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INTRODUCTION

Cyril Lucaris was a man whose life witnessed multiple banishments, ending in martyrdom. This was due to his being a controversial figure: a patriarch of the Eastern Orthodox Church who, nevertheless, held and advocated Calvinist beliefs. Most famously, there is a confession of faith attributed to him which in large part agrees with Reformed theology.¹ For this reason, Lucaris is a figure that stands at the foundation of Reformed - Orthodox dialogue, yet he is commonly misunderstood. At times he is made out to be a sincere Calvinist, showing the triumph of Protestantism, at others, he is only a cunning if opportunistic politician;² at others, he is the victim of slander who could not have actually propounded Calvinism³ or “a tool in the hands of Protestant propagandists;”⁴ and still at others, he is someone best forgotten lest he do more damage. This is unfortunate, both in that these competing interpretations tend to shut down dialogue, and in that they are unfair to Lucaris himself, since, especially individually, they are largely false. To correct some of these initial assumptions about him, it is worth taking a more

¹ This paper follows the consensus in assuming Lucaran authorship of the Confession, for rationale see p. 48.
² George Michaelides offers the names of M. Renieris, Zolotas, C. Androutsos, N. Ambrazis as those who have argued that Cyril wrote the Confession but “under the influence of modern nationalism which is willing to excuse and to justify anything that helps its course.” Michaelides, “The Greek Orthodox Position on the Confession of Cyril Lucaris,” Church History 12, no. 2 (1943), 129.
⁴ See especially, Markos Renieris, Κυριλλος Λουκαρις, Ο Οικουμενικός Πατριάρχης (Athens: Vivliopòleion N. Karavia, 1965).
holistic and nuanced look through Lucaris’ life and writings. This obvious suggestion has been much overlooked in favor of arguing about the *Confession* to the exclusion of any other considerations.

In particular, the work in the twentieth century, meager though it be, has largely focussed on the questions of whether Lucaris wrote the *Confession*, and whether the *Confession* accurately depicts the faith of the Greek Church. These matters have in some regard been settled: one, Lucaris is most likely the author of the confession - though he may have consulted with his Protestant allies in its creation, and two, even though there is plenty of doubt as to how established Orthodox positions were on the questions that led to the Reformation in the West, Lucaris’ *Confession* is incongruous with even seventeenth century Orthodoxy.

However, these are not the only questions to be asked, and as Tsakiris rightly points out, the exclusive focus on the *Confession* eclipses other highly relevant information about the era.\(^5\) But the excessive attention paid to the *Confession* is not the only obstacle in working on the subject of Lucaris. As one modern scholar points out much of the research “has been both polemical and anti-ecumenical.”\(^6\) However, this has improved somewhat in recent decades, with much of the very little scholarship on Lucaris done with ecumenical purposes in mind.\(^7\) Even so, the agenda with which each scholar approaches Lucaris often remains aligned with denominational preferences. For instance, Calian, who was baptized Orthodox but later became


Protestant, sees Lucaris’ beliefs as largely acceptable to the Orthodox. Ioannis Karmiris on the other hand, being Orthodox, judges that Lucaris’ beliefs were essentially Protestant with only faintest of Orthodox influence, assuming there to be a greater difference between the theology of the two Churches than does Calian. Similarly, Chrysostom Papadopulos’ work is marked by “the author’s determination to show that Cyril remained fully Orthodox throughout his life.”

The work of all these authors is, nonetheless, interesting and valuable, and the disagreement noted as to how acceptable the *Confession* is to the Orthodox certainly highlights not only various understandings of Orthodoxy and Calvinism, but various interpretations of Lucaris’ statements in the *Confession*.

Due to the general paucity of scholarship on Cyril, particularly with the only readily available English language biography leaning very Protestant and portraying Lucaris as highly

---

8 Calian’s examination of the Confession renders nine of the eighteen chapters to be acceptably Orthodox: “The Orthodox could accept without much debate the following articles: (1) on the procession of the Holy Spirit; (4) on the creation; (5) on the inscrutability of God's providence; (6) on original sin; (7 and 8) on Christ as the head of the Church and redeemer; (10) on the nature of the Church; (12) that the Church might err without the help of the Holy Spirit and (16) on the necessity for baptism. Also, in the appendix, most Orthodox would find acceptable the reading of Scripture by the *laos* and the list of the canonical books.” Calian, “Cyril Lucaris: the Patriarch Who Failed,” 329.

9 Karmiris limits the number of acceptable chapters in the Confession to two or three - chapters 1 (Trinity), 7 (Christ), and in part, 6 (original sin). (Εἰδικότερον εκ τῶν 18 κεφαλαίων καὶ τῶν 4 ερωτήσεων τῆς Δουκαρείου Ομολογίας ορθόδοξων εἶναι μονον τὸ α, τὸ ζ καὶ εν μέρει τὸ στά κεφαλαίων).

Ioannis Karmiris, *Τὰ Δογματικὰ καὶ Συμβολικὰ μνημεῖα τῆς Ὀρθόδοξης Καθολικῆς Εκκλησίας (The Dogmatic and Symbolic Monuments of the Orthodox Catholic Church)*, vol. 2, 2nd ed. (Austria, 1968), 643.

10 Davey, *Pioneer For Unity: Metrophanes Kritopoulos, 1589-1639, and Relations Between the Orthodox, Roman Catholic and Reformed Churches*, (Churches Together in Britain and Ireland, 1987), 35.
committed to Reformed doctrine, the purpose of this paper is primarily that of a corrective, raising reasonable doubt as to the accuracy and necessity of this conclusion and adding to the existing conversation rather than offering a comprehensive and nuanced replacement understanding of who Lucaris was and what he thought he was doing. It is the contention here simply that a more nuanced view is needed in light of the often ignored facets of his life and times, the extant letters he wrote, and in recognition of various possible interpretations of the existing evidence. Taken together, all this challenges conventional ideas about Lucaris, offering a vision that may downplay his Protestantism in favor of providing greater appreciation for his hesitance and his actual beliefs, as well as for the situation and relationships he was a part of. To do this, this paper explores three main areas relevant to this discussion: his influences, his beliefs, and his own self-understanding.

The first section is dedicated to biographical considerations, especially the significance of certain places, events, and people that Lucaris encountered throughout his life. It serves to demonstrate that Lucaris had nearly constant access to Protestant thought. This section also provides some background points and other insights into the famous Calvinist Confession, again

---

exploring possible influences that led to the creation of that document. The second section explores a variety of specific doctrinal questions that Lucaris wrestled with during his life, including such topics as predestination, ecclesial government, and saints. Through this analysis, it is observed how his thought developed, making note of how this was often done thoughtfully and gradually, as well as how he did not always follow Calvin in every detail. In the third section, we turn to what Cyril made of his own situation. This involves his thoughts regarding loyalty and apostasy, his understanding of the religious landscape of theological commitments and the the place of the Orthodox Church in the disputes of the West, as well as his intentions in engaging in theological dialogue with Protestants and his appropriation of their doctrines.

These explorations through Lucaris’ life, beliefs, and self-reflection provide much food for thought regarding how Lucaris is understood as a complicated individual that resists easy categorization. They show a man engaged in a world influenced by Western theological developments from the Reformation, fostering friendships that he thought would be beneficial, trying to make sense of the Christian faith, upon being confronted by questions and categories foreign to Eastern Orthodoxy, and striving to determine what might be harmful accretions and superstitions and what was essential and proper. He cannot be easily categorized as Orthodox as he departs in significant ways, and yet can be no more accurately be considered a Calvinist for all his reservations. Rather, he is complicated figure from a complicated era of history, and an intriguing subject worth consideration.
PART I: BIOGRAPHICAL AND CONTEXTUAL INFLUENCES

SOURCES

Before we begin to examine Lucaris’ life proper, it is worthwhile to pause and become aware of the sources in use. Cyril Lucaris is somewhat of an obscure figure in Christian history, and due to the controversy surrounding him, the work that has been done on him is far from impartial. This certainly provides a challenge in assembling a more objective understanding of Lucaris from existing sources. I draw here primarily on the work of four anglophone biographers: Thomas Smith, James Beaven, John Neale, and George Hadjintoniou, each of whom has their limitations.\(^\text{12}\)

Thomas Smith’s *Collectanea De Cyrillic Lucario, Patriarcha Constantinopolitano* is widely considered to be the authority on Lucaris, providing not only one of the first biographies (being published in 1707, 69 years after Lucaris’ death), but also including some letters and relates accounts of the activities of the Jesuits, and of the state of the Eastern Church in general. Smith never knew Lucaris directly, being himself an English chaplain who only arrived in Constantinople thirty years after Lucaris’ death. He did however talk to those who knew him personally. He also had access to what documents the English embassy had saved as well as previous biographies written by both Protestants and Catholics.

The biography James Beaven provides is likewise an Englishman’s account, but being written in the 1840s, is one separated from Cyril’s time by a couple more centuries than was Smith’s.\(^\text{13}\) Beaven’s account and follows Smith rather closely, but also draws on several letters Lucaris had written, even providing English translations of many of them. However, his account betrays a certain lack of understanding when it comes to interpreting Lucaris’ various writings as agreeable or not to both Calvinists (he presumes a later Calvinism than Lucaris would have known) and to the Orthodox.

---

\(^{12}\) Also consulted are other slightly more modern, non-English works, namely, in Greek, Chrysostom A. Papadopoulos, Κυριλλος Λουκαρις (του Αυστρουγγρική Lloyd, 1907); and in German, Gunnar Hering, *Ökumenisches Patriarchat und Europäische Politik 1620-1638* (Wiesbaden: Frany Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1968) 146-206.

\(^{13}\) Beaven’s account was printed as a series of four articles published in the *British Magazine and Monthly Register of Religious and Ecclesiastical Information, Parochial History, and Documents Respecting the State of the Poor, Progress of Education, Etc*, the first appearing in the September 1842 issue, and the last in June 1844.
John Mason Neale’s account given in the second volume of his *History of the Holy Eastern Church: The Patriarchate of Alexandria* follows Beaven and uses his translations for several letters that he takes into account. Neale’s is also one of the relatively few sources that attempts an Orthodox perspective, and is determined to “keep clear from the unfounded assumptions of both Genevans and Jesuits, and to judge the whole subject by the Canons and Creed of the Eastern Church.”14 His take though could also be fairly described as brutally anti-Protestant and without an extensive understanding of the Eastern Church.

