the Sea of Marmora near San Stefano and, on June 27, 1638, (July 7, New Style) Loukaris was strangled by the state

70 Hadjiantoniou, op. cit., pp. 149-152.
The body was buried in a shallow grave and the clothes distributed to the janissary guards who sold them in the bazaar.

The appearance of the late Patriarch's personal effects in the marketplace touched off a wave of popular resentment. Mobs shouted to Konatirs, "Pilate, give us the body". The patriarch persuaded the governor to have the body exhumed and sunk at sea, but the sailors had not weighted the body properly and it washed onto the shore of the tiny island of St. Andrew. Here it was buried until, in 1641, Patriarch Parthenios Geron had the remains brought to the Patriarchate in pomp and then transferred the bier to the monastary of the Panagia Kamariotissa on the island of Halki. From there, they were transferred at the beginning of the twentieth century to the Patriarchal Seminary on the same island and, from there, to the Patriarchate at the Phanar where the earthly remains of Cyril Loukaris rest today.

The enemies of Loukaris who must share the blame equally, had triumphed. Schmid could report success to the Congregatio de Propaganda de Fide and Kontaris and his pro-Latin party were in

71 Strenopoulous, op. cit., p. 30.
control of the Patriarchate. Above all, their opponent was no
longer in exile, but dead. Thus ended the life of Cyril Loukaris,
Patriarch.

Cyril Loukaris was dead. Another Cyril, of Verroia, sat upon the Patriarchal throne. Less than three months after the first Cyril had been killed, the second Cyril had convened a Synod in Constantinople to deal with the question of the much disputed Confession. For almost ten years it had been in circulation and the Orthodox Church had remained silent. It was the purpose of the Synod to speak out, and it did so in a series of anathemas dated September 24, 1638.

The tone and atmosphere of the Synod were indicated in the opening paragraphs of its official Acts. Loukaris was a follower of the devil, "brimming over with lethal poison and incurably sick concerning essentials." The Synod would, therefore, subject him to anathema and those who accepted the Confession in order that "the actual truth may not be hindered by those who are in a disorderly manner braying about." 2

1. The background of the synod is given in John Karmires, Ta _

Eight doctrines were specifically condemned and individually anathematized. The admission made in the second chapter of the Confession that the Church could possibly err was flatly rejected. The doctrine of predestination and the allied assertion that works do not affect salvation were condemned at great length. The implication in the Confessio's eighth chapter that the saints are not in any way mediators was denied as was the teaching of the fourteenth chapter that unregenerate man lacks free will. The limitation of the sacraments or mysteries to two was violently rejected and the traditional number of seven affirmed. Objection was taken to the idea of the Eucharist as only of spiritual value and the Council of Nicaea was cited as authority for a substantial change in the earthly elements at the moment of consecration. The eighteenth chapter which seems to deny the efficacy of prayers and contributions made on behalf of the dead was condemned and Cyril was called the worst of iconoclasts for his comments on the icons in which he discourage their veneration.

In supporting its position, the Synod cited both Scripture and early Councils, but the dominant note was violent opposition to Loukaris by name. Each of the doctrines condemned was individually proclaimed anathema as well as the entire Confessio. Even the readers of the Confession are anathema if they accept its teachings. To those that read the chapters of Cyril Loukaris, lyingly written in the name of the Eastern Church, as if they might perhaps contain something true and then drink in the venom concealed in them (for
though there may be some things which superficially seem to be Orthodox, yet unawares implant heresy, Anathema.¹³

The decrees were signed by a number of patriarchs and future patriarchs. Cyril Kontaris, of course, headed the list.⁴ Metrophanes Kritopoulos, Loukaris' old protege who was now Patriarch of Alexandria signed next, followed by Patriarch Theophanes of Jerusalem, a close friend of Loukaris for thirty years. Others who signed were Parthenios I; Parthenios II; of Ioannina, each of whom became ecumenical patriarch; Ioannikos, later patriarch of Alexandria; another Ioannikos, later patriarch of Constantinople; Joachim, later patriarch of Alexandria; and Nicephoros who also became Alexandrine patriarch. Forty-four persons mostly representing the pro-Latin party of Kontaris, with the exceptions of Theophanes and Metrophanes, affixed their names.

One of the men who signed the decrees of the Synod of Constantinople was Parthenios from the city of Adrianople. Cyril Kontaris was caught having embezzled funds which, it was charged had been allocated to procure the deposition and death of Loukaris. Kontaris, therefore, was deposed and sent in exile to Carthage in North Africa

³ Ibid., p. 575.

⁴ The list is given in Robertson, op. cit., pp. 88-91.
where, ultimately, he perished. Thus in 1639, the patriarchal throne was vacant once again and Parthenios secured the election and was consecrated as Parthenios I. Parthenios was involved in several synods during his lifetime, but only one other was of direct concern to the Confession which, according to the Synod of Constantinople, should now be called the Confession of Cyril Loukaris.

From the days in the 1590's when Loukaris had served as Exarch from the patriarch of Alexandria, he had developed and maintained strong ties with the Orthodox communities in eastern Europe. He corresponded with Orthodox in Poland, Wallachia, Moldavia and Ruthenia and, when the occasion presented itself, he visited with old friends. There was, therefore, considerable dismay within those communities when the Synod of Constantinople not only rejected the teachings of the Confession but condemned with considerable heat the name of and person of Loukaris.

The Synod of Jassy was convened in 1642, to deal with the matter of the Confession of Loukaris. In preparation for the meeting of the Moldavian hierarchy, Parthenios assembled his Holy Synod.


6 Background in Karmires, op. cit., pp. 575-578.
This was the body of bishops which shared the administrative responsibilities of the patriarchate and was, thus, distinguished from a local or regional synod which brought together bishops and theologians from a particular geographical area. The ecumenical patriarch, in co-operation with his Holy Synod, drafted a letter which dealt specifically with the Confession but which breathed an entirely different spirit from the acts of the Synod of Constantinople.\textsuperscript{7}

In this letter, each chapter was considered and the heresy contained was rejected. In general, the objections voiced by the Synod of Constantinople were restated, but in much milder tone. Each chapter was summarized and the contradictions between the Confession and Orthodox teaching were pointed out, but the fiery anathemas were conspicuously absent. The entire Confession was presented as being attributed to Cyril Loukaris, but the letter which was signed by the Holy Synod, did not positively identify Loukaris as the author.

The mild tone of the letter commended itself to many. Peter Moglia, Metropolitan of Kiev signed it "on behalf of all the Orthodox and Catholic Church of Christ that is in Little Russia".\textsuperscript{8}

\textsuperscript{7} Text in Karmires, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 578-581. Translation is in Robertson, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 91-103.

\textsuperscript{8} Moglia's signature is recorded by Robertson, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 101. The entire list is found in pages 100-103.
When it was received by the Synod of Jassy and read there, instead of preparing its own set of decrees, thirty-five members present simply added their own names. Thus, the Synod went on record as condemning the teachings of the Confession without, however, pronouncing the violent anathemas which characterized the Synod of Constantinople almost four years earlier and without formally attributing the Confession to Loukaris.

The Synod felt that it should also write to John Vasilios, Voyvoda of Moldavia. Although a layman, John had been one of the prime movers in the assembling of the Synod. The leading Orthodox teaching in the face of various attempts to spread confusion among the faithful. Prince Ostrogsky had intervened in the proceedings which produced the Union of Brest. Prince John felt a similar responsibility in connection with the Confession of Cyril. He had arranged for the legates to come from Constantinople and for the publication of the synodical letter which Parthenios had sent. The letter from the Synod recognized his role in the convening of the meeting and extolled him as a defender of Orthodoxy.


10 Background in Karmires, op. cit., pp. 575-578.
Meletios Syrigos was the representative of Patriarch Parthenios at Jassy and during the course of the Synod, he conferred with Moglia about the Confession which bore Moglia's name. Both the Metropolitan and his confession were of more than passing significance.

Peter Moglia was a Moldavian who came from an important family. In 1632, he had been consecrated metropolitan of Kiev by Loukaris and given the title of Exarch of the Patriarchal See. He used both titles in signing the letter of Parthenios to Jassy. In his efforts to combat the influence and educational advantages of the Jesuits, he completely reorganized the system of theological instruction in his See. Latin became the language of instruction and even Latin textbooks written by Roman Catholic theologians were used. Moglia was so successful in his program that it was widely copied and formed the model for Russian Orthodox theological training into the nineteenth century. Moglia, in collaboration with other theologians,


prepared a Confession which he submitted to a Synod in Kiev in 1640. This Confession was based, in part, upon the Catechism of the Jesuit Peter Canesius and was itself in catechetical form. The Synod amplified and then endorsed the confession but it still existed in unpublished Latin manuscript in 1642 when Moglia came to Jassy.

Meletios Syrigos raised some serious objections to the Confession, especially to some of its Latinizing expressions, and the text was again revised. This revision was translated by Meletios into Greek and approved by Parthenios in 1643, a year after the Synod of Jassy. The Confession may have been published soon after its approval by the Ecumenical Throne, but it was the edition of 1667 which attracted wide attention. Not surprisingly, its writings terminology and its relationship to Roman Catholic writings made it polemical ammunition for Jesuit apologists. Moglia also wrote a

14 Florovsky, loc. cit., p. 186
15 Ibid., p. 186.
17 The complete story of the Confession is given by Karmires, op. cit., pp. 582-592.
18 Florovsky, loc. cit., p. 186.
a shorter Catechism which was first published in 1621. This Catechism is sometimes confused with the larger and far more important Confession.  

While the name of Loukaris is not mentioned anywhere in the Confession, it was commonly regarded as a theological answer to Loukaris' Confession. It might be termed the first theological reply since neither the Synod of Constantinople nor that of Jassy had presented a reasoned, comprehensive refutation of the Calvinistic doctrines in the Confessio. Peter Moglia's Confession, written in question and answer form, was divided into three main sections dealing with the theological virtues of faith, hope, and love. There were three preliminary questions. "What must an Orthodox Christian do to inherit eternal life?" Was answered with faith and good works. The second question emphasized the necessity of faith preceding good works and the third question and answer divided the Catechism into its three sections.


