

5-6-2016

Cyril Lucaris: The Calvinist of Constantinople - Even When in Conflict with Calvin

Stephanie Falkowski
College of Saint Benedict/Saint John's University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/obsculta>



Part of the [Christianity Commons](#)

ISSN: 2472-2596 (print)

ISSN: 2472-260X (online)

Recommended Citation

Falkowski, Stephanie. 2016. Cyril Lucaris: The Calvinist of Constantinople - Even When in Conflict with Calvin. *Obsculta* 9, (1) : 55-71. <https://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/obsculta/vol9/iss1/6>.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@CSB/SJU. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Obsculta* by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@CSB/SJU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@csbsju.edu.

CYRIL LUCARIS: THE CALVINIST OF CONSTANTINOPLE
-EVEN WHEN IN CONFLICT WITH CALVIN

Stephanie Falkowski

Abstract - *Cyril Lucaris (Patriarch of Alexandria 1601-1620, Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople 1620-1638, intermittently) is best known for his controversial Confession of Faith which propounds Calvinist thought. This paper explores the extent of the Calvinisms of this Confession by examining his take on the procession of Spirit and on icons, both of which seem un-Calvinist on the surface, but actually show how similar his thought is to that of Calvin.*

Seven decades after the final authorial edition of John Calvin's *The Institutes of the Christian Religion* was published, a very interesting Confession of Faith came off the press in Geneva, Switzerland, the same city in which Calvin had done most of his reforming work. Like the *Institutes*, it was written in Latin, but this Confession bore the title *Orientalis Confessio Christianae Fidei*. The introductory paragraph tells of its reason for existence:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, Cyril, Patriarch of Constantinople, publishes this brief Confession for the benefit of those who inquire about the faith and the religion of the Greeks, that is of the Eastern Church, in witness to God and to men and with a sincere conscience without any dissimulation.¹

Though this prologue makes the claim of providing a window into the

Eastern Orthodox faith, it falls far short of that goal. John Karmiris, who has edited the later Greek text of the *Confession*, has declared that, aside from a few Orthodox tendencies, one could reasonably assume the *Confession* was authored “by Calvin himself or by one of his circle.”² In fact, the true authorship of the Confession has a long history of being challenged, though the modern scholarly consensus holds Cyril Lucaris to be the author, backed by handwriting analysis of the autograph, the content and fact of his correspondence with Protestants in England and Holland, and the lack of evidence for Lucaris’ denial of his authorship. But that a Confession of such Calvinistic content would be written by an ecumenical Patriarch of the Orthodox Church, especially one as generally well liked as Lucaris, is an understandable shock.

This *Confession* would have been unusual if it were “an Orthodox book written under Protestant influence,” but is truly unique in that it is more accurately, “a Calvinist symbolical book written under Orthodox influence,” as it is described by Karmiris.³ Much of the relatively little scholarly attention given the *Confession* tries to judge just how much “Orthodox” influence it exhibits. Initially the whole *Confession*, and Lucaris himself, was condemned by numerous councils. The Synod of Jerusalem made a closer inspection and redeemed the person of Lucaris, and one chapter of the *Confession* – that dealing with Christ, the incarnation, crucifixion, and resurrection. Karmiris judges there to be three chapters that are “fully Orthodox.” Carnegie Samuel Calian is even more generous, judging 9 of the 18 chapters to be acceptably Orthodox. What has yet to be done is to examine the congruence with Calvinism of Lucaris’ *Confession*.

Most chapters promote doctrine held in common with Calvinists. This involves justification by faith, the authority of scripture over that of the Church, reducing the number of sacraments to two, rejection of transubstantiation and purgatory,

and acceptance of double predestination. The Calvinist impulses do not stop there. As this paper aims to demonstrate, the thought of Lucaris is so consonant with that of Calvin that similarities can be found even where they disagree because they focus on the same aspects of these issues, ignore the same aspects, and generally exhibit similar concerns. To this end, two places where Lucaris departs from Calvin in his *Confession*, i.e. the procession of the Spirit and the veneration of icons, will be analyzed in juxtaposition to the corresponding Calvinist understanding. The paper will conclude with some thoughts regarding the importance of this added layer of congruence commonly ignored between Lucaris and Calvin.

I. THE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

On the surface, it is only to be expected that Lucaris and Calvin would differ on the question of whether the Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, or from the Father and the Son. The doctrine of double procession manifested in the *Filioque* clause of the Nicene Creed has been a point of contention between East and West for many centuries before either Calvin or Lucaris arrived on the scene. The following discussion, however, is no simple reiteration of the traditional eastern view versus the traditional western view. Neither of these reformers is that traditional.