George Hadjiantoniou, in a more modern biography entitled *The Protestant Patriarch*, provides the exact opposite opinion, in which “Cyril -and his Protestant allies-are the heroes. The Romans-and their Turkish dupes-are the villains.”15 Further, this biography is often unreliable in relating the facts and providing accurate citations. Even so, Hadjiantoniou’s biography has the benefit of a clearer sense of the historical context and greater reflection of the theological ideas at play.16

To aid in remedying the aforementioned “polemical and anti-ecumenical” biases that these works display, as well to overcome the other challenges that relying on these sources engenders, this study makes use of the letters that were written by and to Lucaris that have been compiled by John Aymon in their original languages, variously Greek, Latin, and Italian.17 These letters shed much light on what Lucaris was thinking at various points throughout his life, or at least, the thoughts that he was obliged to share with various audiences.

My aim in relating Lucaris’ biographical information is to distill the information from these sources, stripping away as many of the partisan value-judgements as possible. It should also be noted that what follows is by no means an exhaustive biography, as it necessarily skips over events that, though significant when it comes to other discussions of his life, are less relevant to this project. Here we follow


16 It will be noted that most sources used, even the “modern” ones, are quite dated. This is due to the static state of scholarship on Lucaris.

the major and most probative moves in Lucaris’ life, arranged chronologically and categorized geographically: his childhood in Crete and Venice, his education in Padua, his mission to Poland, his patriarchates in Alexandria and in Constantinople. This final consideration of Constantinople requires fuller treatment and is nearly a section unto itself, taking into account some of the drama Lucaris was faced with towards the end of his life, but this too is selective to highlight the most relevant details that show the character and necessity of his interaction with the Protestants and their theology. This biographical summary thus provides a basic sense of where he was and what he was doing at various stages in his life. Special attention is given to the significance of the specific contexts Lucaris found himself in throughout his life, as he largely ignored the Calvinist thought he had been exposed to through his youth and the care in his ongoing interaction with Protestant powers as this became increasingly professionally essential and consequential. Overall, this consideration of the Protestant influences throughout his life clearly demonstrates that Lucaris’ Protestant proclivities were developed slowly despite the ongoing accessibility of Protestant theology to him.

**CRETE: 1572 - 1584**

In 1572, Cyril (then Constantine) Lucaris was born in the Kingdom of Candia, as the island of Crete was at that time known. At the time, the island was under Venetian rule, and it would remain that way throughout Cyril’s life. This detail had a huge impact on everything else, because under the Venetians, the Greeks of Crete were relatively free to carry on as they would. This is significant when compared to much of Southeast Europe whose intellectual devastation is described by Peter Sugar:

Among those who lived under Ottoman rule, not only the literary tradition of their long history was lost, but literacy declined catastrophically to the point that most parish clergymen were

---

18 The Venetocracy, as this period is known, ended during the Creten War in 1645-1669 when the island fell to the Ottomans.
practically illiterates. The literary activity of the Greeks on the Turkish-dominated mainland practically disappeared for two centuries.\textsuperscript{19}

According to Sugar, it was places like Candia that “kept their people’s culture alive and even growing.”\textsuperscript{20} In fact, Crete is singled out as being the first “center of Greek literature after the fall of Constantinople,” and in the era of Cyril Lucaris, it was the Cretans “who dominated the Greek intellectual scene.”\textsuperscript{21} This Cretan domination lasted about a hundred years, starting in the 1570s - a period of time contemporaneous with Lucaris’ life. This intellectual milieu was part of the reason that so many Cretans ended up in powerful positions throughout the Orthodox world. For example, Silvester, a Cretan, was Patriarch of Alexandria from 1569-1590; Meletios Pigas, a Cretan, was Patriarch of Alexandria from 1590 until his death in 1601; Metrophanes Kritopoulos, a Cretan, held the same post from 1636 through 1639; not to mention Lucaris, who also was Patriarch of Alexandria 1601 - 1620 as well as serving as Patriarch of Constantinople 1620-1638 intermittently; and Athanasius III Patellarios, another Cretan, was Patriarch of Constantinople in 1634, 1635, and 1652. Being from such a place where intellectual activity was possible put Cyril in a good position from his birth. Another impact growing up in the Venetocracy had on Lucaris was very much related to this facet just mentioned, i.e. that Crete was a place were learning was still possible, and accordingly, Lucaris was educated in Venice.

\textsuperscript{19} Peter Sugar, \textit{Southeastern Europe under Ottoman Rule, 1354-1804}, (University of Washington Press, 2000), 255.

\textsuperscript{20} Sugar, \textit{Southeastern Europe under Ottoman Rule}, 255.

\textsuperscript{21} Sugar, \textit{Southeastern Europe under Ottoman Rule}, 256.
Like many Greeks of Crete, he was sent to Venice when he was twelve to study. While we do not know specifically how Lucaris saw his Venetian education shaping him, it is indeed fascinating to consider what the character of late 16th century Venice was, as this offers a few tantalizing, albeit speculative possibilities: First, Venice was a center for Hellenic studies. Or, more accurately, it had been; for by the time Lucaris arrived, this was already in decline. The man who had been striving to make Venice “a second Athens,” Aldus Manutius, had died and with him, a printing house dedicated to producing Greek texts, and also the academy he had established with the scholars/Greek enthusiasts whom he associated with. According to Hadjiantoniou’s account, it was likely that the only place where the young Lucaris was likely to have heard his native language spoken was the barbershop, as most of the barbers in Venice were Greek.\(^{22}\) One can wonder at what effect this had on Lucaris, if perhaps this contributed to his being largely unimpressed by his own people. However, this seems dubious, given his later encomiums regarding the Greeks and their religion.

Also fascinating was another aspect of this prior era in Venice, namely, that it had been a center for reform within the Catholic Church. Not only was there an active branch of a reforming order, the Oratory of Divine Love, in Venice, there was also the significant circulation of *Beneficio di Giesu Christo*. In fact, it was described as being, in the sixteenth century, “one of the very commonest [works] in the world,” and this was certainly the case in Venice where it was first printed in 1543.\(^{23}\) Despite its author being a devout Catholic, the work’s preface suggests that notions contained within, including that “justification, remission of sins, and our entire


\(^{23}\) Churchill Babington, preface to *Beneficio di Giesu Christo*, iii.
salvation depend on Christ,” led it to be publicly burned at Rome, and eventually was believed to “have been utterly destroyed by the Romish Inquisitors.” This invites the question of whether or not Lucaris had any sense of this when he was a boy in Venice.

Hadjiantoniou posits the possibility that the reformation-flavored doctrine and with it, the reforming mindset, “had not died out completely” in Venice, and even speculates that it could have been “in this city [where] he heard for the first time the teaching of those doctrines which he was to adopt and defend in later years.” It must be remembered that this is conjecture, and there is little to suggest that such was the case. In fact, it seems that “if young Constantine heard those doctrines in Venice, he either rejected them completely or else, finding them too deep for him, ignored them.” Quite possibly, it was a combination of those responses, given that whenever and wherever his first introduction to such doctrine was, he recalled that he “abominated the doctrine of the Reformed Churches as opposed to the Faith, in good truth not knowing what [he] abominated.” He did not have all the facts, but he did not need such knowledge to detest it at this point in his life. After all, he was young, only twelve to sixteen years old and perhaps twenty years too late to see the strongest of the reforming impulses Venice had to offer, though not necessarily too late to have some exposure to the ideas that were still in the air.

\[24 \text{ Beneficio di Giesu Christo, ch. 3} \]
\[\text{\textquote Doublequote Che la remissione delli peccati, e la giustificazione, e tutta la salute nostra depende da Christo.} \]

\[25 \text{ Churchill Babington, preface to Beneficio di Giesu Christo, iii. Some copies did survive, in multiple translations, hence our modern access to this text.} \]

\[26 \text{ Hadjiantoniou, The Protestant Patriarch, 17.} \]

\[27 \text{ Hadjiantoniou, The Protestant Patriarch, 17.} \]

\[28 \text{ Neale, History of the Holy Eastern Church, vol. 2, 398.} \]
After a year back home in Crete, Lucaris continued his education in Padua for another six years, where he seemed particularly interested in philosophy. While an interesting period in his life, what is known of these university years is not of great relevance when it comes to the discussion of Lucaris’ interaction with Protestant ideas. What is worth mentioning, as one’s schooling does tend to inform one’s views, is that the University of Padua was known as a center of liberal thought, and the teaching there that Lucaris would have been subjected to “was characterized by a distinct divergence from the doctrines of Rome.” Also, and very much because of this freedom of thought, the University of Padua “attracted an increasing number of students from Britain, Germany, and other Protestant countries - students who would not feel themselves safe in attending other Italian universities.” There is no evidence of Lucaris interacting much with these students, much less engaging in theological debate, though again the question arises of what he might have thought at this stage. This lack of evidence means nothing as there is no particular reason that any evidence of this would have survived. What can be said with some degree of certainty, is that had Lucaris been interested, Protestant thought would have been accessible to him, and that it is most likely that by this time he had some degree of exposure to these ideas, regardless of the unknown degree to which Lucaris engaged with them.

---

During these years in Padua, Lucaris remained in frequent contact with Maximos Margunios, the then-exiled bishop of Cythera who had been his primary teacher in Venice.\(^{31}\) While Margunios himself certainly had an effect on Lucaris,\(^{32}\) the content of the correspondence is also of consequence. Much of their letters was taken up by “exercises which the older man set to the younger one on the differences between the philosophy of Plato and that of Aristotle.”\(^{33}\) The fact that Lucaris studied both Plato and Aristotle is not that shocking, but it is worth note. These studies Margunios guided him through manifested themselves in Lucaris’ worldview, leading him towards acceptance of a sort of duality between matter and spirit, which definitely present in his later understanding of the Eucharist.\(^{34}\)

The most significant aspect of these years in Padua is the fact that this may have been when Lucaris was ordained. The knowledge we have of this event is rather tenuous. Smith reports only that: “By him [Meletios Pegas] he was made a Priest, and afterwards Archimandrite or Prior of a Convent.”\(^{35}\) As to his source, it seems he got this straight from Antione Leger who

---

\(^{31}\) Margunios was in exile for some unknown reason on the order of the Venetian authorities, and was eventually allowed to return to his See. Hadjiantoniou, *The Protestant Patriarch*, 9-10.