The first part which discussed faith used the Nicene Creed as its basis. This was divided into twelve articles and, of course, "filioque" was rejected. The second section, dealing with hope, was based on the Lord's Prayer and the Beatitudes while the last section concerning love, was essentially an exposition of the Ten Commandments. It include, however, forty-five questions dealing with particular virtues and sins. Here was maintained the scholastic distinction of the three cardinal virtues; prayer, fasting, and the giving of alms; and of the four general virtues; prudence, justice, fortitude and temperance as opposed to the seven general mortal sins; pride, avarice, fornication, envy, gluttony, vengeance and sloth. Sins against the Holy Spirit were also treated and a distinction was made between mortal and venial sins. Moglia's Confession became extremely popular. In its original form it was widely circulated and its threefold division was used by many other catechetical writers such as Philaret. Orthodox leaders felt that the Confessio and its teachings had been satisfactorily repudiated so for almost thirty years after the Synod of Jassy, no further official action was taken by the Greek-speaking Church concerning Cyril's Confession. In January, 1672, however, another Synod convened in Constantinople and reaffirmed some of the doctrines which had been

21 See, for example, the translation of Philaret's catechism in Prayer Book for Eastern Orthodox Christians (New York: 1944), prepared and authorized by the Syrian Antiochian Orthodox Archdiocese of New York and All North America. For an evaluation of the significance of the Confession, see Gavin, op. cit., pp. 213-214.
called into question by the author of the Confessio. Once again, the authority and infallibility of the Church were affirmed, the number of sacraments placed at seven and the miraculous transformation of the elements during the Eucharist, itself a real sacrifice, reemphasized. The number of books in the canon was considered with the Apocrypha, excluded by Question Three of the Confessio, listed as part of received Scripture.

This second Synod of Constantinople has been virtually, forgotten, however, for its decrees were quickly overshadowed. Only three months later, a Synod convened in Jerusalem which produced the comprehensive definitive answer for Orthodoxy to the questions raised by the Confessio Fidei, in particular, and Calvinistic theology, in general. The Synod of Jerusalem “is the most important in the modern history of the Eastern Church and may be compared to the Council of Trent. Both were equally hierarchical and intolerant, both fixed the doctrinal status of the Churches they represent and both condemned the evangelical doctrines of Protestantism.” While the comparison of the Synods of Jerusalem and Trent might be questioned, the significance of the Synod of Jerusalem or Orthodoxy cannot be denied.


Patriarchs and prelates from throughout the Orthodox world assembled in Bethlehem early in 1672, for an important event. The Church of the Holy Nativity had been restored and renovated and was new ready for rededication. After the event had been celebrated with appropriate pomp, Dositheos, Patriarch of Jerusalem, served as host to the sixty-eight bishops and priests who met in Jerusalem for the Synod. While the majority were from Palestine and several, in fact, signed the final decrees in Arabic, the Russian Church was also formally represented.

The Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem were extensive enough in themselves. The Synod also included in its final statement several other documents which, taken together, were hoped would be the definitive answer to Protestantism. In the introduction to its decrees the Synod felt that it had proved that Cyril


26 For the complete list, see Karmires, op. cit., pp. 732-733 or Robertson, op. cit., pp. 174-181.


28 In addition to Karmires and Robertson already cited, the acts of the Synod of Jerusalem may be found in J. Harduin, Acta Conciliorum (Paris: 1781), vol. XI, pp. 179-274, and E. Kimmel, Monumenta fidei Ecclesiae Orientalis (Jena: 1850), vol. I, pp. 325-488.

29 Karmires, op. cit., pp. 701-706.
Loukaris had not been a Calvinist and that he had not written the Confession. However, even if it be hypothetically admitted that Cyril had written the Confession which bore his name, it could in no sense be considered a reflection of the teaching of the Eastern Church. Orthodoxy, in fact, was so violently opposed to the doctrines of the Confessio that the Synod of Constantinople in 1638, condemned Loukaris simply because he had not written against it during the years between its publication and his death.  

The Synod was not content merely to condemn Calvinist teachings, however. A positive confession of faith was authorized which would set forth the genuine Orthodox teaching on the matters in question. The acts themselves consist of six chapters together with the introduction just summarized and an epilogue. Chapters five and six were essentially reproductions of documents already existing, so only the first four could be called the creative work of the Synod.

The first chapter set out to prove "that it has never been recognized in the Eastern Church that Cyril believed as the Calvinists except those who were seeking to malign Loukaris' name. In order

---

to support this position, quotations were presented and extracts made from many sermons which Cyril had preached in Constantinople.32 Nine of his eighteen chapters and two of the four questions were thus refuted. Quotations were cited against chapters one, two, three, six, eight, ten, fourteen, sixteen and seventeen. Passages in which Loukaris accepted icons were given against what the Synod called question two but which must surely have been question four. The final quotations were selected to show that Cyril accepted as canonical several books commonly listed as apocryphal. Chapter two cited procedural patterns at the patriarchate to show that the Confession could not possibly be an expression of Eastern faith.33 There was no evidence of any of the Holy Synod or patriarchal staff being aware of the Confession nor was it entered in the official records as it normally would have been. The point was made again in chapter three that the Confessio lacked all the attributes and marks of a patriarchal document.34 The fact that it never received any synodical endorsement was a further argument against it being considered in any way a confession of the Eastern Church.


The extensive fourth chapter emphasized that no doctrines proclaimed in the Confession of Loukaris were ever practiced in the Eastern Church.35 The Church organization, for example, remained episcopal rather than presbyterian as suggested by Calvin. The significance of the Sunday of Orthodoxy was stressed. This festival, celebrated since 842 on the first Sunday in Lent, was a reminder of the defeat of the Iconoclasts. As part of the observance, a list of various heresies and particular heretics, including, but by no means limited to Iconoclasts, was read out publicly and formally anathematized. Cyril’s participation in this service each year, the Synod argued, guaranteed his Orthodoxy for some of the very things condemned on Orthodox Sunday were reflected in the Confessio. In a similar way, the commemoration of Seventh Ecumenical Council, the second Council of Nicaea, which was observed on the Sunday after October 11, was an occasion for the rejection of heresies and Loukaris participated fully in these services.

In the first four chapters, the Synod produced its own evidence to prove the heretical nature of the Confessio and Orthodoxy’s contention that Loukaris was not the author. The churchmen assembled in Jerusalem were well aware, however, that

theirs was not the first Synod to deal with the problem and chapter five of the Acts of the Synod of Jerusalem reproduced the findings of the first two Synods which condemned the Confession. The acts of the Synod of Constantinople of 1638 were presented and endorsed even though their tone was far harsher and out of harmony with the attitude both of the Synod of Jassy and the Synod of Jerusalem, itself. The anathemas pronounced by Constantinople were explained by the fact that the Confession had been published six years before Cyril's death, and, although he had denied authorship verbally he had not written against it during those years. 36

The letter of Parthenios to the Synod of Jassy which was adopted by that assembly and the letter of the Synod to the Voyvoda John were also included in the fifth chapter. By endorsing the actions of the Synod of Jassy, the Synod of Jerusalem confirmed the quasi-confessional position given the letters of Jeremias II. While these letters were not made a part of the official record of either Synod, their acceptance by both was the basis for their inclusion in the list of confessional and symbolical writings of the Eastern Church. The major significance of the Synod of Jassy, of course, was the rejection of the teachings of the Confession

without naming Cyril as the author. The Synod of Jerusalem explained this reluctance to condemn Loukaris by the fact that Cyril had been well known personally among the Orthodox of Eastern Europe and they felt that his Orthodoxy was unquestioned. Therefore, the Synod of Jassy could not accept the idea that Loukaris whom they had known could have written the Calvinistic confession.

The Synod of Jerusalem had presented its own prolix arguments against the Loukarian authorship of the Confessio and had proved to its own satisfaction that the teachings of the Confessio had never been accepted or approved by the Eastern Church. It had given its assent to the official acts of the two most important Synods which had considered the Confessio previously. There remained only one more thing to be done. Orthodox teaching should be set forth in a positive way as a confession which could be supported by the entire Synod. This confession formed the sixth and final chapter of the Acts of the Synod of Jerusalem.

In preparing for the Synod, Dosethios realized that a positive statement would be needed. The Confession of Peter Moglia, while excellent in its way, was not the complete answer. Moglia had not mentioned Loukaris or the Confessio directly and the organization of Moglia's Confession was sufficiently different

38 Background is given by Karmires, op. cit., pp. 734-746.
from the structure of the Confessio to make direct comparison difficult. The Synod of Jerusalem commended Moglia's Confession, therefore, but chose a different positive confession to include in its official acts. This confession had been written by Dosethios himself and was a far more direct answer to the Confessio Fidei. Dosethios followed the outline of the Confessio, chapter by chapter, even including the four questions at the end. In each case, he gave a positive refutation to the teaching of the Confessio.39

Chapter one affirmed the doctrine of the Trinity but rejected completely any idea of dual procession of the Holy Spirit. The second chapter pointed out the necessity of holy tradition in interpretation of Scripture and acknowledged the Church to be the guardian of the Bible. This contradicted the doctrine of private interpretation. Chapter three rejected flatly the Calvinistic concept of predestination based on God's will. Dositheos admitted that the righteous were indeed predestined to glory but this was based upon God's foreknowledge. This in no way inhibited the individual's free will and personal responsibility in his salvation. The fourth chapter concerning creation was in substantial agreement with the Confessio. So, also, was chapter five on providence.

although Dosethios observed that God could overrule misfortune
and turn it to good for the believer.

Chapters six, seven and eight were in partial agreement with
the Confessio concerning the original state of man, his fall and
the person and work of Christ. Here, however, certain exceptions
were made. Christ and the Virgin Mary were exempted from the yoke
of original sin in chapter six. Christ was recognized in chapter
eight as the sole Mediator for the Christian, but the Theotokos,
the Virgin Mary, together with the saints could bring the prayers
of the faithful to the Lord's attention and thus make them more
efficacious. Dositheos agreed in the ninth chapter that faith
was fundamental to salvation, but he added to faith works of love,
an element missing in the parallel chapter of the Confessio.

Chapter ten affirmed that the Church included all true
Christians, but it rejected flatly the presbyterian system of
government of Calvin as a substitute for the Orthodox episcopal
system with the bishops standing in apostolic succession. The
Church, chapter eleven stated, included all the faithful who
accepted Christ and the teachings of the apostles and synods.
Even though Christians might sin, this did not exclude them from th
the Church. Contrary to chapter two of the Confessio, Dositheos
saw the Church as taught by the Holy Spirit and therefore incap-
able of error. Chapter thirteen coupled faith and works as
necessary to salvation in opposition to the Confessio which
accepted faith but rejected works.
In the fourteenth chapter, Dositheos, like the Confessio, considered the impact of man's fall from grace upon his human nature. He rejected the concept that because of sin man's will was no longer free. Instead, while accepting the idea that man had been debilitated and was no longer free from suffering, he believed that man still had free will to choose good or evil. Works done without faith, of course, contributed nothing toward salvation, but grace and good works together fitted the Christian for salvation.

There were seven sacraments, stated the fifteenth chapter. They were baptism, confirmation, ordination, the Eucharist, marriage, penance, and confession and, finally, holy unction or anointing. Scriptural references were given to validate each mystery. They were, individually and collectively, not merely empty signs of future promise, as was circumcision, but rather actual means of grace. Chapter sixteen taught the necessity of baptism and considered its effect to be the total washing away of all original sin and actual sin committed before the moment of baptism. Further actual sin was forgiven through confession and priestly absolution. The Eucharist, said chapter seventeen, was both unbloody sacrifice and sacrament. The body and blood of Jesus Christ were truly present and were received by the worthy and unworthy, alike. Lutheran teaching was specifically rejected and the concept of transubstantiation was vigorously accepted. Transubstantiation, however, was not to be considered an explanation
of the mode in which the body and blood of Christ became present, for this remained essentially a mystery beyond explanation.