Calvin, for his part, does uphold the *Filioque*. However, as Gerald Bray helpfully reminds us, though “Protestants confess the same creeds as the Roman Catholics...the words do not convey the same faith.”⁴ He further notes that “too often it is assumed that Reformed dogmatics left the patristic and medieval doctrinal synthesis intact” and that “it is the tragedy of modern historical theology that it has not recognized the revolutionary character of Calvin’s trinitarianism.”⁵ To that end, Calvin’s understanding of the Trinity is worth exploring further.

Calvin rarely speaks about the *Filioque* clause as such. The only partial exception is his commentary on John. As he is explaining his interpretation of John 15:26, a verse commonly used to support the idea that the Spirit proceeds always from the Father and only sometimes *through* the Son, he takes a jab at the Greeks:

When he [Christ] says that he will send him [the Spirit] from the Father and again that he proceedeth from the Father, He does so to increase the weight of his authority...Hence it is Christ who sends the Spirit, but from heavenly glory; that we may know that He is not a human gift but a sure pledge of divine grace. From this it is clear how idle was the subtlety of the Greeks when, on the basis on these words, they denied that the Spirit proceeds from the Son. For Christ according to His custom, names the Father here, to raise our eyes to the contemplation of his divinity.⁶

Here we see that Calvin is aware the Greeks have a different idea when it comes to the procession of the Spirit than is commonly held in the West, and that he disagrees with them on this point. This passage does not give the full picture of Calvin's thought on the matter, which is found within the *Institutes*.⁷

To understand the position of the Spirit in Calvin's thought, one must understand a couple of features important to Calvin's version of trinitarianism: 1) how persons of the Trinity are to be defined, and 2) how these persons interact with humanity.

On the first point, each person of the Trinity is defined as "a subsistence in God's essence, which while related to the others, is distinguished by an incommunicable quality."⁸ These characteristic incommunicable qualities are not each person's relation to the others of the Godhead. In Calvin's schematic, rather, those relationships speak to their unity. To return to the matter of the procession of the Spirit, "processing" would fall under the category of intra-Trinity relations, but this category of relations is not the central defining feature by which members of the Godhead are distinguished in Calvin's system.

The second point considers the relationship between God and humanity. It is here that Calvin departs from Augustine, whom he criticizes for trying to use human analogies to describe the Trinity. Similarly, whereas Augustine believed humans to be created in the image and likeness of the entire Trinity, Calvin disagrees, maintaining that humankind has that relationship only with the Son.⁹ However, the Spirit plays a crucial role in binding humanity to the Son. It is “the energy of the Spirit by which we come to enjoy Christ and all his benefits.”¹⁰ He even goes so far as to say “by means of him [the Holy Spirit] we become partakers of the divine nature, so as in a manner to feel his quickening energy within us.”¹¹ By Bray’s estimation, this understanding could have come straight out of Gregory Palamas, and “at this point Calvin is undoubtedly nearer the Eastern Orthodox than the Thomist understanding of nature and grace.”¹² Bray even questions here why Calvin bothered upholding the *Filioque*, acknowledging that this seems to be an inconsistency in his thought, which may have been reconsidered, had he read the works of Palamas.¹³ The consistency in Calvin’s thought is found in the fact that he imagined the Spirit remaking us in the image of Christ’s hypostasis, not nature, and “to do this, the Holy Spirit must share in the hypostasis of the Son, and therefore proceed from Him.”¹⁴ It is by this logic that Calvin arrives at his insistence on the double procession of the Spirit.

The position Lucaris takes is likewise complicated, but more politically than theologically. Some have claimed that he deftly avoided the issue to the extent that his statement on the Trinity should be perfectly acceptable to the Eastern Orthodox Church. Carnegie Samuel Calian, for example, lists the chapter on the Trinity among the articles he thinks the “Orthodox could accept without much debate,” and refers to his avoidance of the *Filioque* as “in keeping with Orthodoxy’s long standing objection to the *Filioque* in

its understanding of pneumatology.”¹⁵ This may have been the case had Lucaris simply omitted the phrase. But he is not entirely silent on the matter, what he says is:

We believe in one God, true, Almighty, and in three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; the Father unbegotten, the Son begotten of the Father before the world, consubstantial with the Father; the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father through the Son, having the same essence with the Father and the Son.¹⁶

Dositheus II Notarius of Jerusalem, the man charged with refuting Lucaris’ errors, prepared a parallel *Confession*, using Lucaris’ exact wording in many cases to highlight exactly where the problem areas were. In the case of the Trinity, Dositheus’ *Confession* is identical, except his goes from “the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father” straight to “having the same essence with the Father and the Son.” The phrase Lucaris replaces the western “and the Son” with, i.e. “through the Son,” is thus the problem.