\(^{32}\) Margunios is known to have had some strange ideas which nearly landed him in prison on one occasion. He is known to have supported union with Rome, but primarily he was a Humanist and something of a poet. Regardless, his effect on Lucaris was such that not only did they stay in contact, but Margunios’ language seems to suggest a stronger relationship than merely teacher and student, referring to him as “my son in Christ.” It is probable even that Lucaris’ theological inclinations were due to the steering of Margunios. Lucaris also became adept at mimicking his teacher’s writing style, and the characteristic “Margunizing” tendency was pointed out to him by one of his friends. See letter dated October 27, 1590 from Nicolaos Rhodios, in Emilie Legrand, “Documents Concernant Cyrille Lucar.” in *Bibliographie Hellenique ou Description Raisonnee Des Ouvrages Publies Par Des Grecs au XVII Siecle*, vol. 4, (Paris: Culture et Civilisation, 1896), 202-203.

\(^{33}\) Hadjiantoniou, *The Protestant Patriarch*, 25. For examples of these exercises, see their letters contained in Legrand, “Documents Concernant Cyrille Lucar,” 190-193.

\(^{34}\) See the discussion of Lucaris’ thoughts on the Eucharist on p. 74-84

\(^{35}\) Thomas Smith, *An Account of the State of the Greek Church under the Government of Cyrillus Lucaris, Patriarch of Constantinople, with a relation of his Sufferings and Death*, 241.
wrote in a partial life of Lucaris, “At that time, by [Meletios Pegas] he was ordained, and he took up the habit and profession of a hieromonk.”36 Neither provides a year, only that it was at the hands of Meletios sometime before 1596.37 Another seventeenth century chronicler of Lucaris’ history, Richard Simon, places the ordination prior to his studies at Padua:

Cyrillus Lucarus…entered very young into the service of Meletius Patriarch of Alexandria, who …having found him to be a Man of Parts and Studious, ordained him Priest. After that he went to Padua to prosecute his Studies; from whence returning to Alexandria, Meletius made him Head of a Monastery…38

Again no year is mentioned, only that it was before he went to Padua. Papadopoulos offers yet another version of the story,39 saying that Lucaris was ordained November of 1592 - a few years after his studies, citing a few lines of verse from Meletios in which he refers to Lucaris being tonsured.40 But just when this occurred is less important than the fact that for whatever reason, Lucaris became a cleric, adopting the ecclesial name Cyril. From here, his life takes on more religious and theologically centered tone, and his theological opinions he records for us take on greater import, for now we realize that these matters had greater significance for him as his own life became dominated by his religion and his Church.


37 Hadjiantoniou claims that the ordination took place in Constantinople when Meletios was serving as *locum tenens* of the Ecumenical throne. If this is the case, then the timeline skews problematically since Meletios was not *locum tenens* until 1597. Hadjiantoniou, *The Protestant Patriarch*, 27. For the list of Patriarchs giving the dates Meletios was in Constantinople, see Demetrius Kiminas, *The Ecumenical Patriarchate: A History of Its Metropolitanates with Annotated Hierarch Catalogs*. Orthodox Christianity vol. 1 (Rockville, MD: Borgo Press, 2009), 38.


39 Hadjiantoniou’s understanding of Papadopoulos is quite different, taking him to mean that Cyril was ordained a deacon in 1592 and a priest the year after. How he arrived at this interpretation is baffling.

THE MYTHICAL TOUR OF WESTERN EUROPE

At this point in the timeline of Lucaris’ life, many biographers “send Cyril on a most doubtful journey” through western Europe. The repetition of this story demands correction, inasmuch as the trip through Europe most likely having never happened. Smith for instance – again usually considered something of an authority – does not provide many details, but says that Cyril

travelled out of Italy into other parts of Christendome, the better to fit himself for the service of his Country; where he learned enough, by discourse and conversation, added to his own inquisitive genius and wise Observations of things, to make him more and more disrelish the Tenets of the Roman Church, and the Fopperies and Superstitions of their Worship, and to pity the defects and miscarriages which his deserted Countrymen lay under by reason of their Ignorance and Oppression, and to be more and more in love with the Reformation.

Neale also repeats the tale from his own view, but follows Smith’s lead in his assumption that this event occurred. Always looking to highlight Lucaris’ attraction to Calvinism, Neale writes:

[O]n the completion of his academical career, [he] resolved to visit several of the most famous European cities, and more especially, to inquire for himself into the real condition and character of the Reformed communities, of which so much was heard, and so little known, in Egypt.

Neale also mentions how unfortunate it is that we lack record of these travels, but he seems confident that “he visited Geneva, Holland, and it would seem, England.” Yet he makes these assertions without referencing where he came up with these specific countries. Sir Paul Rycaut

---


also testifies to the patriarch having visited England, claiming that it was the English who won him over to Protestant belief, saying:

I am persuaded that this Cyrillus, having spent some time in England, and there observed that purity of our Doctrine, and the excellency of our Discipline, which flourished in the beginning of the reign of King Charles the Martyr, and ... entertained a high Opinion of our happy Reformation; intending thence perhaps to draw a Pattern, whereby to amend and correct the defaults of the Greek Church.  

Rycaut’s account undermines itself, as the timeline does not match up; this trip Lucaris is said to have taken would have been before 1596, at which time Queen Elizabeth would have been reigning, not King Charles. But it is not merely the lack of evidence for such a trip and the problematic timelines that fail to line up that make this trip so doubtful. Other reasonable explanations for the story’s genesis are less inventive than fitting into his life a European tour. Hadjiantoniou suggests that the issue arose from a misreading of an earlier biography in which it said that he arrived at the next stop in his story from Padua, in Latin, *Patavium*, and that this was confused with the Latin for Holland, *Batavia*. In order to have him coming from Holland, he had to be there in the first place, and so biographers send him there, while bemoaning the fact that they do not actually have record of it. But the strongest source of doubt comes from the fact that there was another Greek, one Metrophanes Kritopoulos, who did study in England, did travel through Germany, and who was elevated to the throne of Alexandria in 1636. Generally,

---


46 It is unknown what early biography this would have come from, but since most of these were propaganda pieces, it is not surprising that Protestants would include such a trip to show how interested he was in their religion, nor is it surprising that Catholics would include it for the same reason, though ultimately to defame Cyril instead of praise him. See Hadjiantoniou, *The Protestant Patriarch*, 27.

it is now accepted that the trip probably never occurred and the confusion arose from Lucaris being conflated with Kritopoulos.

The absence of this trip means a couple of things for Lucaris. First, if Cyril felt such a desire to travel and experience Reformed communities firsthand, this desire was not enough to make it happen and overcome any barriers there may have been to such travel. Second, Lucaris lacked this type of firsthand experience. Perhaps with the exception of that possibly gained during his time in Poland, his entire understanding of Protestant theology was based on friendships made with individuals who crossed his path and were kind enough to give him books explaining their beliefs. This limits his understanding of how Reformed communities operated, since it is quite possible that he only was familiar with a more theoretical and easily idealized Protestantism.

POLAND48: 1596-1601

In October of 1596, a recently ordained49 Cyril Lucaris was sent to Poland as exarch from Alexandria together with Nicephorus Cantacuzinos, exarch from Constantinople. To appreciate why they were sent and what their role was, one must first reflect on the events that served as a prequel to this episode of Polish church history.

The head of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was king Sigismund III, a devout Catholic, who aimed at making his realm properly Catholic. This led to not merely royal support of the Catholic Church but also the expulsion of non-Catholic bishops from the Senate and a ban

---

48 In speaking of this region in the sixteenth century, it is more accurate to refer to it as the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. However, the region relevant to this discussion is Poland proper, and is usually referred to simply as Poland.

49 See section on Padua for a discussion on Cyril’s ordination. Whenever it was, all sources agree that it occurred prior to his being sent to Poland.
against non-Catholics serving in any public office. Such measures produced results, and many Protestants as well as Orthodox, particularly from upper classes, acquiesced to the king’s new standards and became Catholic.\(^{50}\)

Another consequence of these policies grew out of the bitterness many Orthodox clergy felt over their exclusion, and that was the growth of an influential cabal within the Orthodox Church. This faction, headed by the Metropolitan of the Greek Orthodox Church in Poland, advocated union with Rome, hoping that the terms laid out at the Council of Florence would still be acceptable, and that the king would find their submission to Rome satisfactory. Five years of secret negotiations culminated in 1595 at the first Council of Brest which settled on an agreement of this sort by which the Eastern form of the liturgy, Communion in both kinds, the use of the Julian calendar, and the marriage of the priesthood would be retained, while otherwise subjecting the formerly-Orthodox of Poland to the authority of the Pope and the Roman doctrines. The decision was sent to Rome for approval, and was swiftly granted.

In order to ratify the decision and accept the pardon and welcome of Pope Clement VIII, there was need for the Polish bishops to gather again - the second session of the Synod of Brest. It was to this meeting that Cyril and Nicephorus were sent. This second session was well attended, particularly by the masses who remained loyal to the Orthodox tradition and felt betrayed by their leaders.\(^{51}\) This backfired though, as the large numbers, not to mention


\(^{51}\) There is some uncertainty on this point, as some sources hold that the masses faithfully followed after their bishops, (as it is the bishop that properly determines orthodoxy), and this was most certainly the case in Brest and the surrounding areas that had been subject to much pro-union propaganda. It is possible that the number of qualified representatives was small, but they were backed by (armed) followers numbering between two hundred and three thousand. Oscar Halecki, *From Florence to Brest (1439-1596)*, (Rome: Sacrum Poloniae Millenium, 1958), 368-369.
irreconcilable goals, led to two separate assemblies. The pro-unionists met in “the only convenient and dignified place” Brest had to offer, the Church of the Virgin. The rest, opposed to union, met down the street in a private house. The two gatherings reached the verdicts one would expect, including each one’s anathemas against the other.

Nicephorus’ actions in Poland were cut short as he had been executed for the crime of ignoring King Sigismund’s orders to not come to Poland in the first place. Lucaris, on the other hand, stayed for five years, improving the schools of Greek Orthodox communities and setting up printing houses. During this time, for fear of sharing Nicephorus’ fate, he was under the protection of the esteemed Prince Constantine Basil Ostrog, a man who also had dealings with Protestants, though was best known for publishing the first Slavic Bible some 15 years earlier.

The Protestants, such as those in contact with Ostrogski, are an often overlooked fact in the religious history of Poland. While the certain of the Orthodox and the Catholics were making historically significant attempts at union, the Protestant communities in Poland were in comparison, unengaged in such large-scale ecumenical endeavors. They are however, both present and relevant to this discussion.