The final chapter considered the state of souls after death. While agreeing that there was no further opportunity for repentance and conversion, Dositheos held that the state of the believer was not perfected until the final resurrection and that for those who died repentant, but without the chance to bring forth fruits of that repentance, there was occasion to perform such fruit and satisfaction for committed sins. Prayers and the giving of alms by friends and relatives would help to reduce the amount of fruit and satisfaction required. This was essentially the doctrine of purgatory although the term was carefully avoided.

The four questions which were appended to the Greek edition of the Confessio appeared again, but with different answers. Dositheos did not believe that everyone should read the Scriptures in their ordinary language and would restrict Bible reading and Scriptural interpretation to those who have received proper training. Certain portions of the Old Testament should not be read at all. The Scriptures were not as plain as the answer in the Confessio indicated, and this was further reason for emphasizing the teaching and interpretative authority of the Church. The canon was defined as including the Apocrypha. In the final question, the importance of the icons was stressed and the three-fold distinction of worship maintained. To God alone belonged latria. The saints were worthy of dulia or adoration while the
Theotokos, the Blessed Virgin, was to receive hyperdulia which was more than the common dulia but less than latria. A whole catalogue of religious artifacts was to receive worshipful veneration. The Confession of Dositheos concluded the Acts of the Synod of Jerusalem.

The chapters composed by the Synod of Jerusalem were not particularly concise or closely reasoned but, taken together with the acts of the other synods and the Confession of Dositheos, they represented a massive restatement of Orthodox belief. The occasion for this restatement was the Confessio Fidei and the Synod of Jerusalem had endeavored to clear Loukaris of any responsibility for the Confession. This had been a most difficult undertaking. There was the condemnation by the first Synod of Constantinople, Cyril’s reluctance to write against the Confession and the evidence that Loukaris had admitted privately to Westerners that he had been the Confessio’s author. Yet, the Synod felt that it must make the effort to absolve Loukaris, because there still existed a large group of friends and admirers of Cyril within the Orthodox world. Even more important, Cyril had died defending the Greek Church and nation and could hardly be condemned. It would appear, however, that the members of the Synod of Jerusalem were not completely convinced by their carefully selected and prepared evidence. Only a lingering suspicion that perhaps Loukaris might have written the Confessio could account for the elaborate efforts of the Synod to point out that Orthodoxy repudiated the Confession.
no matter who the author might have been. No writer has seriously questioned the good faith of the Synod of Jerusalem, but the acts of the Synod indicate that the members of the Synod felt it necessary to rest their opposition to the Confession on other grounds than simply a denial of Cyril's authorship.

In its restatement of Orthodox faith, the Synod of Jerusalem reacted against the theology of the West while using Western theological vocabulary in the effort. Calvinism in all its forms was flatly rejected and Lutheranism repudiated when the Synod gave its approval to the letters of Jeremias. Luther was singled out by name and his teaching on the Lord's Supper specifically opposed. In expressing their views, however, the Orthodox theologians made use of scholastic terminology and the structure given to dogmatics by Protestant and Roman Catholic theologians. It as this acceptance of Western techniques to re-assert Orthodox teaching in a systematic way which in part led Schaff to compare the Synod of Jerusalem with the Council of Trent.

The position defined by the Synod of Jerusalem has remained unchanged. With the exception of one further relatively minor Synod held in Constantinople in 1691 to condemn the teaching

---

of John Carophylos and reconfirm the doctrine of trans-substantiation, no more synods were necessary. The findings of the Synod of Jerusalem represented the definitive, official position of the Orthodox East toward the Protestant West.
CHAPTER X

LOUKARIS THROUGH GREEK EYES

The Synod of Jerusalem represented an effort on the part of Orthodoxy to settle once and for all the question of Cyril Loukaris and the troublesome Calvinism of the Confession. It put the best possible face on the first Synod of Constantinople of 1638 which had condemned Loukaris along with the Confession, but it hoped that such a finding could be reversed. Theophanes of Jerusalem had denied the Loukarian authorship of the Confession and Synod of Jerusalem concurred. This was to be the definitive solution

This official answer was accepted by most Orthodox writers for over two hundred and fifty years. Meletios Syrigos declared that the Confession was a forgery. Almost a hundred years after Meletios had written, Meletios of Athens echoed his words and agreed with Theophanes of Jerusalem who said that the Jesuits were responsible for the forgery.

---

1 Meletios Syrigos, Κατὰ καθολικῶν κεφαλαίων ἑρμηνείας Κυρίλλου τοῦ Λουκάρους (Bucharest: 1690).

In the nineteenth century, Constantine Oikonomos accepted the idea that the Confession was a forgery but laid it to Protestant sources.\(^3\) This was also the position of the Russian theologian Makarios.\(^4\) Constantine Sathas emphasized the role of Leger and Haga. "Leger came to Constantinople in 1628 as the evil demon of Loukaris."\(^5\) They were responsible for the introduction of Calvinist ideas into the Orthodox East and, finally, for the forging of the Confession.\(^6\)

The attribution of the Confession to Protestant sources continued. John Velloudos\(^7\) expressed this opinion as did Chrysostomos Paparregopoulos.\(^8\) Paparregopoulos became especially influential as his monumental history was reprinted time and again.\(^9\) Menas Hamoudopoulos\(^10\) denied Cyril's authorship and

---

\(^3\) Constantine Oikonomos, Πέρι τῶν Ἐρυθρωτῶν τῆς Παλαιάς Θείας Γραφῆς Βιβλία (Athens: 1849), vol. IV, p. 131


\(^5\) Constantine Sathas, Νεοαλητική Φιλολογία (Athens: 1868), p. 244

\(^6\) Ibid., 238-244

\(^7\) John Velloudos, Χρυσοβουλλά καὶ γράμματα περὶ τῆς ἐν Ἑβραίοις Ἑλληνικῆς Ἀποκάλυψις (Venice: 1872), pp. 32 ff.

\(^8\) Chrysostomos Paparregopoulos, Ιστορία τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν Ἑθῶν (Athens: 1874), vol. V, p. 522

\(^9\) The latest illustrated edition was published in eight volumes by Eleftheroudakes in Athens in 1932.

Gerasimos Mazarakes\textsuperscript{11} agreed that it was the work of Protestants. The subject of Loukaris interested Manouel Gedeon and he wrote several articles dealing with his career.\textsuperscript{12} His most important work, however, was \textit{Πατριαρχικοί Πυθακές} in which he said, "A certain confession which was published in 1628 must certainly have been published by the Protestants, if not by some Papist, and was circulated under the name of Loukaris.\textsuperscript{13}" John Mesolora was primarily interested in the doctrinal and symbolic books of Orthodoxy. His collection had been widely used as the canon of the authentic statements of Orthodox teaching.\textsuperscript{14} In commenting on the Confession, he said, "Cyril did not write the Confession attributed to him but some other person, possibly a Latin, in order to slander him with the imputation of Calvinism.\textsuperscript{15}" Theologians such as Papangeles\textsuperscript{16} and Amvrazes\textsuperscript{17} joined in attributing the Confession to Protestants. Zacharias Mathas who was Bishop of the island of Thyra also felt the Confession a

\textsuperscript{11} Gerasimos Mazarakes, \textit{Μητροφάνης και Κριτόπουλος} (Cairo: 1884), p. 229 ff.

\textsuperscript{12} Six titles are listed in the memorial volume \textit{Κυρίλλος και Λουκάρης} (Athens: 1939), p. 204

\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Πατριαρχικοί Πυθακές} (Constantinople: 1891), p. 554

\textsuperscript{14} John Mesolora, \textit{Συμβολική τῆς ορθόδοξου ιερατικῆς Ἐκκλησίας Τῆς υπαρχούσας Ἀιωνίως} (Athens: 1883-1904), vol. II, p. 18

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., vol. II, p. 18

\textsuperscript{16} S. Papangeles, \textit{Τὸ πέντε μετανεώσεως σοφία} (Constantinople: 1896), p. 153

\textsuperscript{17} N. Amvrazes, \textit{Ἡ Ὀρθόδοξος Ἐκκλησία} (Athens: 1903), p. 90
forgery to be laid at the feet of the Protestants.  

A. Diomèdes Kyriakès, a professor at the University of Athens, was one of the foremost church historians of his day. His comprehensive work *Εκκλησιαστική ἱστορία* was published in 1881, a second edition in 1898 and introduced to the Western world in a German translation by E. Rausch in 1902. Kyriakos agreed that the Confession was a forgery, but continued, "It is not known who the author of the Confession was. The most probable is that it was the Jesuits who published it so that they might incriminate their enemy Cyril."  

In 1906, the publisher P. D. Sakellarios printed a twenty page booklet by Izekiel Velanidiotes. The author presented what had become the standard arguments to absolve Cyril from responsibility for the heresy of the Confession. After reviewing the Synods of Constantinople and Jerusalem, Velanidiotes considers two

---

21 Izekiel Velanidiotes, *Ὁ κατὰ Κυρίλλου Δουκάρεως Οἰκουμενικοῦ Ναρπαδήδου Ἀδικός Ἀναθεματισμός* (Athens: P. D. Sakellarios, 1906)
letters written by Loukaris. The encyclical to Jassy and the letter to the Orthodox of Little Russia or Ruthenia were sufficient to prove Cyril's Orthodoxy and the forgery of the Confession. The Synod of Constantinople was dominated by the personal enmity of Cyril Contaris against Loukaris, and the mistake it made in condemning Loukaris was corrected by the wise and judicious men who assembled in Jerusalem. There was little originality in this pamphlet but it was, nevertheless, significant. It accepted uncritically the findings of the Synod of Jerusalem, and it denied that Loukaris wrote the Confession or was a Calvinist. It marked the last time than an Orthodox author could, with any claim to scholarship, hold such a position, for another book from the same press a few months later was to subject the whole question to detailed, critical examination.