It is perhaps a problem because, in a surprising move, Lucaris accepted this same phrase that had been adopted by the Synod of Brest in 1595. This was a personal matter, for Lucaris was in attendance, representing his uncle, the then Patriarch of Alexandria, Melitos. His role was to try to counter the efforts towards union, and in the aftermath, along with much of the Orthodox Church, he found that Synod to be something of an embarrassment. A very common speculation was that Lucaris’ vehement anti-Roman stance was fueled by his failed mission in Poland, and still he opts to use the same words found in the *Thirty-Three Articles from the Union of Brest*: “from the Father through the Son.” Though as of yet no one has offered a satisfactory explanation of what may have motivated Lucaris’ word choice, it is likely that he wanted to eliminate the possibility of the Spirit originating in the Son, as seems to be the case with the formulation used at Brest, which, read fully, does just that: the Holy Spirit proceeds, not from two sources and not by a

double procession, but from one origin, from the Father through the Son.¹⁷ To be certain that this is why Lucaris used these words is difficult, although it is supported both by a letter he sent to Uytenbogaert in 1613, in which he holds to the understanding of Palamas, and also by some of his sermons, which contained similar sentiments. However, this evidence is also cited by the Synod of Jerusalem, which condemned Lucaris' *Confession*, as they made a case to prove that Lucaris was not the author and thus salvage his memory.¹⁸ By this we see that whatever Lucaris meant, he was either somehow compromising with the West, or he was misunderstood as doing so. However, in light of the fact that he seems to have failed to see the inconsistencies between Calvinism and Orthodoxy, he may have been holding even a strict single-procession opinion and still seen a sort of consonance with Calvin, as far as Calvin followed Palamas at least.

II. ICONS AND IMAGES

Calvin has a very nuanced position on the question of images, and it is generally negative. He begins with the axiom of God's transcendent unknowability together with the second commandment of the Decalogue. One can never do justice to God in attempting to capture him artistically, and so "the Lord forbids not only that a likeness be erected to him by a maker of statues but that one be fashioned by any craftsman whatever, because he is thus represented falsely and with an insult to his majesty."¹⁹ Calvin sees even attempting to make such an image as insulting to God.

Worse, he sees the slippery slope towards idolatry as inevitable. Any form of honor given to images is idolatrous in Calvin's eyes. He speaks specifically about the distinction between *λατρεία* and *δουλεία*. He is sure of his position: "never will they succeed by their eloquence in proving to us that one and the same thing is really

two things.”²⁰ He thinks it obvious that each iconodule is simply trying to “escape guilt by dubbing his crime with some other name.”²¹ Calvin is equally suspicious of the claim that the honor given to the image is transferred to the prototype depicted by it. He thinks the exact opposite is true: “there is no difference whether they simply worship an idol or God in the idol...whatever is conferred upon the idol is snatched away from Him.”²² These are harsh words that make it seem that Calvin is wholeheartedly iconoclastic.

His position is more nuanced and thought out than may seem from his above refusal to consider the any value there may be in his opponents’ arguments. Images themselves are not intrinsically evil. For example, Calvin writes “sculpture and painting are gifts of God,” ranking among “those things the Lord has conferred upon us for his glory and our good.” Therefore they must have “a pure and legitimate use.”²³ He posits there to be two types of artwork according to what is depicted, and two uses which correspond to them:

some are histories and events, some are images and forms of bodies without any depicting of past events. The former have some use in teaching or admonition; as for the latter I do not see what they can afford other than pleasure.²⁴

Images thus can convey doctrine, or if nothing else, beauty. The didactic role however, is a limited one in Calvin’s understanding. There are two primary arguments he makes to all but extinguish this use of images. First, he draws on scripture, particularly the prophets, pulling out verses such as “a molten image is a teacher of falsehood” (Habakkuk 2:18). As he sees it, “the prophets set images over against the true God as contraries that can never agree.”²⁵ Second, he argues that images are ineffective substitute teachers. The doctrine Calvin wishes to be set forth is to be found in the preaching of the Word and the proper administration of the sacraments. If the people are so ignorant, then he asks why this is, “if not because they are defrauded of that doctrine which alone was fit to instruct them?”²⁶ He goes

on to say, “Indeed, those in authority have turned over to idols the office of teaching for no other reason than that they themselves were mute.”²⁷ He sums up his position on the so-called didactic use of images thus: “even if the use of images contained nothing evil, it still has no value for teaching.”²⁸