Like the Orthodox, the Protestants were unable to serve in public office in Poland. Often being bishop-less, they were not as affected by the removal of non-Catholic bishops from the senate, but they were nevertheless unhappy about these developments in the commonwealth. The upper class Protestants faced the same choice of either giving up their privileged place in society,

---

52 This house interestingly enough was the property of an Arian, showing that there was at least some willingness to accept the aid of “heretics” in the struggle for Orthodox autonomy. Halecki, *From Florence to Brest*, 367.
or converting to Catholicism, and in turn, many were joined to the Roman Church, just as the formerly-Orthodox were.

From these Protestant communities in Poland arise three items of particular interest when considering if Lucaris’ experiences in Poland influenced his later Protestant tendencies. The first is that a number of Orthodox were interested in Protestantism, and indeed, “the magnates and Russian nobility, as well as some burghers, were leaving the Orthodox Church and converting… often to Calvinism.” Some were engaging with anti-Trinitarian communions, and as already mentioned, others were becoming Catholic, but aside from the politically advantageous Roman Church, it is the Reformed Church that seems to have wielded a particular draw, perhaps because their theology is generally appealing to the bourgeois mindset.

Yet, with this revelation that enough Orthodox were drawn into the Reformed Church to be historically noticeable, Cyril Lucaris no longer seems as uniquely out of place as he can otherwise be made to appear. While he is the only major Orthodox figure who seems to have appropriated Protestant theology to the extent he did, he is less of an anomaly when understood in this context of shifting religious loyalties towards “more reasoned” and less disadvantageous communions.

The second reason the Protestants are worth consideration returns us to more political matters that are unlikely to have escaped Lucaris’ attention, though he never explicitly mentioned it. It is a matter of geography and demographics, and the potential consequences for church politics. Jerzy Kloczowski describes what he sees as impossible to miss:

> [E]ven a brief look at a map of denominations in this part of Europe in the second half of the sixteenth century reveals how significant such cooperation [between Protestant and Orthodox

53 Kloczowski, *A History of Polish Christianity*, 116
Churches in Poland] could have been. Within the area of the Commonwealth, the Catholic population was as it were squeezed between two homogenous blocks, the Lutheran to the west and the Orthodox to the east.⁵⁴

Had there been more contact and cooperation, the religious history of Poland could conceivably have unfolded very differently, and very less favorably to the Catholics whom actual history hails as the victors in Poland. If Lucaris realized this potential, it may have influenced him to see Protestants in a friendlier light, as prospective allies. And, witnessing as he did the threat the Catholic Church posed to the Orthodox Church’s autonomy, he may have been more likely to be prepared to employ such strategy should the need present itself.

The third reason the Protestant element of Poland cannot be ignored is that the situation with the Union of Brest actually did involve Protestant/Orthodox cooperation. It is known that Lucaris had direct contact with Protestants while in Poland, establishing an even stronger precedence for him to later make such attempts himself. If one consults a map of the religious geography of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and notes the places Lucaris is known to have stopped, it seems highly unlikely that he would have been able to avoid passing through the pockets of Calvinism.⁵⁵ This means little in comparison to the fact that there was a Protestant faction present at the anti-unionist gathering of the second session of Brest. The anti-unionist leader, Prince Constantine Ostrogski, who was also responsible for requesting the validating

⁵⁴ Kloczowski, A History of Polish Christianity, 107

⁵⁵ Sources fail to agree on Lucaris’ precise movements through Poland, but generally agree that he spent time in Wilna, Lwow, and Krakow, as well as in Brest. Traveling between these cities, he almost certainly would have passed through Lublin or the cities that surround it. This area was one of the largest centers of Calvinism in Poland, and indeed in eastern Europe, during those years, though there was also another sizable Calvinist area not far from Wilna.

It is also worth noting that there were areas in sixteenth century Poland that were primarily Lutheran, and there were also several Mennonite communities. However, both Lutherans and Mennonites were largely limited to the northwest, bordering on the Baltic sea and modern day Germany. It was the Reformed who had communities scattered throughout the center of Poland.
presence of Nicephorus and Cyril, “decided…to secure the support of the Calvinist leaders,” reasoning that if the anti-unionists but had the cooperation of the Calvinists, “those scoundrels” (meaning the pro-union bishops), and “even the Pope, could achieve nothing.”

While we do not know the numbers in which Protestants showed up, “una massa di heretici” is reported to have accompanied Ostrogski at Brest. This detail gives clear precedence of cooperation with Protestants that would have been inescapably known to Lucaris. In fact, Smith tells of a meeting in Wilna in 1599 of the Orthodox along with several Protestant Nobles and Divines…Here several Proposals were made about their uniting in Spirituals, which met at first with opposition from the ignorance and obstinacy of the Lithuanian Bishops and Priests, and became afterwards, upon sedate reflection on things, more inclinable to terms of peace and reconciliation.

Regardless of what he did or did not know of their theology, Lucaris would have at this point in time seen Protestants in a friendly light, as allies whose usefulness was recognized by the highly

---

56 From a letter Ostrogski wrote to one of the Calvinist leaders he hoped would support him, Christopher Radziwill, quoted in Halecki, From Florence to Brest, 367. The strength of the language may be mitigated by the realization that this was a persuasive, and therefore flattering, letter aimed at gaining support from Radziwill. Still, the fact that he wanted and was willing to use such support speaks volumes.

57 From the account of Peter Arcudius, who was himself “a Catholic favorable to the Union,” quoted in Halecki, From Florence to Brest, 367.

58 Smith, An Account of the State of the Greek Church, 244-245. It should also be mentioned here that this meeting did not produce much in the way of action, since there was an unwillingness “to determine anything of this nature without consulting the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria.” For this reason, “there was a stop put to the Debate for a time…which afterward fell to the ground and proved abortive.” Colin Davey also reminds us that this meeting in Wilna was not the first Orthodox-Protestant connection. The meeting in Wilna was actually suggested as a continuation of overtures that occurred 148 years previous when the Orthodox first reached out to Bohemian Hussites in hope and indeed expectation “that their unity could very soon be achieved.” Davey holds it to be only the 1453 fall of Constantinople to the Turks that “put an end to the matter.” See Colin Davey, Pioneer for Unity, 51-53. Florovsky warns about pushing this previous incident too far, because, as he demonstrates, both the party of Hussites and that of the Orthodox seeking union with them were minority groups that doubtfully would have been able to effect, or even affect, ecclesial union. Nevertheless, this incident does show that there was something of a precedent for exploring possibilities of union between the Orthodox and Protestant communions. R. Rouse and S.C. Neill, A History of the Ecumenical Movement (London: S.P.C.K., 1954), 175.
respeectable Prince of Ostrog. Thus, Lucaris’ time in Poland brought him into contact with Protestants, such that he would have seen them as allies against Rome’s attempts at reunion.

ALEXANDRIA: 1601-1620

Lucaris had been sent to Poland as exarch from Alexandria, and one might wonder what his connection to the church in Egypt was. His uncle, Meletios Pegas, was patriarch of the see of Saint Mark, i.e. Alexandria,⁵⁹ from 1580 until his death in 1601. It also deserves mention that from 1588-1598, he enjoyed a personal friendship with the English Ambassador in Constantinople, Edward Barton, who is described as being “constant in the profession of the reformed religion” and even tried to establish a Calvinist church within the City of Constantinople.⁶⁰ It is said that Barton’s “recommendation contributed to the appointment in 1597 of his friend Meletios” to the throne of Constantinople as Locum Tenens.”⁶¹ Meletios himself spoke highly of Barton for “his protection of the Orthodox against Roman attacks.”⁶² This friendship did not restrict itself to such protection, but the two are also known to have conversed regarding the doctrine of the Eucharist.⁶³ Again, through Lucaris’ relationship with his uncle, he saw precedence for friendship with the Protestants that even included doctrinal

⁵⁹ Though Alexandria is the traditional seat of the Patriarch, at this point, the patriarch’s residence had moved to Cairo. Though Lucaris explains the shift to be due to Cairo’s superior climate, this may only be true if he meant the political climate, which in Cairo, was much more friendly to Christians. The real reason though seems to be that Alexandria, the “Metropolis of Africa…now hath nothing left her but ruins…the buildings now being, are meane and few, erected on the ruines of the former. George Sandys, quoted in Hadjiantoniou, The Protestant Patriarch, 38.

⁶⁰ Davey, Pioneer for Unity, 61. Even though, and in fact because he was Patriarch of Alexandria, Meletios spent a fair amount of time in Constantinople.

⁶¹ Davey, Pioneer for Unity, 61.

⁶² Davey, Pioneer for Unity, 61.

⁶³ Davey, Pioneer for Unity, 61. One letter from Meletios to Barton on this subject still exists, and based on this letter, it seems to have been part of an ongoing discussion.
discussion. It was in 1601 on the occasion of his uncle’s death that Lucaris was recalled to Egypt. He was elected to succeed Meletios, which he did for the next twenty years.64

Unlike the treatment of other episodes of Cyril’s life, it is not so much the place that is central as it is the people with whom he was in contact. Still, it is worth noting that Cairo, where his residence was, was “one of the great cities of the world” - far more impressive than the greatly impoverished Alexandria. The Eastern Orthodox Church was still existent in Egypt, but “was steadily diminishing.”65 The Coptic Church on the other hand was flourishing, and, by Cyril’s reckoning, was welcoming Nestorians. Judging by his letters, this distressed Lucaris.66 But this is not the interesting part of those letters. There are two aspects of Lucaris’ correspondence from this era that ought to be considered. First is the fact of whom he was writing to, and second is the evidence it gives as to his beliefs, which during this time undergo a gradual shift towards increasingly Protestant, and clearly Calvinist sensibilities.

One such example of this shift in beliefs would be his thoughts following a visit to the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem, about which he “expressed himself quite strongly against the ornaments with which people, in their religious zeal, had through the years disfigured the cave in

---

64 Though there were rumors of his elevation being the result of nepotism, or more commonly, simony, these accusations do not seem to have much basis.

65 Hadjiantoniou, The Protestant Patriarch, 37.

66 See for example a letter Lucaris wrote to de Wilhelm dated 20 March 1618, Aymon, Monumens Authentiques, 190. The translation is Beaven, “Cyril Lucar, part II,” 625:
“Since you desire to be informed whether there are any Nestorians here, or other kind of heretics, you must know that, besides the Copts, there are the Arminians and Nestorians; who, when they came here first, kept themselves concealed. This is not more than fifteen years ago; but now I see that they are spread into two streets [contradi], and the Copts communicate with them, the blind with the blind. They have a place of worship assigned to them out of Cairo, named the church of St. Moena, where they go every Sabbath and Lord’s-day to perform divine worship; but in doctrine, knowledge, and habits, they are much inferior to the Copts; amongst whom I believe you are already aware what troubles were caused by the death of their abuna or patriarch. The poor wretches go on from bad to worse, and one can expect no other end but their total ruin, because they will not place themselves under our government; which, as my predecessors tried for many years with loss, and in vain, I have determined not to undertake.”
which the dead body of our Lord had lain.”\textsuperscript{67} Hadjiantoniou cites this incident as one of the indications that Lucaris was starting down paths of Protestant thought, and “a more simple Christian faith.” This certainly appears a Calvinist impulse, and perhaps is the result of the influences on him we have already noted, as well as some new ones.