The overwhelming testimony of Orthodox historians and theologians denied Loukarian authorship of the Confession. Even in the seventeenth century, however, there had been some like Nektarios of Jerusalem who agreed that the Synod of Constantinople in 1638 had correctly identified the author of the Confession. Mark Renieres was the first of the modern Greek writers to accept this conclusion. He gave special attention to the early

22 He expressed this view in a letter to the French theologian Jean Claude. See Basil Stephanides, Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία (Athens: Aster, 1948), p. 651

23 Mark Renieres, Ἐν Κύριλλος Λούκαρης ὁ σικουμνικὸς Πατριάρχης (Athens: D.A. Maurommates, 1859)
influences on Cyril and then looked at the question of the
Confession, again. He came to the conclusion that Loukaris
had, indeed, written the Confession and that the reasons for his
authorship were to be found in the tangled political and diplomatic
picture of his day. Loukaris was not, at heart, a Calvinist, but
he wrote a Calvinist Confession to keep the support of Protestant
powers.24

Renieris was almost alone in his evaluation. Only a few
writers dared to impute the Confession directly to the Patriarch
who had died a martyr to Greek national integrity. Andronikos
Demetrakopoulos was one who raised some questions to the accepted
position. "If Loukaris had not written the Confession,"
Demetrakopoulos asked, "would he not have written against it,
since it caused so many scandals and was referred to as his?"
And how could the Calvinists ever publish a book not written by
someone still alive and yet bearing his name on it?25 However,
the doubts implied in such a statement were not followed up in
a full scale revue of the life of Loukaris. In his corrections
to Sathas,26 Demetrakopoulos simply restated his earlier position.

24 Ibid., 53 ff.
25 Andronikos Demetrakopoulos, "Βίος του Πατριάρχου Κυρ/νού και "Κυρ/νού του Λουκάρησ" in M.P. Vrettos, "Ευνουκίου Ιερομονάχου" (Athens: 1870), p. 47
26 Προετοιμάσια καὶ Διατυπώσεις εἰς Νεολαίανς Φιλολογίας Σάβα (Leipzig: 1871), pp. 38-40
His notice on Loukaris emphasized Cyril's patriotic role and significance while avoiding the whole controversy. But only Demetrakopoulos and Georgiades gave any support to Renieres and they formed a tiny band against the host of writers who denied that Loukaris could have written the Confession.

In 1906, however, P.D. Sakellarios, who had published the booklet of Velanidiotes, published a book on the Confession of Loukaris by Demetrios Ballanos, a lecturer and later professor at the University of Athens. Ballanos based his work on a careful examination of Cyril's correspondence between 1589 and 1637. Thanks to Aymon and Legrand, these letters were widely available. Where the Synod of Jerusalem confined itself to an examination of Loukaris' sermons and public statements, Ballanos insisted that the patriarch's private papers should be studied too, and that such a study revealed that the Confession was not inconsistent with ideas he expressed in his correspondence.

Cyril's early letters showed an increasing acceptance of Calvinism.

---

27 **ypericho AoVlas** (Leipzig: 1872)

28 B. Georgiades writing in **Ekklesiastiki Athineia** V (1884-1885), p. 105


and Ballanos felt that by 1618, Loukaris had become quite impressed by Calvin’s teachings. Thus, in opposition to both Sathas and Renieres, Ballanos did not consider Leger as the “evil demon” who corrupted the Orthodox Patriarch.

Having established this basis, Ballanos turned to a consideration of the Confession article by article. While some of the articles seemed to warrant no discussion, seven of the articles, specifically articles I, II, III, VI, VIII, X, XIV, and XVII reflected opinions which were also expressed in Loukaris’ letters. In some cases, the evidence cited by the Synod of Jerusalem was not actually relevant. For example in chapter six the reference to the Virgin Mary was a special case and did not apply generally to the doctrine of original sin. Ballanos concluded by observing that only in connection with chapter seven concerning Christ the mediator, was there substantial disagreement between the public and private statements of Loukaris. Neither the letter to the Orthodox of Leontopolis nor the evidence cited by the Synod of Jerusalem could be considered adequate refutation of the Loukarian authorship of the Confession. In view of this and of the similarity of ideas in

31 Ibid., p. 7
32 Ibid., p. 12
33 Ibid., pp. 28-30
the Confession and the correspondence of Cyril, Ballanos concluded that Loukaris was indeed the author and that he wrote because of sincere conviction.

Naturally, the reaction to Ballanos' position was immediate and heated. Before the year was out, Sakellarios had published a rejoinder from Velanidiotes. He cited the impressive list of Greek and Russian writers who unanimously denied that Loukaris had written the Confession. The evidence of Cyril's life was produced and Velanidiotes felt that it was manifestly inconsistent to charge such a great defender of Orthodoxy with Calvinistic learnings. Ballanos tried to read too much into the correspondence with Utyerbogaert while at the same time failing to give adequate weight to the letter to Leontopolis.

Velanidiotes had presented his case with much vigor, but he had not really come to grips with the basic questions raised by Ballanos. This Ballanos pointed out in his reply to his rejoinder. He reviewed each of Velanidiotes' arguments and produced his refutation. The conclusion of the booklet contained

34 Izekiel Velanidiotes, Ο Ευαγγελιστής Πατριάρχης Κύριλλος Λουκαρίς (Athens: P.D. Sakellarios, 1906)

35 Demetrios Ballanos, Η Λουκαρίων Ομολογία (Athens: P.D. Sakellarios, 1907)
quotations from German reviews which supported Ballanos' contention that he represented the position of modern, scientific scholarship which must prevail, no matter how distasteful it might be to traditionalists to admit that a patriarch who was a national martyr had been a Calvinist.

There was really little more to say. Velanidiotes, who later became metropolitan of Thessaliotidos and Phanariopherson in central Greece, replied to Ballanos with fifty more Greek and Russian authorities and continued to write on the subject but this was largely a re-fighting of old battles. The new spirit was evident in the church history of Philapetres Vafides, a professor in the patriarchal seminary of Halki near Constantinople and later a bishop. Vafides compared authentic specimens of Loukaris' handwriting with the autograph of the Confession and the copy as published by Legrand and came to the "Sad conclusion that they were all written in Cyril's own hand." Together with Cyril's correspondence, this proved for Vafides Loukaris'

36 Izekiel Velanidiotes, O Παλαιοσκληρός καὶ νεωτέρος Κύπρικος ο Λουκάρης οικουμενικός ιερομόναχος (Athens: P.D. Sakellarios, 1907)
37 Philapetres Vafides, Εκκλησιαστική Ιστορία (Constantinople: 1912)
39 Vafides, op. cit., vol. III, p. 69
Calvinistic tendencies. 

One of the most prolific modern Greek writers in church history was Chrysostomos Papadopoulos. A professor at the University of Athens, he ultimately became Archbishop of Athens and primate of the Church of Greece. The career and confession of Loukaris held an attraction for him and his was the first full scale biography of Cyril from a Greek pen. Papadopoulos attempted to defend Loukaris from his enemies and especially those who would compromise him by calling him a Calvinist. One of his early articles charged the Confession to Protestants and his position never essentially changed. The publication of facsimiles of the autograph of the Confession in Cyril's handwriting, the arguments of Ballanos and the increasing impact of Western scholarship on the question forced him to concede that Loukaris was not simply a slandered bystander. He refused to admit, however, that Cyril became a convinced Calvinist and advanced the arguments of political pressure and exuberant friendship for Antoine Leger to explain Loukaris apparent authorship of the Confession.

40 *Ibid.,* vol. III, p. 68

41 Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, *Κύριλλος Λουκάρης* (Trieste: 1907)

42 *'Διάλογοι Κύριλλου Λουκάρης Πατριαρχίας Κιατιπόλεως* (Jerusalem: 1905), pp. 17 ff. in which he emphasized Loukaris' letter to Leontopolis of December 4, 1637, and calls it Cyril's "Apologia."
Papadopoulos showed great familiarity with the facts and documents of Loukaris’ life and the second edition of his biography, issued in 1939, one year after the author’s death, showed extensive revision incorporating new materials. Papadopoulos, therefore, represented the most conservative position on the Confession which an Orthodox writer could hold with any claim to sound scholarship.

Since both Ballanos and Papadopoulos agreed on the Loukarian authorship of the Confession, though they disagreed on the motive, most later writers have also agreed. Chrestos Androutsos, a noted theologian, was one who accepted Loukaris as the author of the Confession but pleaded extenuating circumstances. 1938 was the tricentennial of the death of Cyril Loukaris and the following year saw a flurry of interest in the Patriarch. Emmanuel Tsouderos published a popular biography in which he stressed the role of Cyril as a national hero and referred only in passing to the Confession. Here he followed the old tradition of attributing to either Jesuits or Protestants. The second edition of Papadopoulos’ biography of the Patriarch, of incomparably greater


\[44\] Emmanuel Tsouderos, Κουρενικός Κύριλλος ο Λουκαρης (Athens: 1939)
significance than Tsouderos' work, also appeared.45

An official committee appointed to celebrate the tricentennial was responsible for the publication of a memorial volume.46 There were articles by Velanidiotes, now a metropolitan, and Gedon and some of Cyril's correspondence. The bulk of the book, however, consisted of articles by Adamantios Diamantopoulos47 and George Arvanitides.48 Both men accepted Cyril's responsibility for the Confession. Arvanitides explained that it was for political reasons.49 Diamantopoulos, who also wrote an introduction to the second edition of Papadopoulos's biography,50 gave a somewhat different explanation. While admitting that Loukaris might have compromised his religious principles for religious support,51 he places most of the blame on Leger. *Leger committed
an immoral act of blackmail against the representatives of the Greek Church, by which he intended to bind them in favor of Protestantism. He wrote himself a 'Confessio Fidei' and sent it to Geneva to be published as if it emanated from the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria and Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{52}

Without doubt, the most thorough and comprehensive study of the relations between Orthodoxy and Western Protestantism was by John Karmires, a professor in the theological faculty of the University of Athens.\textsuperscript{53} This work, which reflected Western as well as Orthodox scholarship, devoted an entire section to the question of the problem of the authorship of the Confession.\textsuperscript{54} Here, Karmires essentially followed Papadopoulos in attributing Loukaris' authorship to other than religious motives. Karmires was the first Greek writer to make a systematic study of the Confession in comparison with the \textit{Confessio Belgica}, the \textit{Confessio Gallicano} and Calvin's \textit{Institutes}.\textsuperscript{55} He returned to the subject of Protestant-Orthodox relations in \textit{Tā Αγαθοτρικά και Ευρυβολήκα Μνημεία τῆς Ορθόδοξου Καθολικῆς Εκκλησίας} which provided the documents for a study of the dogma of Orthodoxy.\textsuperscript{56} The texts of virtually all the

\textsuperscript{52} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 53
\textsuperscript{53} John Karmires, \textit{Τὰ Αγαθοτρικά και Ευρυβολήκα Μνημεία} (Athens: 1937)
\textsuperscript{54} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 207-224
\textsuperscript{55} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 225-231
\textsuperscript{56} John Karmires, \textit{Tά Αγαθοτρικά και Ευρυβολήκα Μνημεία τῆς Ορθόδοξου Καθολικῆς Εκκλησίας} (Athens: 1952-1953
confessions, catechisms and synodical acts pertaining to the
earlier Lutheran contacts and the Loukarian problem were presented
with appropriate introductions.