Lucaris has a different pronouncement on images, a more positive one. This may be expected from an Orthodox Patriarch, given the importance of the icon to Orthodox spirituality. But Lucaris once again follows his pattern of not being what one would expect. In the first edition of the *Confession*, the question is ignored altogether, as if it were entirely peripheral to the faith of the Eastern Church, which he purports to expound. In the Greek version published in 1631, he adds four questions with answers. The last of these regards icons. In short, he says:

[W]e do not reject pictorial representations, which are a noble art, and we permit those that so desire to have Eikons of Christ and of the Saints; but the worship and service of them, as being forbidden by the Holy Spirit in Sacred Scripture, we reject, lest we should forget, and instead of the Creator and Maker, adore colours, and art, and creatures.²⁹

For Lucaris, the images are not the problem, but the worship of them is. He does not mention veneration as being something different from worship as may be expected as a standard argument in favor of the practice of venerating icons. Possibly he fails to recognize the difference, thinking Calvin soundly delegitimized that defense. Possibly he is being ambiguous, allowing for the practice of veneration, different from worship, but in a way that would keep both his Protestant allies and Muslim overlords content. In either case, he is more optimistic about religious art.

Despite Calvin’s suspicion of images, and Lucaris’ more accepting stance setting the two in conflict, both make very similar arguments, dealing with the same aspects of the issue. First, Calvin

and Lucaris share the same glaring omission from their treatments of the topic. As Lee Palmer Wandel asserts in the opening sentence of his chapter on the Reformation and the visual arts, “Any consideration of the visual arts in the Reformation must begin with the Incarnation.”³⁰ Interestingly, neither Lucaris nor Calvin does so. Indeed, neither one mentions the Incarnation a single time in their respective discussions of images. This is a notable omission in that it was the Incarnation that “overthrew the Jewish prohibition of images.”³¹ In order to be truly convincing, one would expect that they would address what is perhaps the strongest and central argument for icons. Yet neither one does.

Their second similarity in the treatment of images is where they do start, in scripture. Like Calvin, Lucaris starts this section of his Confession in considering the second commandment. He begins:

We are taught by the Divine and Sacred Scriptures, which say plainly, ‘Thou shalt not make to thyself an idol or likeness of anything that is in the heaven above, or is on the earth beneath; thou shalt not adore them, nor shalt thou worship them;’ since we ought to worship, not the creature, but the only the Creator and Maker of the heaven and of the earth, and Him only to adore.³²

And as he says a little farther down, “it were better to yield obedience to the commandment of God than to be persuaded by the vain reasonings of men.” It is this commandment prohibiting images that he seeks to obey in his judgment. Lucaris though, unlike Calvin, makes much of the line “thou shalt not adore them, nor shalt thou worship them.” He sees this as the reason behind the prohibition. By this logic of idolatry being the driving reason images are problematic, Lucaris is able to make the claim that so long as idolatry is avoided, images are acceptable.

This is not all that different than what Calvin said. This would be a third similarity, i.e. the pronouncement of images as being not entirely evil. Remember, as previously quoted, Calvin refers to sculpture and painting as “gifts of God...conferred upon us

for his glory and our good.”³³ Further, Calvin thinks that “thinking absolutely no images permissible” is superstition, which he tries to avoid.³⁴

A fourth similarity is that both Calvin and Lucaris understand how easily images can be abused. As already seen, Calvin sees idolatry as inevitable in practice, even if it is not in theory. Instead of being used for “for his glory and our good” he sees images not only “polluted by perverse misuse but also turned to our destruction.” It is this inevitability of idolatry that makes Calvin take his position against images. Even though Lucaris disagrees with the conclusion, he is quite sympathetic as to the potential, and often realized, problem. He highlights this in a letter he writes to Mark Antonio de Dominis, a Catholic archbishop who had converted to Protestantism:

As for image worship, it is impossible for me to say how disastrous it is under the present circumstances. ... not that I can say that, absolutely speaking, images are to be condemned, since, when not worshipped, they cannot do any harm; but I abhor the idolatry of which they are the cause to these blind worshippers. Although in my private prayers I have sometimes observed that the Crucifix was an assistance to my mind, as bringing more readily before it the Passion of our Lord, yet in view of the fact that the naïve, to say nothing of some who are enlightened, are carried away from the true and spiritual worship and adoration which is due to God alone, I would rather that all would entirely abstain from this so dangerous handle of sin.³⁵

Clearly he is as aware as Calvin was of the tendency people have to idolatry, the naïve and the enlightened alike. But whether he was trying to honor the possibility that images can be useful; or whether he was not willing to go to far against Nicaea II, an ecumenical council which holds far more authority than even the ecumenical Patriarch; or whether he did not want to take on the impossible task of trying to wrestle icons away from the Orthodox; Lucaris could not condemn images to the degree Calvin felt able to. And still, even with their different degrees of comfort with images, their thoughts on the matter have much more in common than they have in conflict.

III. CONSEQUENCES OF THE CONSIDERED
CONSONANCES WITH CALVIN

Treating even the particulars of images and the procession of the Spirit in ways not dissimilar to Calvin, Lucaris would seem a good Reformed Christian. For his own part, he did not think of himself as such, but he also did not seem to recognize any sort of incompatibility between Eastern Orthodoxy and Calvinism. This sentiment is encapsulated in one of the letters he writes to Antoine Leger, the Swiss pastor that was one of his biggest supporters:

If I die, I wish you able to testify that I die an Orthodox Catholic, in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, as contained in the *Confessio Belgica*, in my own *Confession*, and in all Confessions of the Evangelical Churches, which are all alike. I hold in abomination the errors of the Papists and the superstitions of the Greeks; I approve and embrace the doctrine of the most excellent teacher John Calvin and of all who agree with him.³⁶

Whether for political reasons or for true convictions, Lucaris had no qualms about asserting his Orthodoxy and his Calvinism in the same breath. His fellow churchmen had other ideas, recognizing a real difference between the Protestant ideas adopted by Lucaris and the teaching of the Orthodox Church. Roughly fifty years prior, Patriarch Jeremias II had refuted point by point the teachings found in the *Augsburg Confession*, providing the precedent of refusing characteristically Protestant ideas.³⁷ Because Lucaris seemed to be reversing this and severely compromising the faith, six councils soundly denounced him in the fifty years following his death.³⁸

His legacy remains very complicated among the Eastern Orthodox.³⁹ Some simply denounce him and his *Confession* as heretical. Some deny his authorship and denounce only the *Confession*. Some admit he wrote, but say it was all part of his political genius. In 2009, he was canonized as a Hieromartyr by the Patriarchate of

Alexandria. Still, he remains a controversial figure. But by noticing the ways in which Lucaris did not simply parrot whatever Calvin said without considering consequences, both of the situation of his Church and of truth as he understood it, Lucaris' legacy and memory is more accurately assessed.

From the Protestant side, Lucaris is treated with a generally positive tone, though very few are cognizant of his existence. Some, including Calian, tend to see great opportunity for furthering Orthodox-Reformed dialogue based on the case study of Lucaris. However, with an honest Protestant bias, the tendency is to highlight the aspects of Lucaris' *Confession* that are most characteristically Protestant. By instead considering the parts that do not immediately seem so glaringly Protestant, it is possible to bypass that bias to a certain degree, and really consider commonalities that might be otherwise overlooked and unnoticed.

Notes

1. Cyril Lucaris, *The Confession of Faith, of the most reverend father in God Cyrill, Patriarch of Constantinople. Written at Constantinople, 1629* (London: Printed for Nicolas Bourne, 1629), *Early English Books Online*, http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99839708. Unless otherwise noted, this will be the edition used in subsequent citations.

2. Quoted in Timothy Ware, *Eustratios Argenti: A Study of the Greek Church under Turkish Rule* (Oxford,: Clarendon Press, 1964), 9.

3. Quoted in Timothy Ware, *Eustratios Argenti*, 8. There was another Orthodox Confession written by Mitrophanis Kritopoulos only a few years earlier which had "a faint Protestant tinge," far weaker than the strong Calvinist influence found in the Confession of Lucaris. Kritopoulos' Confession is held to be of

some authority by the Orthodox. This is not the case with that of Lucaris.

4. Gerald Bray, "The *Filioque* Clause in History and Theology," *Tyndale Bulletin* 34, 143.

5. Bray, "The *Filioque* Clause in History and Theology," 143.

6. John Calvin, *Calvin's Commentaries, vol.5: The Gospel According to St. John 11-21 and the First Epistle of John*, trans. T.H.L. Parker (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1961), 110.