A solid basis for his new Protestant predilections is found in the consideration of Lucaris’ choice in friends. On this count, there are three Dutchmen who are of particular interest: Cornelius van Haga, John Uytenbogaert, and David Le Leu de Wilhelm. It was primarily from these three that Lucaris learned Protestant theology. It then follows naturally that that it would be (Dutch) Reformed doctrine that Lucaris gravitated towards. His correspondence with de Wilhelm is touched on later. For now it is enough to note that this was a Protestant with whom Lucaris conversed regarding doctrine and worship. The other two Dutchmen require further reflection.

Perhaps the most important of these friends, Cornelius Van Haga, was the States General to the central Ottoman government – the Sublime Port, a man with whom Lucaris rekindled a friendship when he travelled to Constantinople in 1602, just a year after his elevation. Lucaris and Van Haga had known each other previously when they both happened to be traveling in the Levant. They met when Lucaris was “but a monk,” but, it is unclear just when this was, though it was probably prior to his ordination. What can be noted with certainty is that Lucaris did have Protestant connections long before he wrote his \textit{Confession}. From Van Haga, Lucaris requested

\textsuperscript{67} Hadjiantoniou, \textit{The Protestant Patriarch}, 40. Hadjiantoniou is often unreliable, and this is one of the problematic claim he makes. He attributes this anecdote to John Henry Hottinger, \textit{Analecta Historico Theologica},(John Jacob Bodmeri, 1699) 52. However, Hottinger’s work \textit{does not concur}, with this story not being contained even in the section that \textit{is} on Lucaris - p. 398-567. With the story being somewhat dubious and unconfirmed, it is unwise to put overmuch weight on it, despite this incident speaking so clearly to Lucaris’ early Reformed sympathies - if it actually has any historical basis.
“some books of the Protestant Divines,” explaining that he had “some liking of their opinions.” However, it is unclear what Lucaris meant by this, which opinions he had some liking of, or what he understood these opinions to be.

It was likely through Van Haga that Lucaris came into contact with another notable Dutch Protestant, John Uytenbogaert. This man was greatly involved in the Remonstrant school of theology, and was considered the successor of the more famous Jacob Arminius. Given that the Remonstrants identify themselves through their disagreements with Calvin, this undermines Neale’s assertion that Lucaris “certainly had no knowledge of the Calvinistic controversy beyond that which the Calvinists were pleased to give.” Although, it should also be remembered that Lucaris might not have read the work of Arminius at this point in his life, since when he writes to Uytenbogaert, he apologizes for having not read the book he had sent him, and hints that it was too difficult for him to understand. Even if he did read it, it is likely he did not understand every nuance.

Given all this evidence that seemingly points to a Lucaris that throughout his time in Egypt was becoming more and more Protestant, it is worthwhile to question if that is indeed the logical conclusion. Looking carefully, all this actually points to is a Lucaris who was interested in Protestant viewpoints. Indeed, even Neale, who generally takes pains to chastise Lucaris for his Protestant leanings admits that in the letters we have from his time in Alexandria,

---


70 Letter to Uytenbogaert translated in Neale, History of the Holy Eastern Church, vol. 2, 381. This is further considered under the subsection devoted to Lucaris and his language abilities.
we may observe that Cyril’s Orientalism appears here undiminished. The Greek Church still, to use his favorite expression, carries the marks of her Crucified Lord; and we have not a wish for union with Protestant Communities.71

Perhaps it would be thought that Lucaris’ own aims were to reform the Orthodox Church, though he did not have much hope that this aim could be achieved. As he writes to DeWilhem, “If I could reform my Church I would gladly do it, but God knows that it is impossible for me to succeed in this purpose.”72 Lucaris does not express what sort of a reform he had in mind, and indeed, as is illumined in the next section, his beliefs were not yet as Reformed as his Protestant friends may have hoped. However, it is plausible that Lucaris had no intent of any sort of a “reform.” James Beaven might have it right when he comments on Lucaris’ aims in fraternizing with the Dutch Reformed, and in particular Uytenbogaert:

His object, so far as it can be gathered, seems to have been, not at all to learn from the reformed, nor to form a union with them in their present state, but to produce such a favorable impression on his [Uytenbogaert’s] mind of the Greek church as might lead the reformed to fall back upon primitive and apostolical principles.73

This theory is based on how Lucaris went about initiating contact with Uytenbogaert. Here, I will allow Lucaris to speak for himself:

The lord ambassador proposed this to us, and we decided swiftly. This is that, although I am not well known to you, you are sufficiently known to me. And no wonder, for I write to you as a minister to a minister, and a pastor to a pastor; for we both sustain these titles - you in your church, I in mine: and although both you and I are pastors, it is certain that we are both under one

71 Neale, *History of the Holy Eastern Church*, vol. 2, 386. From time to time, Neale refers to the Eastern Orthodox Church as the Oriental Church. While today the Oriental Orthodox refers to a separate communion of Christians than the Eastern Orthodox, Neale uses the terms oriental and eastern interchangeably. He also uses the term “Greek Church” quite often to distinguish it from the other communions in the east. Many other writers also use this convention.

72 “Io se puotese riformare la mia Chiesa lo farei molto volentieri, ma Iddio sa che traciaetur de impossibili.” From an undated letter to David de Wilhem from Cyril Lucaris, in Aymon, *Monumens Authentiques*, 194.

Pastor, whose sheep we ought to be and by whom we must be appointed pastors, if we wish to be really such. And if we have this from God, it is good; but at the present time it is bad, because your vocation is not fully recognized by me, nor mine by you. And what is worse, one or the other of us, not regarding the ancient authority of the fathers, to say nothing of Scripture, admits into the church human opinions and innovations, which now immerses the Church which appears to be extremely languishing. In the place of faith, inane philosophy is introduced, that sword turning every way, not to protect but to impede Paradise. To this philosophy we subject Christ, by which we believe if the mysteries of the faith are not sanctioned by it, we do not accept them; we make this alone the foundation of salvation.\textsuperscript{74}

From the outset, he assumes that he knows all he needs to about the Reformed, that they are “sufficiently known” by him. From this opening line alone, it would be difficult to say that Lucaris was trying to learn from Uytenbogaert. Lucaris may have made some concession to the Reformed Protestants, addressing Uytenbogaert “minister to minister” instead of displaying the differences in their stations, i.e. “the third Prelate of the Church to a teacher and propagator of schism.”\textsuperscript{75} But raising this issue probably would only have insulted the Dutch pastor “eager to prove his denial of the Divine Right of Episcopacy.”\textsuperscript{76} Cyril avoids such insult, but even as he speaks “minister to minister,” he only allows that both of them are pastors in their own reckoning, or rather, by the reckoning of their respective churches, and specifically tells Uytenbogaert that “your vocation is not fully recognized by me, nor mine by you.” He also

\textsuperscript{74} Proposuit hoc nobis Dominus Orator, at nos celerius deliberavimus. Hinc est, quod ego tibi minime notus, mihi satis noto tibi, praesentes exare voluerim. Nec mirum: ad Ministrum enim scribit Minister, & ad Pastorem Pastor; uterque enim nostrum hisce nominibus fungimur, at tu in tua, ego in mea Ecclesia: & quamvis Pastores & tu & ego simus, constat tamen ambos sub uno Pastore summo sees, cui simus oves oportet, & a quo, si sees volumus, constituinur Pastores. Quod si a Deo habemus, bonum est; at hoc est modo malum, quia non constat tibi mea vocatio, non constat mihi tua. Et quod pejus, vel alter neuter, Patrum autoritatem antiquam, ne Scripturae dicam, respiciens, admittit in Ecclesias humanas opiniones & innovationes, quibus jam immersa Ecclesia extreme languescere videatur. Loco fidei, inanis introducitur Philosophia, versatilis ille gladius, viam non custodientis, sed impediens Paradisi. Cui Philosophiae Chrstitum submittimus, cui credimus, qua nisi probentur fidei mysteria, non suscipimus, hanc solam fundamentum salutis ponimus.


centers the question of the validity of their offices on the appointment received not by an institutional church, but from Christ. This is especially notable when placed in juxtaposition to what “one or the other of them,” has been up to, i.e. “admitting into the church human opinions and innovations” with the result of subjecting Christ, along with the “mysteries of faith,” to the “inane philosophy,” instead of subjecting all to Christ.

At this initial stage of contact, one may still wonder what purpose he had in mind, but he does not ask for any account of what is being taught in the Netherlands, but instead he closes the letter to Uytenbogaert with this desire: “I wish that your Church would with us follow the same rule; for in that case, there would not be those objections to it which the writers of these times everywhere bring forward.” This is hardly a strong desire for reform or union with the Reformed. What “following the same rule” entails is unclear, but the need for change falls to the Protestants.

What is meant by the reasoning he provides for his desire, i.e. “there would not be those objections to it which the writers of these times everywhere bring forward,” depends on the antecedent of the “quae.” If referring to “the same rule,” being the rule of Orthodoxy, then his aim with this wish may be to put to rest the Jesuit incursions that make the un-learned Orthodox doubt their faith. Just as Ostrovsky recognized in Poland, the Calvinists were seen as “sensible” or “strong” or some other adjective such that their acceptance and support of Orthodoxy would be enough to ensure the Orthodox of their own sensibility and would even form a bulwark against the Jesuits who try to claim otherwise. However, if the pronoun refers instead to the

77 *Et optarem, ut una nobiscum, regulam istam vestra sequeretur Ecclesia: non enim objicerentur ei, quae passim plures hujus temporis scriptores objiciunt.*
From a letter to Uytenbogaert dated 30 May 1612, Aymon, *Monumens Authentiques*, 129 (the pagination in Aymon is mis-numbered for a couple pages, p. 129 being numbered as 131).
Reformed Church, then he is trying to protect the reputation of his useful political allies. It could be that he is worried that the objections against the Calvinists, again probably raised by the Jesuits, are giving his allies the label of heretical and untrustworthy. It is conceivable that his hopes are that by nudging the Reformed to hold to more apostolical principles, that his decision to befriend these Protestants seems less ill-advised than his Jesuit and Romanized Greek opponents claim.