The question of Loukaris and his Confession was considered
briefly by Basil Stephanides in his church history.\textsuperscript{57} Since
this was a one volume work, he did not devote the same attention
to the problem as Vafides and Kyriakos, and he accepted Cyril as
the author but subject to political pressure.\textsuperscript{58}

The only real study of Loukaris in English has been a thirty-
one page booklet by Germanos Strenopoulous.\textsuperscript{59} A former professor
at the Patriarchal Seminary at Halki, Germanos spent much of his
life as Metropolitan of Thyateira which made him the head of
Orthodoxy in the West. His book was a lecture on Loukaris
delivered in 1947 at King's College, Cambridge. Germanos agreed
that even as Patriarch of Alexandria he had developed Calvinistic
tendencies and he accepted the evidence of Loukarian authorship
of the Confession as overwhelming. However, he pointed out that
Haga and Leger seem to have exerted tremendous pressure on Loukaris
and therefore the Confession may not reflect Cyril's considered
theological position.\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{57} Basil Stephanides, \textit{Ekklesiastiki Evangelia} (Athens: Aster, 1948)

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid., pp. 649-652

\textsuperscript{59} Germanos Strenopoulous, \textit{Kyrillos Loukaris} (London: S.P.C.K., 1951)

\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., pp. 26-27
George Michaelides was another Greek scholar who contributed a short but important article in English. 61 Michaelides, a professor at Schauffler College, part of Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio, summarized the position of many Greek writers on the authenticity of the Confession. He distinguished three groups; those who denied Cyril's authorship, those who accepted it and attributed it to sincere conviction, and those who considered Loukaris the author but denied that he had truly been a Calvinist. The arguments of each group were summarized and the evidence for each argument cited. This survey was the most succinct and useful evaluation of the pertinent Greek literature which had yet appeared, but Michaelides refrained from expressing his own opinion on the disputed authorship.

The most recent Greek author to write on Loukaris was G. A. Hadjiantoniou. 62 The first Greek to write on Cyril who was not a member of the Orthodox Church, Hadjiantoniou 64 is a pastor in the small Greek Evangelical Church which has Calvinistic backgrounds. Therefore, he warmly accepted the idea that Loukaris wrote the Confession out of conviction and marshalled the various arguments of Orthodox writers such as Ballanos which might support his position. 63

61 George P. Michaelides, "The Greek Orthodox Position on the Confession of Cyril Lucaris" in Church History XII (1943), pp. 118-129
63 Ibid., pp. 114-127
This biography, one of the few full scale studies of Cyril's life, is soon to be published in English.

Only reluctantly did Orthodox writers turn from the decision of the Synod of Jerusalem which denied that Loukaris was the author of the Confession. The events surrounding Cyril's life and death marked him so strongly as a national hero that it would be most awkward to admit his Calvinism. After the work of Ballanos and the publication of the autograph of the Confessio by Legrand, however, it was impossible for a reputable scholar to uphold the forgery theory. Instead, most Orthodox scholars stressed the difficult position of Loukaris in Constantinople and the political pressures which were exerted by his friends and his enemies. Emphasis was also placed on the close friendship which existed between Loukaris and Leger and the Westerner was accused of exploiting this friendship to spread Calvinism. Thus, Orthodox consensus today admits the private Calvinistic tendencies of Loukaris and his undoubted authorship of the Confession but is still reluctant to state that the theology of the Confession is actually the theology of Cyril.

"The Confession of Cyril Lucar was never adopted by any branch or party of the Eastern Church," Philip Schaff correctly

reported. The impact of the Confession on the life and teaching of Orthodoxy, therefore, was not direct. Its significance for the Eastern Church lay in the response which it provoked which led to a clearer definition of the distinctive position of the Eastern Church. The question of authorship was largely a literary and academic one, but important nonetheless. Loukaris was considered a national hero and martyr. Vovoline, in his story of the role of the Church and churchmen in the struggle for Greek freedom, considered Loukaris one of the most important leaders of the seventeenth century. His book also showed how prominently the Greek Orthodox Church figured in the efforts of the Greek people to attain independence. The "Confessio" therefore represented an embarrassment. How could a patriarch of the Orthodox Church and a martyr for the Greek people have written a Calvinistic Confession? The Synod of Jerusalem offered the explanation that Loukaris had not actually written the Confession and, when this position no longer was tenable, Orthodox scholars suggested that Cyril had written it under external pressure without actually adopting the views it contained. The requirements of patriotism and scholarship made it increasingly difficult to explain satisfactorily from the Greek Orthodox viewpoint the true relationship between Cyril and the Confession.

65 Constantine A. Vovoline, "N.Ekklesiá eis tón 'Agion ton 'Eleutherión" (Athens: P.A. Kleisiounes, 1952)
66 Ibid., pp. 40-42
The career and Confession of Cyril Loukaris have attracted considerable attention from Western writers. The first to discuss Loukaris were the Latinized Greeks who, for the most part, were graduates of the College of St. Athanasius and ardent members of the Roman Catholic Church. The ink was scarcely dry on the Confession before John Matthew Caryophilus was writing against it in a book which was, characteristically, dedicated to Pope Urban VIII.¹

Far more significant was Leo Allatius. A Greek from Chios, Allatius went to Rome as a child and stayed there the rest of his life. He was appointed Vatican librarian by Alexander VII and he remained there until his death in 1669. Leo had graduated from the College of St. Athanasius and he was most bitter and slanderous in his opposition to Cyril Loukaris. He accused Cyril of bribery, forgery, embezzlement and virtually every other crime and moral defect. So far as he was concerned, the question of authentic authorship of the Confession was immaterial, since he had already denied any basic integrity in Loukaris' character. Since he out-

¹ John Matthew Caryophilus, Censura confessionis fidei, seu potius perfidei Calvinianae, que nomine Cyrille Patriarchae Constantinopolitani edita circumfertur (Rome: 1631).
lived his opponent by some thirty years, he was able to speak against Loukaris without contradiction from Cyril himself. The work of Allatius established the basic direction for Roman Catholic treatment of Loukaris. Simon, for example, while more moderate in tone, followed the general attitude of the Latinized Greek.

The question of Loukaris entered indirectly into the Jansenist controversy within Catholicism. Arnauld, one of the Port-Royal theologians, wrote in *La Perpetuite de la Foi* that Loukaris was guilty of violating his conscience in his letter to De Wilhelm or in accepting the patriarchal throne if he actually professed Calvinism in his heart.

Aloysius Pichler, a German Catholic, claimed in 1862 to have written the first complete monograph on Cyril Loukaris. He was partly right. He introduced a mass of new material and

---

2 Allatius' most important work was *De Ecclesiae Occidentalis atque Orientalis Perpetua Conscensione* (Cologne: 1648).

3 R. Simon, *La Greance de l'Eglise Orientale... ou l'on fait voir que Cyrille Lucar a ete un Imposteur* (1687).


reflected in his work the critical scholarship which was flourishing. In this respect, his work did, in fact, break new ground. However, he must still be classed as a follower of Allatius since he reflected the same prejudice against Loukaris and the same spirit as that which distinguished Allatius. Both were scholars, yet both found themselves unable to break free into the realm of true scholarship. Allatius was a Greek Orthodox who became Roman Catholic. Pinchler, on the other hand, was a Roman Catholic who later became Orthodox.

In general, Roman Catholic historiography has accepted the authenticity of the Confession and has directed its attention to the general anti-Jesuit and anti-Catholic activities of Cyril's whole life. In such a context, Loukaris' unwavering opposition to Rome coupled with his admitted influence in the Orthodox world cast him in the role of arch enemy. This was the position adopted by Ludwig von Pastor in his monumental History of the Popes.6 Loukaris was a "perfidious heretic," a "past master of simulation and deceit."7


7 Ibid. vol. 29, pp. 236-237
Catholic historians were also concerned by the charges generally made that Loukaris was a victim of plots from Rome. This Pastor flatly denied. "The accusation spread by the Huguenots that the Jesuits had brought about the tragic end of their old opponent is an invention of the Greeks. As a matter of fact, Loukaris was the victim of a plot hatched by Contari, by a Pasha of the name of Bayram, and by the Greek pope Lamerno."  

The same position was held by Adrian Fortesque. "Naturally, the Jesuits have been accused of having him killed," he said. "They had nothing to do with his death, really. The enemies who accused him to the Sultan were Cyril, Metropolitan of Berrhoea, and his party." Fortesque saw Loukaris as a reformer who intended "not to join any form of Protestantism already set up, but to bring about a reformation of the Orthodox Church, just as the Western Protestants had reformed the Catholic Church." 

Semnoz, another Roman Catholic writer, also placed the blame for Loukaris' death on Kontaris. He agreed with Pinchler in laying

---

8 Ibid., p. 237
9 Adrian Fortesque, The Orthodox Eastern Church (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1907).
10 Ibid., p. 266
11 Ibid., p. 265
great stress, too, on the early education of Loukaris. Much of Cyril's later heresy can be traced to his early teachers, particularly Piccolomini and Cermonini.

One of the finest modern Catholic scholars was the Jesuit Georg Hofmann, a professor at the Papal Oriental Institute who died in 1957. As a Jesuit, he, too, was eager to clear his order of complicity in the death of Loukaris but his most significant work was the publication of a number of documents relating to the career of Cyril. These had been in various archives and libraries under papal control and were previously inaccessable. In his reliance upon sources, Hofmann resembled another eminent Catholic scholar, Oscar Halecki, a professor at Fordham University. Halecki used archives almost exclusively in his From Florence to Brest which touched on the early career of Loukaris. Both Hofmann and Halecki, however, limited their viewpoint and sympathetic understanding to Catholic figures and parties with the result that their work had a curiously lopsided quality.

13 Georg Hofmann, "Patriarch Kyrillos Lukaris und die römische kirche" in Orientalia Christiana XV, No. 52 (May, 1929).

Had only Roman Catholic writers been available, the picture in the West of Cyril Loukaris might have been most seriously distorted. But, from the beginning, there were others who offered effective correction.

The first important Protestant writer was J. H. Hottinger. His biography was to be a reply to Allatius and he made use of the "Fragmentum vitae Kyrilli" of Leger. Next to this eyewitness document, Hottinger's work is the oldest Protestant biography of Loukaris and it, too, established a trend.

Even more significant than Hottinger was the Englishman Thomas Smith. Smith devoted many years to the study of Loukaris' career and his findings were contained in two major books. Smith displayed strong anti-Catholic and especially anti-Jesuit sentiments which colored his writing. He also enthusiastically

---


16 The Fragmentum is included in Thomas Smith, Collectaneae de Cyrillo Lucari (London: 1707).

17 Thomas Smith, An Account of the Greek Church to which is added An Account of the State of the Greek Church under Cyril Lukaris, Patriarch of Constantinople with a Relation of His Suffering and Death (London: 1680). A Latin translation was published in 1686. The other important book is Collectaneae de Cyrillo Lucari (London: 1707).
accepted Loukaris as a Calvinist and a genuine reformer. Cyril wrote the Confession out of inner conviction since the British and Dutch ambassadors were too gentlemanly to exert pressure on the Patriarch to write something in which he did not believe. Of course, Cyril's death was primarily the result of Jesuit machinations coupled with the hatred of Kontaris and his followers.