7. Cf. Calvin, *Institutes*, I.13.18-19 and III.1.2-3.

8. Calvin, *Institutes*, I.13.6.

9. Calvin, *Institutes*, I.15.3. For Augustine's understanding, see Augustine, Sermon 52, 17-19, where he refers to man as "the image of the Trinity" and makes much of the plural pronouns used in Genesis 1:26 "Let us make man after our own image and likeness."

10. Calvin, *Institutes*, III.1.1.

11. Calvin, *Institutes*, I.13.14.

12. Bray, "The *Filioque* Clause in History and Theology," 140.

13. Bray, "The *Filioque* Clause in History and Theology," 140.

14. Bray, "The *Filioque* Clause in History and Theology," 142.

15. Carnegie Samuel Calian, "Cyril Lucaris: The Patriarch Who Failed," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 10, no.2 (1973): 327.

16. Lucaris, *The Confession of Faith*, chapter 1.
17. *The Thirty-Three Articles from the Union of Brest* (1595), Article 1. United European Christendom. Accessed December 4, 2015, http://www.unitedeuropeanchristendom.com/union_of_brest.html.
18. See *The Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem: Sometimes Called the Council of Bethlehem, Holden Under Dositheus, Patriarch of Jerusalem in 1672*, trans. J.N.W.B. Robertson (New York: AMS Press, 1969), 20-21.
19. Calvin, *Institutes*, I.11.4.
20. Calvin, *The Institutes*, I.11.11.
21. Calvin, *The Institutes*, I.11.11.
22. Calvin, *The Institutes*, I.11.9.
23. Calvin, *The Institutes*, I.11.12.
24. Calvin, *The Institutes*, I.11.12.
25. Calvin, *The Institutes*, I.11.5.
26. Calvin, *The Institutes*, I.11.7.
27. Calvin, *The Institutes*, I.11.7.
28. Calvin, *The Institutes*, I.11.12.
29. Cyril Lucaris, *The Eastern Confession of the Christian Faith*, appended to *The Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem: Sometimes Called the Council*

of *Bethlehem, Holden Under Dositheus, Patriarch of Jerusalem in 1672*, trans. J.N.W.B. Robertson (New York: AMS Press, 1969), Question IV, 213. Robertson's translation is of the 1631 Greek edition, so unlike many other translations which are based on the 1629 Latin publication, it contains the four questions, including the last one regarding icons. The first three questions regard the use of scripture, and do not deviate from Calvin.

30. Lee Palmer Wandel, "The Reformation and the Visual Arts" in *The Cambridge History of Christianity, vol. 6: Reform and Expansion 1500-1600*. R. Po-Chia Hsia, ed. (2007), 345.

31. Wandel, "The Reformation and the Visual Arts," 345.

32. Lucaris, *The Eastern Confession of the Christian Faith*, trans. J.N.W.B. Robertson, Question IV, 213.

33. Calvin, *Institutes*, I.11.12.

34. Calvin, *Institutes*, I.11.12.

35. Quoted in George A. Hadjiantoniou, *Protestant Patriarch: The Life of Cyril Lucaris (1572-1638), Patriarch of Constantinople* (Richmond, Va: John Knox, 1961), 43.

36. Quoted in Timothy Ware, *Eustratios Argenti*, 11.

37. Jeremias II (Patriarch of Constantinople intermittently 1572-1595) wrote his "Reply" to refute the German Lutherans who had provided him with a Greek translation of the *Augsburg Confession* in 1575. Yet, not having the authority of a council, the questions were not definitively settled. For a text of Jeremias' response, see Ecumenical Patriarch Jeremias II, "The Reply to the Augsburg Confession, 1576." in *Creeds & Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition*

Vol. 1 Early, Eastern, & Medieval, Jaroslav Pelikan and Valerie R. Hotchkiss, eds. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 392–474.

38. The six councils mentioned are: Constantinople, 1638; Constantinople, 1642; Jassy, 1642; Constantinople, 1672; Jerusalem, otherwise known as Bethlehem, 1672; Constantinople, 1691.

39. For an explanation of the various schools of thought on Lucaris and his *Confession* held by Orthodox thinkers, both of Lucaris's contemporaries and of those in the modern era, see George P. Michaelides, "The Greek Orthodox Position on the Confession of Cyril Lucaris," *Church History* 12, no. 2 (1943): 118–129.