If the above quotation is not enough to show that any “union” would, in Lucaris’ mind, be one in which the Reformed would do the reforming to become less scandalous to the Orthodox, perhaps putting it in context will. The preceding lines read:

Why then do I mention these things [the dangers of innovation and novelty] to you? In order that your good sense may teach you, that in these parts, it is a difficult thing to admit any novelty into the Church or Faith. We will never consent to those things which, although they have an appearance of advantage and usefulness, but are proven by experience to bring about great scandal to all Christians…  

In this passage, Cyril reports his intentions of not budging from his refusal of innovation, whether it be benign or even apparently useful innovation. It is true that here he is speaking for his Church more than for himself personally. Still, he is aware the danger of admitting novelty and puts this forth, perhaps partly to convince the Calvinists to be more cautious in their

---

“invention” of new doctrine, partly to make it clear that he is not interested in entertaining anything scandalous. While he never describes what he means by scandal, he is adamant that the Eastern Church is in the right to avoid change of any kind, accepting of the position that his Church is already in possession of the truth and that therefore, truth needs to be preserved within it rather than be “discovered” by it. He writes,

To her [the Eastern Church], innovations are novel signs and prodigies, to be dreaded rather than followed. She is contented with that simple faith which she has learned from the Apostles and our forefathers. In it she perseveres even unto blood. She never takes away, never adds, never changes. She always remains the same; always keeps and preserves untainted orthodoxy. With these words, he makes it clear from the genesis of his relationship with the Dutch minister that he is not about to be swayed by anything, and that any hoped for acceptance of new Protestant doctrines on the part of the Orthodox was simply not going to happen.

While Lucaris does not seem to have been interested in any sort of ecclesial union, the Protestants he corresponded with likely did. Their interest was not that different than Lucaris’

---

79 It must be realized that Uytenbogeart and other Calvinists may have interpreted this to be an early claim of congruence between Lucaris and themselves, since they envisioned their reforms to be a stripping away of the innovations, both in doctrine and in practice, that they thought had corrupted the Catholic Church, thus returning them to an un-innovated, purer faith. It is even possible that they are correct in their interpretation of Lucaris’ words here, i.e. that he was making a claim of solidarity in the quest to reject novelty such as that accrued within the Roman Church, but this seems unlikely given the chastising tone of the letter. In particular, the mention of rejecting “the mysteries” due to their lack of sanction in the inane philosophy seems to be aimed at the Protestants rather than the Catholics.


81 Gunnar Hering establishes this quite well, especially how van Haga and Leger were orchestrating the dissemination of Reformed theology among the Orthodox to this end, to bring about a union between their Churches. Hering, Ökumenisches Patriarchat und Europäische Politik, 1620-1638, (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1968), 184.

On the point of Lucaris’ degree of interest I diverge from others, notably Vasileios Tsakiris who insists that Lucaris knew of the unionist plans of his Protestant allies and was as devoted to this cause as his friends were. Cf. Tsakiris, “The ‘Ecclesiarum Belgicarum Confessio’ and the Attempted ‘Calvinization’ of the Orthodox Church under Patriarch Cyril Loukaris,” Journal of Ecclesiastical History, Vol. 63, no. 3 (July, 2012): 475-487. Hering is also of the opinion that the whole thing was “ein Komplott des Patriarchen.” Hering, 176.
except that it was coming from the reverse direction. For them, “a possible church union presupposed a broad dissemination of Reformed Protestant theology in the Orthodox East.”

Specifically, they were not interested in compromise so much as they were in making the Orthodox into Reformed Protestants. Both seemed to agree that “union” meant unity of belief and practice, over and against organizational/institutional unity, and so were focused on agreeing doctrinally with little discourse concerning ecclesial government, at least at this stage in the relationship between the two churches. It is interesting that such overtures did not come across in the letters exchanged between Lucaris and his Dutch friends. It remains unclear if Lucaris knew of the extent of these plans or not.

If Lucaris did know of this, perhaps these intentions contributed to his not fully trusting the Dutch, at least in terms of his unwillingness to let them assist in his project to improve the education of Egypt’s Orthodox clergy. However, this unwillingness is usually attributed to his still having reservations about Reformed theology. As Neale tells it:

He probably was unwilling to send them [the clergy wanting of learning] to Venice or Padua, knowing the dangers to which they would there be exposed [i.e. the Jesuits]; and still more unwilling, at this time, to trust them at Geneva, or at any of the Dutch universities.

While this “unwillingness” is but Neale’s interpretation of things, it is the case the Lucaris did not appeal to Venice or Padua, nor to Geneva, nor to the Dutch universities. He certainly had contacts in these places - or in the case of Geneva, would form connections soon enough - such that they would be real options. Going through the Dutch in particular would have strengthened his political ties already had with De Wilhelm and Van Haga. Perhaps if Lucaris’ friendship with

---

82 Tsakiris, “The ‘Ecclesiarum Belgicarum Confessio,’” 483.

Uytenbogaert did begin as a plea to the Dutch pastor to not scandalize the Church, he would have been unwilling to have these innovations taught to his priests. Whatever influenced the decision, Lucaris ended up turning to England instead for educational aid, and even sent one of his favorite young priests, Metrophanes Kritopulous, to be educated at Oxford. This is not that surprising given England’s reputation as a “refuge and sanctuarie for Greeks.”

It is reported by another Greek who was in England at the same time, that when he had been seeking anyplace where he could keep his faith, he was pointed towards England, since “English men love the Grecians.”

Even though Kritopulous was still exposed to Reformed doctrine, (the Archbishop George Abbot, under whose care he was, happened to be a strict Calvinist), Lucaris judged this to be a solution better than entrusting the education of his priests to the Dutch, and certainly better than maintaining the status quo. And indeed, Kritopulous for the most part never thought much of reformed doctrine, focusing entirely on the Greek church fathers, refusing to even learn Latin.

Lucaris himself did not limit himself in this way. Clearly, he did know Latin. But during his time in Egypt, now that he could undertake “private, solitary study of such books as he could obtain” and correspond with “foreign theologians” he studied as wide a range of theological thought as he could – “often with a sheer delight in playing around with new thoughts and

---

84 Christopher Angelos, “Encomion of Great Britaine, and of the flourishing Sister-Universities Cambridge and Oxford written by Christopher Angel a Grecian borne, in token of his thankfulness to his charitable worthy Friends and Benefactors in both Universities” (1619) quoted in Davey, Pioneer For Unity, 77.


87 See Neale, History of the Holy Eastern Church, vol. 2, 384 - 386

88 Kritopulous did relent at the very end of his studies, but even then he was adamant that he only wanted to be able to read the language, not to write or speak it. Davey, Pioneer for Unity, 91; 114.
ideas.” Davey insists, lest anyone jump to the conclusion that Lucaris was eager to seek out and accept non-Orthodox theology, that this study was a private matter and he seems to have enjoyed playing with ideas – “without necessarily being completely committed to them.” This non-commitment is not merely Davey’s opinion, but is evident in the series notes sent back and forth between Lucaris and de Wilhelm that accompanied their interchange of books. Particulars from these are treated in part II of this paper where Lucaris’ shifting stance on specific doctrines is examined. For now, it is worth noting that while he was finding places of commonality between the Reformed and the Orthodox and seeking more information on specific theological differences, Lucaris was sharing as much information about Orthodoxy as he was receiving about Protestantism. Also, he differed with his corespondents on some particulars and even outright denied certain Protestant doctrines.

CONSTANTINOPLE: 1620 - 1638 (INTERMITTENTLY)

It is in Constantinople that much of the intrigue and action of Lucaris’ life takes place. As this is not intended to be a proper biographical account, there is much that must be left out. This section considers the implications of certain major dynamics and Lucaris’ interaction with them.

89 Davey, Pioneer for Unity, 63.

The import of Lucaris’ time in Constantinople must be considered, as examining this context, we see how much of Lucaris’ attention was focussed on his own Church as he worked for the well-being of the Orthodox, even as he cultivated relationships with Protestants, and also how some of his questionable activities were less “unorthodox” than may be assumed.

**The fact of Turkish rule:**

The first thing that must be understood is that Constantinople was under Turkish rule. This meant that Constantinople lacked the same significance and dignity that it had had as the Christian capital of the Byzantine empire. The situation was not what it had been in the early days of the Ottoman empire when the Turks were “tolerant masters,” and beginning with the reign of Bayezid II in 1481 the “freer and even experimental intellectual climate” gave way to growing religious intolerance and by 1512 when the reign passed to Selim I, “any chance for original artistic or intellectual activity disappeared.”\(^91\) This was especially true around the capital where things were “more closely supervised by the authorities.”\(^92\) The Orthodox Christians that were “the overwhelming majority of the population” were not well trusted, indeed “the Ottomans distrusted them more than any other religious group” and so it was that “the Orthodox millet was always more closely surveyed than were the others.”\(^93\) To say that this created a great deal of unease within the Orthodox world would be something of an understatement. Cyril himself, while still in Egypt, chided the once Christian city for being so subjected, saying,

\(^{91}\) Sugar, *Southeastern Europe under Ottoman Rule*, 252.

\(^{92}\) Sugar, *Southeastern Europe under Ottoman Rule*, 252.

\(^{93}\) Sugar, *Southeastern Europe under Ottoman Rule*, 252.
The election of patriarchs, excepting him of Constantinople, rests in the leading men of the nation, who assemble with the clergy, and after the customary prayers, choose whom they judge fittest. When they [patriarchs of Constantinople] are elected, the deposit a certain sum with the Turkish officials of the providence to obtain possession...The patriarch of Alexandria pays nothing to the Turks, nor does he ever join them in any church matters, or choose them as advisors or allies.\(^\text{94}\)

Cyril actually would have quite the experience with this system of paying the Turks. He could have been named Patriarch of Constantinople a number of years before he finally was, had he been willing to pay more than his opponent, Timothy.\(^\text{95}\) He did finally pay, on five separate occasions, each time he came back from banishment. Needless to say, it was a system he never much liked.