The influence of Smith can clearly be seen in the dissertation of G. Chr. Bohnstedt. While he introduced some new material here and there, the bulk of the work was based on Smith with considerable polemic against Allatius.

For Anglicans, the figure of Cyril Loukaris was that of a Hus or Wycliffe, presaging a Reformation in the East which never occurred. There was no question of motivation. Loukaris had sincerely tried to introduce reformed teachings into Orthodoxy but "the effects of his labors were partial and temporary; the flame which he had kindled died with him, and his memory is only preserved by a scanty record in an unfrequented corner of ecclesiastical history."  

18 Account, p. 273.  
19 G. Chr. Bohnstedt, De Cyrillo Lucari eiusque pro re Graecorum emendanda certaminibus (Halle: 1724).  
20 Anon., Classical Journal No. 72 (1827), p. 179.
While Smith and his followers may not have questioned Cyril's motives, some did. Hugo Grotius\textsuperscript{21} said that Cyril of Constantinople was moved by considerations political, not theological.\textsuperscript{22} While Rivetus\textsuperscript{23} disagreed with Grotius, the question was one which kept recurring: Twesten\textsuperscript{24} felt that Cyril had written the Confession out of religious conviction but Paul Trivier,\textsuperscript{25} although a Protestant, was severely critical of Loukaris, charging him with lacking even elementary loyalty.

Accurate study of Loukaris' inner development was greatly facilitated by the publication of his correspondence. The first significant advance in this area was made by Jean Aymon.\textsuperscript{26} Aymon wrote to counter the Roman Catholic theologians who issued \textit{Perpetuite de la foi} but he felt that he could establish his position best by indirection. While his Protestant sympathies

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{21} Hugo Grotius, \textit{Votum pro pace ecclesiastica} (Amsterdam: 1642).
\item \textsuperscript{22} Ibid., p. 54
\item \textsuperscript{23} A. Rivetus, \textit{Apologetius pro schismate contra Votum pacis facti} (Ieremopoli: 1645).
\item \textsuperscript{24} Twesten, "Eyrill Lukaris" in \textit{Deutsche Zeitschrift für christliche Wissenschaft und christliche Leben} No. 39 (1850), p. 305.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Paul Trivier, \textit{Cyrille Lucar, sa vie et san influence} (Paris: 1877).
\item \textsuperscript{26} Jean Aymon, \textit{Monuments authentique de la religion des grecs, et de la faussete de plusieurs Confessions de la foi des chretiens orientaux} (The Hague: 1708).
\end{itemize}
may have guided the choices he made of letters to include, the
fact that he published seventeen letters together with other material
previously unavailable was of utmost importance.

The next serious addition to the published correspondence of
Loukaris was made by Emile Legrand. This was truly a monumental
effort and included almost all the known correspondence of Loukaris.
Volume one contained a photostatic copy from the library of the
University of Geneva, of the autograph of the Confessio in Cyril's
handwriting. There were 216 letters in volume four with 130 more
in a supplement. The significance of Legrand's work can be seen
in the flurry of interest among Greek writers which it occasioned
while scholars ever since have acknowledged their indebtedness to
Legrand in their footnote references.

Modern scholars have continued to show awareness of Loukaris and
the problems connected with his name. Philipp Schaff felt that
Loukaris had become a Calvinist in French Switzerland early in his
life and that the Jesuits were primarily responsible for his death.

---

27 Emile Legrand, *Bibliographie hellenique ou description
eraisonnée des ouvrages publiés par des Grecs au dix-septième siècle*

28 Philipp Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom with a History and
See (6th edition; London and New York: Harper and Brothers, 1931),
vol. I, pp. 54-55.
Philipp Meyer wrote extensively about the Eastern Church and took Legrand's work well into account. He saw, however, a split in Loukaris' life between Orthodoxy and Calvinism which was probably unwarranted by the evidence he cited from the letters.

An important piece of scholarship was contributed by Richard Schlier, a German Lutheran. Schlier reviewed the literature on the question of the Confession but his most important work was detailed comparison of the Confessio Fidei with Calvin's Institutes, the Confessio Belgia, the Confessio Gallicana and the Orthodox Confession of Dositeos. This marked the first time that the Confessio had been subjected to such a detailed comparative study and thoroughly documented its Calvinism. Frank Gavin considered Loukaris only in passing, for his main effort was to summarize for Western readers the doctrinal teaching of Orthodoxy. While avoiding the critical question of authorship, he did provide a helpful bibliography.


30 Richard Schlier, Der Patriarch Kyrill Lukaris von Konstantinopol (Marburg: 1927).


32 Ibid., p. 217
Most of the Orthodox scholars who wrote on Loukaris did so in Greek or Russian. Most of those who wrote in Western languages were Roman Catholic or Protestants. Two exceptions were the Romanian J. Michalcescu and the Russian Georges Florovsky. Michalcescu admitted Cyril’s authorship of the Confession but laid his troubles at the feet of the Jesuits. Fr. Florovsky, now a professor at Harvard Divinity School, has been perhaps the most eminent interpreter of Orthodox teaching in the West. His chief contribution to the study of Protestant-Orthodox relations was his section on “The Orthodox Churches and the Ecumenical Movement Prior to 1910” in *A History of the Ecumenical Movement* Here, he reflected modern Orthodox scholarship in attributing Loukaris’ motive for writing the Confession to emotional pressure from Haga and Leger which re-inforced Calvinistic tendencies which were already strong.

---


34 *La Theologie*, p. 74.

35 *Oneyupas*, p. 264.


37 Ibid., p. 185.
Western scholarship has tended to accept without question the authenticity of the Confession, thus ignoring a topic which attracted considerable attention from Orthodox writers. Western scholars, on the other hand, have looked more carefully at Cyril's motivations, a question which only recently has received much attention from Orthodox scholars. Many would see an inner religious integrity and cohesion in Cyril's life. Others would agree with the opinion of one of the most recent writers on the question. After describing the aggressive Jesuit proselytizing campaign, Philip Sherrard observed,

"It is this that explains the political action of such a Patriarch as Cyril Doukaris. His desire, as Ethnarch of the Greek Christians, on the one hand to protect the Greek churches from Roman infiltration and, on the other, to free the Greek nation from the Turks and to revive 'hellenism', involved him in a struggle in which he was willing to barter the tradition of the Church in order to achieve his political and diplomatic ends; not only did he make advances, which included concessions and compromises on matters of doctrine, to the representatives of Protestant countries in order to secure their purely political alliance; but he also, in the interests of 'hellenism', appointed to direct the Patriarchal Academy at Constantinople such a person as Theophyllos Corydaleus, a 'philosopher' whose teachings were, . . . . scarcely compatible, to say the least, with Christian doctrine."

Western scholars have accepted Loukaris as an authentic Calvinist and the true author of the *Confessio*. Their attention has been directed largely to assessing blame for Cyril's death and to evaluating the role of a Calvinistic primate of the Eastern Orthodox Church.
The sixteenth century Reformation was peculiarly Western phenomenon. The combination of religious, political, economic and social factors which provided the dynamics of the Reformation movement changed irrevocably the patterns of life and thought which had been developing for a thousand years. As Protestantism consolidated its position in northern and western Europe, it began to look about and to establish its first groping contacts with the Eastern Church, a segment of Christendom which was virtually unknown as it lay in Turkish bondage or Russian barbarism. As it did so, it encountered a church which had not, would not, and perhaps could not participate in a similar cataclysmic experience.

The social, political and economic forces which gave impetus to the Reformation in the West did not exist in the East. The ecumenical patriarch in Constantinople was in a far different position from Luther in Saxony, Calvin in Geneva or even the pope in Rome. This alone would be sufficient to explain the absence of any popular, transforming movement equivalent to the development of Lutheranism, Calvinism or resurgent Roman Catholicism in the West. But even on the purely religious and
theological plane, relations between the Protestant West and the Orthodox East were unproductive. What was the reason?

The first phase of contact between Protestants and Greek Orthodox was largely Lutheran and literary. Here, it would seem, the problem was one of communication. From a purely physical standpoint, communication was difficult. The fate of the letter which Melanchthon addressed to Joasaph II is a reminder of the uncertainty of correspondence at this time. But there was an even more fundamental aspect to the problem of communication. Melanchthon seemed to have sensed it when he realized that a simple literal translation of the Augsburg Confession into Greek would be insufficient. In drawing upon the phraseology of the Divine Liturgy, he was attempting to bridge the gulf in viewpoint and terminology between East and West. That he and his successors were ultimately unsuccessful is not to be denied. But it has only been in the present day under the stimulation of the ecumenical movement that the scope of the difference has been understood and much remains to be done before Protestant and Orthodox can really claim to communicate with full understanding.1

---

Neither Greek nor German in the sixteenth century realized the difficulties standing in the way of complete rapprochement. The Tubingen theologians seemed genuinely surprised when Jeremias raised doctrinal objections to their presentation of Lutheran teaching, and Constantinople seemed to have felt equal surprise when it discovered that the Lutherans were not prepared to accept without question the theological statements and position of the East. It became increasingly clear that while Tubingen and Constantinople had a common enemy, Rome, they did not possess a common faith. This was a discovery which brought little joy to either church and effectively ended the first period of Reformation - Orthodox relations.

The second period was fundamentally Calvinist and personal. Perhaps the ultimate deterioration of contact might have been prevented if someone other than Cyril Loukaris had been the link between Geneva and the East. More likely, however, there would have been the same complete rejection of Calvinist doctrines by Orthodoxy with only the names and dates changed, for the Orthodox Church had even less in common with Calvinists than with Lutherans.

Historically, it was in the career of Loukaris that relations between East and West came to a climax and his enigmatic and controversial personality must be considered in any evaluation of the entire episode. The efforts of the Synod of Jerusalem
to clear Loukaris of Calvinistic taint cannot be accepted since it is now known positively that the *Confessio Fidei* came from Cyril's pen. The implications of the authenticity of the *Confessio* are troublesome. Loukaris may have been unable to perceive the differences between Orthodoxy and Calvinism, but he then would have been theologically incompetent and unfitted to serve as the chief pastor to the Orthodox flock. No one, either during Cyril's lifetime or later, seriously charged Loukaris with being theologically ignorant and obtuse.

The problem of Loukaris' motivation becomes more complex when it is admitted that Cyril knew the theological differences between Calvinism and the teaching of his Orthodox Church. The charge of hypocrisy is difficult to avoid. Either Loukaris was at heart a Calvinist and kept this belief secret while he engaged in religious services and activities which a Calvinist would consider superstitious and idolatrous, or else he was truly Orthodox and played upon the Protestant ambassadors for their support. The Calvinistic sympathies which he displayed to Haga and Leger would then be feigned and the *Confessio* a shameless piece of opportunism. Either explanation leaves Loukaris badly compromised as a man of principle and integrity.

Moreover, Loukaris was "a Greek national leader, who defended his nation and its faith against Latins and Moslem Turks, and who
in doing so laid down his own life for his sheep. The tercentenary of Cyril's death was celebrated by Greeks with great solemnity.

Loukaris' stature as a national leader adds another complicating dimension to the problem of explaining satisfactorily the apparent contradictions in the life and activity of Cyril Loukaris.

Much of the difficulty stems from the assumption that doctrine and theology were the central interest of the patriarch. Since almost all important ecclesiastical figures in the West during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were theologians, it might be logical to suppose that a leader of the Eastern Church would also be a theologian or, at least, primarily concerned with religious affairs.

A careful examination of Cyril's life reveals that there were other matters which probably lay closer to Loukaris' heart than doctrinal distinctions. Cyril was a Greek who, upon ascending the patriarchal throne, became not only the head of his people's church but the leader of the Greek nation. His concern for his people was uppermost as he demonstrated in Poland, in Egypt and in Constantinople.

In discharging his responsibilities as the leader of the

---

2 George P. Michaelides, "The Greek Orthodox Position on the Confession of Cyril Lucaris" in Church History XII (1953), p. 119
Greek nation, Loukaris continually emphasized the importance of education and educational facilities. In his own youth, Cyril had shown that he recognized the value of learning. In Poland, Loukaris observed Jesuit techniques at first hand and noted the important place the Jesuits gave to schools and literature. In combating Latins throughout his life, Cyril relied on schools, academies, printing presses and books. His appointment of Theophyllos Corydaleos as director of the Patriarchal Academy was one of his more important acts. It was Corydaleos who completely re-organized Greek education along the lines of the Venetian pattern. The Academy in Constantinople became the equivalent of the University of Padua.

Cyril's custom of preaching in vernacular Greek and his commissioning of a translation of the New Testament into common Greek can both be understood as significant educational innovations. Throughout his life, Loukaris labored consistently to strengthen his people by using the best means he knew; he certainly furthered the cause of literacy and education.

Even though Loukaris was primarily interested in education for himself and his people, theology had an important place in Cyril's life. His request to Haga for Protestant books and his correspondence with Western churchmen indicate a mind willing to consider questions of doctrine and religious teachings.
Loukaris' letters show him becoming more favorable to Calvinism and his deep friendship with Leger, Haga and Rowe encouraged a personal religious re-orientation toward Calvin. But Cyril realized that as an openly Calvinistic patriarch, his influence and standing among his own people would be destroyed and he would no longer be able to labor in their behalf. His Calvinism, therefore, remained private.

The problem of Cyril's inconsistancy is not solved by the assertion that Loukaris devoted his life primarily to educating his people. The paradox of a man privately Calvinist and publically Orthodox remains. But it need no longer be considered absolutely central to an evaluation of the life and career of Cyril. Rather, Loukaris can be seen as a man who was unswerving in his dedication to his major task although perhaps equivocal in matters which, while important, were secondary. Even in this light, the personality of Cyril Loukaris remains complex and sometimes baffling. It is this very complexity which has made Loukaris a favorite subject for many historians and theologians for three hundred years.

The Synod of Jerusalem marked the end of an epoch. Protestantism had been flatly rejected and only in our own day have conversations
between Protestantism and Orthodoxy been significantly resumed. The results of Protestant efforts to establish and maintain contact with the East, therefore, were negligible. The greatest positive effect that Florovsky could show was that "in this early phase of Orthodox ecumenical contacts, it was recognized in practice and implicitly that the Christian East belonged organically to the Christian world, and that its witness and attitude were highly relevant to the life and destiny of Christendom at large. This was itself an ecumenical achievement; it was no longer possible for the East and the West to ignore each other. Nebulous the results might have been, but it is impossible for anyone today to attempt to understand the relationship between Protestant West and Orthodox East without taking into account their contacts in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

---

3 For an authoritative statement on the progress of such conversations by the former representative of the ecumenical patriarch to the World Council of Churches, see Archbishop Iakovos, "The Contribution of Eastern Orthodoxy to the Ecumenical Movement" in Lutheran World VI, No. 2 (September, 1959), pp. 140-147.

4 Georges Florovsky, "The Orthodox Churches and the Ecumenical Movement Prior to 1910" in Rouse and Neill, op. cit., p. 188.
APPENDIX A

EASTERN CONFESSION OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

In the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

Cyril, Patriarch of Constantinople, for those who ask and enquire concerning the faith and religion of the Greeks, that is, of the Eastern Church, how it believes concerning the Orthodox Faith, publishes this concise confession in the common name of all Christians as a witness before both God and man with a sincere conscience and without dissimulation.

Chapter I

We believe one God, true, almighty and infinite, in three persons, Father, Son and Holy Ghost; the Father unbegotten, the Son begotten of the Father before all ages, consubstantial with the Father, the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father through the Son, consubstantial with the Father and the Son. These three persons in one essence we call the All-Holy Trinity, ever to be blessed, glorified and worshipped by every creature.
Chapter II

We believe the Holy Scriptures to be taught of God, whose Author is the Holy Ghost and no other. This we ought to believe without doubting for it is written. We have a more sure word of prophecy, to which ye do well to take heed, as to a light shining in a dark place. And so the witness of the Holy Scripture is of higher authority than that of the Church. For it is far different for us to be taught by the All-Holy Spirit and by man; for man may through ignorance err, and deceive and be deceived; but the Sacred Scriptures neither deceive nor are deceived, nor are subject to error, but they are infallible and have eternal authority.

Chapter III

We believe the most good God to have, before the foundation of the world, predestined those whom He has chosen without any regard for their works and having no motivating cause for this election except His good pleasure and His Divine mercy. In like manner before the world was made, He has rejected those whom He would reject; and of this rejection, looking to the absolute power and authority of God, His will is the cause, but looking toward the laws and principles of good order which God's providence uses in governing the world, His righteousness is the cause, for God is merciful and righteous.
Chapter IV

We believe that God, three persons in one, Father, Son and Holy Ghost to be the Creator of all things visible and invisible. By invisible we mean angelic powers; by visible, we mean heaven and everything under heaven. And because the Creator is good by nature, He has made all things good and He cannot be the creator of evil. But if there be any evil in nature, it is either of the devil or man. For it is a true and infallible rule that God is not in any way the author of evil nor can such be attributed to Him by any just reasoning.

Chapter V

We believe that all things are governed by God's providence which we ought to adore rather than pry into curiously, since it is beyond our comprehension, nor are we able to understand the reason of it from the things themselves. Therefore, concerning this matter, we feel that we ought to observe silence in humility rather than to indulge unedifyingly in vain discourse.
Chapter VI

We believe that the first man created by God fell in paradise, because, disregarding the commandment of God, he yielded to the deceitful counsel of the serpent. From this original sin flowed to his posterity, so that no one is born after the flesh who does not bear this burden and experience the fruits of it in his life.

Chapter VII

We believe that the Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, emptied Himself, that is, He assumed into His own substance human flesh being conceived by the Holy Ghost in the womb of the ever-virgin Mary, that he became man, was born, suffered, buried and rose in glory, that He might bring salvation and glory to all believers, whom we look for to come to judge both the living and the dead.

Chapter VIII

We believe that our Lord Jesus Christ sits at the right hand of the Father and is a mediator there interceding for us exercising alone the office of a true and genuine high priest and mediator. From there, He alone cares for His own and presides
over the Church adorning and enriching her with all variety of blessings.

Chapter IX

We believe that without faith no man can be saved. And we call faith that which justifies in Christ Jesus which the life and death of our Lord Jesus procured, and the Gospel proclaims, and without which it is impossible to please God.

Chapter X

We believe that what is called the Catholic Church contains all the faithful in Christ; those who, having departed, are in their home in the fatherland as well as those who are yet pilgrims on their way; of which Church our Lord Jesus Christ is sole head since a mortal man can in no way be head, and He holds the rudder and is at the helm governing the Church. Yet, because there are on earth particular visible churches, each for order has its presiding officer, who is not properly called head of that particular church except improperly, because he is the leading member in it.
Chapter XI

We believe that the members of the Catholic Church are the saints who are elected to eternal life, from whose number and fellowship hypocrites are excluded, though we perceive that in particular visible Churches the tares are mingled with the wheat.

Chapter XII

We believe that during its sojourn here the Church is sanctified and instructed by the Holy Ghost. For He is the true Comforter whom Christ sends from the Father to teach the truth and to drive out darkness from the understanding of the faithful. For it is true and certain that the Church while on its way is liable to err and to choose falsehood instead of truth, from which error, the light and doctrine of the Holy Ghost alone frees us, and not that of mortal man, though this may be done through the instrumentality of such as faithfully minister in the Church.

Chapter XIII

We believe that a man is justified by faith and not by works. But when we say by faith, we mean the correlative or object of faith which is the righteousness of Christ, to which, functioning as a hand, faith grasps and applies to us for our salvation.
This we declare in order to sustain and not deter works. Truth itself teaches us that works are not to be neglected for they are necessary means for a witness to faith and confirmation of our calling. But human frailty witnesses to be false that works are sufficient for our salvation, that they can enable one to appear boldly at the tribunal of Christ and that of their own merit they can confer salvation. But the righteousness of Christ alone applied to those who repent and imputed to them justifies and saves the believer.

Chapter XIV

We believe that free will is dead in the unregenerate because they can in no way do what is good and whatever they do is sin, but in those who are regenerate by the all-Holy Ghost, free will is revived and operates but not without the assistance of grace. So, therefore, for a regenerated man to do what is good, it is necessary that he be guided and preceded by grace, otherwise he is wounded and has as many wounds as the man who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho received, so that of himself he is powerless and can do nothing.
Chapter XV

We believe that there are in the Church evangelical mysteries which the Lord instituted in the Gospel and that these are two. Only these have been delivered to us and He who instituted them delivered no more. These consist of the Word and the elements, and we believe firmly that they are seals of God's promises and procure grace. But for the mystery to be whole and entire, it is necessary that an earthly substance and an external act concur with the use of that element ordained by Christ our Lord and joined with sincere faith, for when faith is not present in the recipient, the wholeness of the mystery is not preserved.