The payment of the \textit{peshkesh} was not the only thing that put the Patriarch of Constantinople in a different position than that of Alexandria, or anywhere else for that matter. The patriarchate of Constantinople had new administrative and political functions that caused no small amount of dissension among the Orthodox throughout Southeastern Europe:

The patriarch and the bishops had the duty, especially after the establishment of the millet system, to administer the affairs of the Orthodox Christians, to speak on their behalf before the sultan and other Ottoman authorities, and to protect them from injustice.\(^\text{96}\)

To do this, the church had to expand “beyond the old purely spiritual organization” and become more of a “highly centralized administrative structure.”\(^\text{97}\)

\(^{94}\) \textit{Electio Patriarcharum, praetermisso Constantinopolitano, stat in iis qui sunt optimates Reuipublicae qui congregati una cum Clero, post habitas orationes solitas eligunt, quem aptiorem judicarint. Ubi fuerint electi, ut habeant possessum, aliquam summam deponunt Turcis, qui Ministri fuerint illius Provinciae, &c. Alexandrinus Turcis non solvit, nunquam cum Turcis rem aliquam gerit Ecclesisticam, nunquam illos vult consiliarios, & socios.}\textit{ letter to Uyttenbogaert dated October 10, 1613, in Aymon, \textit{Monumens Authentiques}, 152.}

\(^{95}\) For more on Cyril’s troubled relationship with Timothy, see a letter from Lucaris to Uyttenbogaert dated October 10, 1613, in Aymon, \textit{Monumens Authentiques}, 151-152. An English translation can be found in Beaven, “Cyril Lucar, part I,” 249; also in Neale, \textit{History of the Holy Eastern Church}, vol. 2, 375.

\(^{96}\) Sugar, \textit{Southeastern Europe under Ottoman Rule}, 253.

\(^{97}\) Sugar, \textit{Southeastern Europe under Ottoman Rule}, 253.
The relevance of this information is that foreign aid was necessary, and in such a world in which politics and religion were so intertwined, the aid from western Europe had not only political, but religious interests and consequences. This situation was why ambassadors of the Protestant English and Dutch and the Catholic French would be primary players in the intrigue, which Davey describes as “a diplomatic version of the Thirty Years War in terms of influence and prestige at the Court of the Sultan, which included assisting in the promotion or deposition of different candidates for Patriarchal thrones and other senior posts in the Orthodox Church.”

Having such allies was unavoidable if one was to gather funds to actually hold any religious/political office. This had incredible doctrinal consequence for the Orthodox, but was not a huge obstacle in terms of accessibility, which brings us to the next relevant facet of Constantinople’s significance in the saga of Lucaris.

**Western Influences - Catholic and Protestant:**

The second issue follows from the first, and that is that the Jesuits were causing problems among the Orthodox. The main thread of action in this episode of Lucaris’ life is the struggle with the the Catholic Church, and in particular the Jesuits, who had a college established in Constantinople. In all fairness, the whole era could also be seen as something of a tug-of-war

---


99 It is the Jesuits who were responsible for most of the intrigues, and they lacked the support of other Catholics in the area. Neale tells us in particular that despite their success among the Greeks, the Jesuits “found more difficulty with members of the Roman Communion. The latter were, for the most part, under the spiritual guidance of Franciscans and Dominicans, who viewed the advances of the new Society with jealousy: and were not without their fears least the turbulent and intermeddling spirit it displayed at Constantinople should occasion the banishment of all Romanists from that city.” Neale, *History of the Holy Eastern Church*, vol. 2, 365.
between the Jesuits and Protestant ambassadors, with the Orthodox playing the part of the rope.

Papadopoulos describes the political dynamic quite well:

…the Orthodox Church became the apple of discord between Protestantism and Catholicism. … And both sides initiated great efforts to attract the suffering and troubled Eastern Church, which was completely surprised, found herself receiving flattery and lavish offers of protection, provided by both the Protestants and the Latins.\textsuperscript{100}

Prior to Lucaris, it was the French Jesuits who were held in favor.\textsuperscript{101} The Jesuits were taking advantage of the opportunity (from their perspective, their responsibility), offering their political and financial influence to further their interest in facilitating a hoped for union between the Orthodox and Catholic Churches. In this endeavor, they not only raised their preferred candidates to the highest honors within the Orthodox Church, they also offered free education to the Greeks, but one that Lucaris distrusted. Following the news of the new school while still in Alexandria, he writes to Uytenbogaert saying: “…The Jesuits grasping the opportunity, have laid the foundation of a plan for educating boys at Constantinople, with the same undisputed success as that of a fox amongst poultry.”\textsuperscript{102} He elaborates further to George Abbot about these schools:

\textsuperscript{100} C.A. Papdopoulos \textit{Ịστορικαί Μελέται}, (Jerusalem, 1906), 210-211. 
\textsuperscript{101} This favor stemmed from 1536 treaty between the French government and the Sultan Suleiman I, whose clause on the religious rights of the French was taken to mean “the right of the protection of all Christians living in the Ottoman empire.” Hadjiantoniou, \textit{The Protestant Patriarch}, 54. By the time Lucaris came on the scene five more Ottoman emperors had reigned, and now the sixth, Osman II was in power, though soon to be replaced with Mustafa I, who in turn only lasted a couple more years before Murad IV, under whom Cyril would be executed. All to say, the government was less than stable with nearly as fast a rate of turnover as the patriarchate was experiencing. It was a time when leadership and policies could change rapidly.

These emissaries exceedingly terrify us, and impose on our simplicity, and make use of many machinations to bring us under their power, trusting primarily in their show of erudition and the thorny difficulties of the questions they themselves raise; while we meanwhile, labor under a lack of educated men who are able to meet these sophists on equal terms.\textsuperscript{103}

Lucaris’ fears were not unfounded. One of the Jesuits involved, Fleuriau, tells us that “Through these children, we have reconciled many of their parents and even whole families with the Roman Church.” But this reconciliation was not so limited to “parents and whole families,” and the aims of the educational programs went a good deal further. Sir Thomas Roe explains the aim of a similar school set up in Rome “where young men from Greek lands were educated in all subjects, but particularly theology…later as Jesuit monks or secular priests or lay teachers they would attempt to convert the Greeks to the Holy See.”\textsuperscript{104} This was a brilliant plan in its own right, since, as Davey tells it:

\begin{quote}
\ldots in the ill-educated East, it created a group of clergy who were well qualified for high office in the Orthodox Church, ‘a powerful crypto-Roman party,’ \ldots as the seventeenth century progressed, more and more graduates of the Greek College in Rome or Jesuit school in Constantinople were made Bishops or Patriarchs…\textsuperscript{105}
\end{quote}

Thus, there were planted within the Orthodox Church those friendly towards Rome who would make excellent candidates, for first, they had an enviable education, even if it was one with subversive ulterior motives, which set them above other candidates who were un-indoctrinated, but uneducated. Second, they had the right connections politically to achieve high office. The Jesuits and indeed also the Franciscan and Dominican friars, “had instructions from Rome to do all they could to to extend their influence in the Orthodox Church as a whole, in particular by

\textsuperscript{103} Hi emissarii terrorem mirum in modum nobis incutiunt, nostraeque imponunt siplicitet, cui mancipandaeae varias admonvent machinas, maxime freti eruditionis fuco, & spinosarum disputationum aculeis, cum nos interea eruditorum pernuria laboremus, qui cum Sophistis istis aequo Marte congregiantur.
1616 letter from Lucaris to George Abbot, in Aymon, \textit{Monumens Authentiques}, 45.

\textsuperscript{104} quoted in Davey, \textit{Pioneer for Unity}, 49.

\textsuperscript{105} Davey, \textit{Pioneer for Unity}, 49.
backing suitable candidates for episcopal or patriarchal thrones, and preventing the election of rival, anti-Roman clergy.”\textsuperscript{106} This meant that the pro-Roman former students of these schools would be advanced within the Orthodox Church, even to the office of Patriarch, and would importantly not have to worry about finding funds for the \textit{peshkesh}, since that would be “provided by the Catholic ambassadors or the Papacy.”\textsuperscript{107}

This could be seen as a highly generous act by the Jesuits, providing “excellent education at almost nominal fees,” and then going out of their way to support and promote their students, even paying “the unheard of figure of 50,000 gold pieces” to the Turks to see these students to powerful positions. And to Catholic ears, the goal of union was noble enough. But to the Orthodox who failed to see subjugation to Rome as actual union or as a thing worthy of pursuit, it was disastrous, being seen instead as a corruption of orthodox teaching as well as autonomy.

The Jesuit activity as it surrounds Lucaris was not limited to their educational offers and aid in the promotion of candidates friendly to them. Their mission to effect union between the Orthodox and Rome also meant arranging the deposition of those less-friendly to this union, such as was the case with Lucaris. 1612 was the first time this occurred, when Lucaris was removed from his \textit{locum tenens} post in the then-vacant throne of Constantinople. Lucaris had marked himself as an enemy to the Jesuits when he had insisted on the deposition of the previous Patriarch, Neophytos II, who had “expressed to the Jesuits his fervent desire for unity, and had acknowledged the primacy of the pope.”\textsuperscript{108} Lucaris was a favored candidate and likely would have become Neophytos’s successor, had not Timothy Marmarinos and his Jesuit backers offered

\textsuperscript{106} Davey, \textit{Pioneer for Unity}, 50.

\textsuperscript{107} Davey, \textit{Pioneer for Unity}, 49-50

\textsuperscript{108} Papadopoulos, \textit{Ἱστορικαὶ Μελεταὶ}, 38.
to increase the *pesheksh* to eight thousand gold pieces (as a bribe to the Turks who ultimately, if unofficially, determined who the Patriarch would be) and Cyril refused to “bid higher.”\(^{109}\) To go into detail of every attempt would be entertaining, but not as relevant as the fact that this was an ongoing project of the Jesuits and the *Congregatio de Propaganda Fide*.\(^{110}\) They were successful on five occasions, and their actions and influence led to his, generally brief, banishments to Rhodes, and finally to his death.\(^{111}\)

Not all projects were aimed at controlling who the Patriarch would be, and much effort was devoted to, in their eyes, minimizing the damage of anti-Romanists already in power. One of their projects warrants explicit mention, and that is the case of the printing house operated by Nicodemus Metaxas, that through the influence of the English ambassadors, Lucaris was able to have set up in Constantinople. Only eleven months previous, the Vatican library had sent equipment to the *Propaganda Fide* to establish a “Greek” printing house from which they could “inundate the Near East with their literature.”\(^{112}\) This new rival press posed a threat to the Jesuits,

\(^{109}\) For more on this incident, see Hadjiantoniou, *The Protestant Patriarch*, 44-45. Also, in letter from Lucaris to Uytenbogaert dated October 10, 1613, he wrote about what had transpired with Timothy: “He [Neophytos] was admonished by me more than once, but he would not put any check upon himself; for which reason I was compelled to surmount every other difficulty, to set at nought private loss, and to do my utmost to get him deposed, which was done. But Timotheus has obtained the vacant place by dint of bribing the Turks: wherefore the name of the Patriarch of Alexandria keeps him in alarm, and Constantinople is still in considerable commotion.” Aymon, *Monumens Authentiques*, 151-152.