Chapter XVI

We believe that baptism is a mystery instituted by the Lord and unless a man has received it, he has no communion with Christ from Whose death, burial and glorious resurrection flow all the virtue and efficacy of baptism. Therefore concerning those who are baptised as is commanded in the Gospel, we do not doubt that their sins are forgiven, both original and any which the baptised person has committed, so that those who are washed in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost are regenerated, cleansed and justified. But we have no commandment concerning a second reception of baptism or to re-baptise. Therefore, we must refrain from this irregularity.
Chapter XVII

We believe that the other mystery instituted by the Lord is that which we call Eucharist. For in the night in which the Lord offered up Himself, He took bread and blessed it and He said to His apostles, "Take, eat, this is My Body," and when He had taken the cup, He gave thanks and said, "Drink ye all of it, this is My Blood which was shed for you, this do in remembrance of Me." And Paul adds, "For as often as ye eat of this Bread and drink of this Cup, ye do proclaim the Lord's death." This is the simple, true and genuine tradition of this wonderful mystery, in the performance and administration of which we acknowledge and believe in the true and real presence of our Lord Jesus Christ; that, however, which our faith presents and offers unto us, not that which the invented doctrine of transubstantiation teaches. For we believe that the faithful do eat the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ in the Supper of the Lord, not by perceptibly breaking and dissolving the host with the teeth but by the soul realizing communion. For the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ is not that which is seen with the eyes and received in the mystery but that which faith spiritually apprehends, presents and bestows to us. From whence it is true that we eat and partake and have communion if we believe. If we do not believe, we are deprived of all benefit of the mystery. We believe, consequently, that to drink the cup in the mystery is really to drink the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the same
manner as was said of the Body. For as the Institutor gave commandment concerning His own Body, so He did also concerning His own Blood, which commandment ought not to be mutilated or maimed, according to man's arbitrary fancy, but rather the tradition of the institution should be preserved entire. When, therefore, we partake worthily of the Body and Blood of Christ and have completely communicated, we acknowledge ourselves to be reconciled to our Head and united with Him, and one body with Him, with certain hope of being co-heirs with Him in the Kingdom.

Chapter XVIII

We believe that the souls of the dead are either in blessedness or in condemnation, according to what each has done, for when they depart from their bodies, they depart immediately, either to Christ or to condemnation. For as any one is found at death, he receives the corresponding reward, there being no repentence after death. For the time of grace is the present life. Therefore, they who are justified here will in no way be subject to condemnation hereafter. And they who die without being justified will inherit eternal condemnation. From which it is evident that we ought not to admit the fiction of purgatory, but to maintain in truth that each one ought to repent in the present life and seek forgiveness of sin through our Lord Jesus Christ, if he would be saved. And this is so.
This, our concise confession will, we conjecture, be a sign to be spoken against by those that love unjustly to slander and persecute us. But we, taking courage in the Lord, are sure that He will not neglect His own, nor forsake them, nor will He altogether leave the rod of the malignant upon the lot of the righteous.

Dated in Constantinople in the month of March, 1629.

Cyril, Patriarch of Constantinople

Having first written the above confession in Latin, we have now translated it into our own tongue, word by word, as it stands in the Latin prototype, in which, being concise, we have not presented such an ample treatise as perhaps the nature of the case required. But let this reservation be made, that we shall take care that everyone know that our faith is that which our Lord Jesus Christ delivered, and the apostles preached, and Orthodoxy has taught. Therefore, since some Orthodox have asked us how we think about certain articles, and have requested our opinion, we have added to the above that which follows, as you see.

Question 1. Ought the Sacred Scriptures be read in the common tongue by all Christians?
Answer. All faithful Christians ought to know, believe and confess what is in the Sacred Scriptures; if not in their entirety, at least the necessary parts, and to proclaim what is in them. For neither can we learn from any other source except the Sacred Scriptures, whether it be by reading them or by hearing what is in them expounded by faithful man. For as it is not forbidden to any Christian to hear what is in the Sacred Scriptures, so neither is he forbidden to read them. For the word is near them, and in their mouth and in their heart. Therefore, the faithful Christian of whatever rank he might be is manifestly wronged if he is deprived and prohibited from either hearing or reading the Sacred Scriptures. For it is the same as depriving a hungry soul and forbidding it to touch spiritual nourishment.

Question 2. Are the Scriptures plain to Christians that read them?

Answer. It is certain that Sacred Scriptures contain in many places great difficulty concerning their literal sense and verbal interpretation. But the dogmas of the Faith contained in them are plain and clear to those who are regenerated and enlightened by the Holy Ghost. Thus, it is obvious that the reader may indeed often encounter some difficulty, but when enlightened by the grace of the All-Holy Ghost, he may compare by analogy the literal sense and the verbal interpretation and derive from the same Scriptures
both the solution and with it, the right meaning. Thus, the Scriptures are a lamp and a light enlightening the understanding of the faithful, dispelling the darkness.

Question 3. What books do you call Sacred Scriptures?

Answer. By Sacred Scriptures we mean all the canonical books which we have received and hold as a rule of faith and salvation, especially, because, being divinely inspired, they teach us doctrine and are of themselves sufficient to instruct, enlighten, and perfect him that comes to the faith. And these canonical books we believe to be the number which the Synod of Laodicea pronounced, and which the Catholic and Orthodox Church of Christ, enlightened by the All-holy Ghost, prescribes. But those which we call apocrypha we distinguish by this name because they do not have the same authority from the All-holy Ghost as have the proper and undoubtedly canonical books, among which are the pentateuch of Moses, and the hagicgrapha, and the prophets, which the Synod of Laodicea decreed to be read - twenty two books from the Old Testament and, from the New, we possess the four evangelists, the acts, the epistles of blessed Paul, and the catholic epistles, to which we add also the Apocalypse of the beloved disciple. And these we hold to be the canonical books, and we acknowledge these to be Sacred Scripture.
Question 4. How ought we to think of the icons?

Answer. As we are taught by the Divine and Sacred Scriptures which say plainly, "Thou shalt not make to thyself an idol, or a likeness of anything that is in the heaven above, or that is on the earth beneath, thou shalt not adore them, nor shalt thou worship them." since we ought to worship not the creature but only the Creator and Maker of heaven and of earth and adore only Him. From this, it is evident that we do not reject pictorial representations which are a noble art and we permit those who so desire to have icons of Christ and of the saints, but we reject the worship and adoration of them as being forbidden by the Holy Ghost in Sacred Scripture lest we should forget and adore colors, and art, and creatures instead of the Creator and Maker. And we regard as wretched anyone that thinks otherwise having awful darkness in his mind and a hardened heart. And it would be better to yield obedience to the commandment of God than to be persuaded by the vain reasoning of men. We have explained in the fear of God and with a good conscience though the subject, we admit, might have been treated better.

Thus we conclude, having answered in writing those that questioned us, and subjoin the answers to our confession. And may the Lord give to all to be right minded in all things, and to have
a sincere conscience.

Given at Constantinople in the
month of January, 1631.

Cyril, Patriarch of Constantinople

This translation is based on the Greek text in J.N. Karmires, *Tá Ασθεντικά καὶ Συμβολικά Μυθικά τῆς Ὀρθόδοξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας* (Athens: 1952-1953), vol. II, pp. 565-570, and has been compared with the translation of J.N.W.B. Robertson in *The Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem with an Appendix containing the Confession published with the name of Cyril Lucar, condemned by the Synod* (London: Thomas Baker, 1899), pp. 185-215, which is based on the Greek text in E. Kimmel, *Monumenta fidei Ecclesiae Orientalis* (Jena: 1850), pp. 381-422. It has also been compared with the translation of G.A. Hajiandiniou (unpublished manuscript) which is based on the Latin edition of 1629.

The four questions and answers first appeared in the Greek translation of 1631. The Robertson translation appended to each chapter and to each of the four answers a list of Scripture references intended to furnish Scriptural proof for the doctrines discussed. These references were not included by Karmires and have been omitted in this translation.
APPENDIX B

Patriarchs of Constantinople

Dionysios II 1546-1555
Joasaph II Megaloprepea 1555-1565
Metrophanes III 1565-1572
Jeremias II 1580-1584
Pachomios II 1584-1585
Theoleptos II 1585-1586
Jeremias II 1586-1595
Matthaios II 1595
Gabriel I 1596
Theophanes I Karkyes 1596-1597
Matthaios II 1597-1602
Neophyto 11 1602-1603
Matthaios II 1603
Raphael II 1603-1608
Neophyto 11 1608-1612
Timotheos 1612-1620
Kyrillos I Loukaris 1620-1623
Anthimos II 1623
Kyrillos I Loukaris 1623-1633
Kyrillos II Kontaris 1633
Kyrillos I Loukaris 1633-1634
Athanasios III Patellarios 1634
Kyrillos I Loukaris 1634-1635
Kyrillos II Kontaris 1636-1637
Neophyto 11 III 1636-1637
Kyrillos I Loukaris 1637-1638
Kyrillos II Kontaris 1638-1639
Parthenios I 1639-1644
Parthenios II 1644-1647
Ioannikos II 1646-1648
Parthenios II 1648-1650
Ioannikos II 1650-1651
Athanasios III Patellarios 1651
Kyrillos III 1651
Paisios I 1651-1652
Ioannikos II 1652-1654
Kyrillos III 1654
Paisios I 1654-1655
Parthenios III 1656-1657
Gabriel II 1657
Parthenios IV 1657-1662
Dionysios III 1662-1665
Parthenios IV 1665-1667
Klemes 1667-1668
Methodios III 1668-1671
Parthenios IV 1671
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patriarchs of Alexandria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dionysios IV Mouselimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerasimos II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parthenios IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionysios IV Mouselimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacovos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patriarchs of Alexandria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silvestros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meletios I Pegas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrillos III Loukaris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerasimos I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrophanes Kritopoulos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikephoros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ioannes VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paisios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parthenios I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roman Popes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pius IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pius V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixtus V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clement VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clement IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clement X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent XI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The literature on the Eastern Church is extensive. The most complete guide to books and pamphlets in English is by Dean Timothy Andrews, *The Eastern Orthodox Church, a Bibliography* (New York: Greek Archdiocese - Publications Department, 1957), which lists over seven hundred titles. The standard source for creeds, doctrinal statements and synodical decrees of the Greek Orthodox Church is now John Kamires, *Τὰ Δοξατουρὰ καὶ Ευπορικὰ ΜνΗμεῖα τῆς Ὑποδοχῆς Καθολικῆς Εκκλησίας* (Athens: 1952-1953). An excellent introduction to the Eastern Orthodox Church is provided by Reginald M. French, *The Eastern Orthodox Church* (London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1951). Frank S. B. Gavin, *Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought* (Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1923), presents an authoritative and systematic study of Orthodox theology based on nineteenth and twentieth century Greek theologians. The best study of Russian church history in English is by Nicolas Zernov, *The Russians and their Church* (London: S.P.C.K., 1951). Zernov has written a number of pamphlets and special studies which are helpful and reliable.

An extremely comprehensive and authoritative study of the relationship between Greek Orthodoxy and Protestantism is John Kamires, *Ἀρθροφορία καὶ Προτεσταντισμός* (Athens: 1937). The most recent and complete study of Lutheran-Orthodox relations


The following bibliography contains most of the works which pertain to Cyril Loukaris and the relations between Protestants and Greek Orthodox in the sixteenth and seventeenth century.
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