\(^{110}\) For an account of the Jesuits’ activities in Constantinople around this time, see Thomas Smith, “Narratio Historica turbarum, quas Constantinopoli moverunt Jesuitae adversus Cyrillum Patriarcham, & alia notatu dignissima” in *Collectanea De Cyriillo Lucario* (1707), 84-119. Also, Hadjiantoniou, *The Protestant Patriarch*, 57-90; 110-115; and 127-133.

\(^{111}\) The first banishment was a few months: April 1623 - September 1623; the second was even shorter lasting only a week: October 4, 1633 - October 11 of the same year; the third was also brief: February 1634 - April 1634; the fourth March 1635 - March 1637; it was the fifth time in June of 1638 that resulted in his assassination.

\(^{112}\) Hadjiantoniou, *The Protestant Patriarch*, 80.
and so they began to “try by every means to persuade the Turks to forbid the operation of the Greek printing house,” which was effected by the accusation that:

Cyril had insulted the Koran through his books and that Metaxas, being a man well acquainted with the art of war, had come to Constantinople with the specific purpose of stirring the people to sedition against the Turkish authorities and had used his strange machinery to falsify the official documents of the Sultan and thus create confusion within the empire.\textsuperscript{113}

The accusations being believed, Metaxas was to be arrested, but the officers, not believing the Greek would dress like an Englishman, assumed the wrong man had been pointed out to them, and so instead he “let his soldiers loose to plunder and destroy to their heart’s content…The books and those pieces of furniture and machinery which they could not take away with them they destroyed.”\textsuperscript{114} In the end, Metaxas was cleared, as were Cyril’s writings since he never actually insulted the Koran. The damage was done and the press was never repaired. What this event represents is the way in which Cyril had to be careful in his every move to not upset either the Turks or the Jesuits. It also shows that he was willing to take risks to counter Jesuit propaganda by working to offer alternative information. During the short time the press operated, works were published on controversial themes such as those against the papacy (by Meletios Pegas, Nilus of Thessalonica, and Gabriel of Philadelphia) and against purgatory (by Barlaam).\textsuperscript{115} This episode also demonstrates how crucial it was to have the aid of the Dutch and English ambassadors, as they are the ones who not only cleared things up with the Mufti, but were the ones who insisted that the printing equipment get through customs to begin with.

\textsuperscript{113} Hadjiantoniou, \textit{The Protestant Patriarch}, 80.

\textsuperscript{114} Hadjiantoniou, \textit{The Protestant Patriarch}, 83-84.

\textsuperscript{115} These are the books mentioned in various letters sent between Cyril and Metaxas, found in Legrand, “Documents Concernant Cyrille Lucar,” 240-243.
The counter to the Jesuit projects, were others orchestrated by Protestants, who, hoping to further their own commercial interests, “endeavored to undermine the privileged position which the French were enjoying in Turkey by representing the religion of the French as idolatrous.”

The English in particular were quite successful in presenting their religion as anti-idolatrous and therefore a much more agreeable form of Christianity. A similar treaty as the French had had was drawn up with the English in the year 1580, since as one of the Muslim Turks, Sinan Pasha, says “the only things those English lack in order to be real Muslims is to be circumcised and to pronounce the ‘Elshed.” It then must be realized, that Lucaris had to see the political and religious benefit of English aid. Indeed, save following the previous few Patriarchs into pro-unionist relations with the Jesuits, there really was no other way for him to be in a position to do anything to improve the state of the Orthodox Church.

**Inside the Orthodox Church:**

There was trouble within the Orthodox Church as well, compounded and maintained by the situation with the Turkish rule and Western influence. Due to the lack of schools that would not indoctrinate them with either Muslim or Catholic doctrine, most were uneducated. This included the clergy, most of whom, if they had much education at all, were taught by the Jesuits, with the results already mentioned. Initially, Lucaris had tried to put a positive spin on the situation, at least in presenting it to Protestants, again, perhaps with the intention of making a positive impression. As he describes to Uytenbogaert:

---

118 See above, p. 28.
Some seem to reproach the Eastern church for ignorance, inasmuch as the study of literature and philosophy have moved to other parts. But, certainly, the East can now be regarded as very happy in her ignorance. For though, undoubtedly, it is pressed down with many miseries through the tyranny of the Turks, and has no facilities for the attainment of learning, it has at least this great advantage - it knows nothing of those pestilent questions which, in the present day, infect people’s ears;...And if anyone chose to observe seriously the state of things in the Eastern Church, he would become aware of a highly important and wonderful circumstance; for Christians themselves, since they have been reduced to servitude, though persecuted by the unbelievers as by serpents within their dwellings, even if they see themselves deprived of their substance, their children dragged from their embraces, and themselves afflicted and distressed without intermission, to the utmost limits of endurance, yet think it not grievous to suffer these things for the faith of Christ, and, as has been often proved, when occasion offered are ready to submit to death itself. And perhaps the almighty power of God is by this means rendered more apparent by which so great grace is bestowed on men, when his strength is made perfect in weakness. Is not this a miracle? Are not these the marks of the Lord Jesus which Paul carried about? For with this the Eastern Christians, setting no store by the advantages of this life, and regarding them as perishable, keep up their hearts to one end - the inheritance of a heavenly kingdom to the glory of God.119

Here Lucaris relates his list of top crises facing his Church, first being the ignorance and lack of schools, but then also the general tyranny and persecution, and even a mention of the practice of child-gathering - a system under which “every five years small bands of soldiers visited each little Greek community throughout the empire…to carry off all male children over seven years old who were noted for beauty or cleverness,” who were then raised as Muslims.120 He presents

---

119 Letter from Lucaris to Uytenbogaert dated 30 May 1612. Aymon, *Monumens Authentiques*, 130. *Videntur aliqui exprobrare Ecclesiae Orientis τὴν ἀμάσθεναν (literarum ignorantiam) quod videlicet inde litterarum studia & Philosophia in alias partes migraverint. Sed certe ob hoc, quod nunc ἀμάσθης (indoctus) sit Oriens, valde beatus reputari potest: etsi enim ob tyrannidem Turcarum multis sit oppressus miseriis, neque sit ei uilla discendi commoditas; at inde magnum sumit emolumentum, quia non novit quaeam sint illae pestiserae quasiones, quae hoc tempore hominum inficium aures;... & si quiu ulterius voluerit serio statum Christianum in ecclesia Orientis observare, rem magni momenti miraculumque animadverteret: nam ipsi Christiani, ex quo reducti sunt in servitutem, etsi ut a domesticis anguibus, ab simfidelibus persequantur, & si propriis substantiis privari se videant, & si raptos filios a propriis ampliebatur, & si continuo se afflictos tribulatosque, ut nil amplius, ista tamen pro fide Christi patinon est eis grace, prompteque habent, ut multities est probatum, si sese obtulerit occasio, ipsam mortem subire. Forsan Dei omnipotentia inde apparente, unde tanta hominibus donatur gratia, οὐτὶ ή ἐκεῖνη δύναμις ἐν ὑπάρχει τελειοτο: (cum illius potentia in infirmitate perficiatur) an non est hoc miraculum: an non sunt ista stigmata Domini Jesu quae gestabat Paulus? quo cum Christiani Orientales hujus vitae commoditates pro nihilo ponentes, ut caducasque reputantes, animum ad unum erigunt finem, qui est haereditas regni coelstis in Dei gloriam.

all these troubles as preferable to the suffering he sees afflicting the West, namely the “pestilent questions” which are foreign to the East. At this point, Lucaris seems quite content to keep those questions unknown in the East, as he devalues the importance of the questions central to the Reformation. His words suggest that these “pestilent questions” are not ones that should be or need to be bothered with, and again demonstrate that at this point in time, he has a distrust of, and disinterest in, western theology. He also points Uytenbogaert to what is worthy of attention, that such suffering can lead to an increased focus of the heart on God and the Kingdom, and a readiness for even martyrdom. Lucaris presents this as the true miracle of their faith, being made perfect in weakness in emulation of Christ as well as of Paul. Nevertheless, this widespread and systematic ignorance of his people clearly bothered him, and he was willing to do what he could to counteract it. This meant getting educational aide where he could, working on a translation of the liturgy and the scriptures into demotic Greek.

This was necessary since the language people used on a daily basis had developed into something very close to modern Greek, while the Greek used liturgically was older, and often intentionally archaic, and therefore increasingly unintelligible.\textsuperscript{121} The translation of the New Testament into modern demotic Greek was the only part of this project that made it to fruition, being finally printed in Geneva in 1638 - the same year Lucaris was killed. This was a suspect endeavor, and as Hadjiantoniou described it “it was very daring indeed to offer the sacred text of Scriptures to the people in a language considered ‘vulgar,’ but this was the only one they could

\textsuperscript{121} For a discussion of the development of the Greek used in this era, see Procope S. Costas, \textit{An Outline of the History of the Greek Language with Particular Emphasis on the Koine and the Subsequent Periods} (Chicago: Ares, 1997). By the end of the fifteenth century, the Greek in everyday use had most of the characteristics of modern Greek. However, the tradition of using archaic Atticized Greek liturgically, even for sermons, was well established much earlier.
understand.” Lucaris provided an introduction to this New Testament which defended the project against those who thought it improper, saying “if we speak or read without understanding, it is like throwing our words to the wind.” There are two things to note about this project of translation. First is the role of the Protestants, which was not that extensive aside from arranging for it to be printed in Geneva, since doing so in Constantinople was no longer possible. The act of translating scriptures out of the accepted but antiquated language and into the vernacular was another way in which Lucaris was able to connect the actions of the reformers with his own, which is generally why it was so frowned upon, though the issue of mimicking Protestants was not as worrisome as the decision to make the scriptures accessible to the masses. The second thing to note is that despite this hesitation, it is in keeping with tradition to translate the scriptures into the language of the people, even when this means having to create a written form of an otherwise oral language. The difference here is that the Greek was the original and was not nearly as unintelligible to people as it would be in other areas. And the bigger

122 Hadjiantoniou, The Protestant Patriarch, 94. The Greek language as it had evolved was not highly esteemed, especially by those with knowledge of older forms of the language. Metrophanes Kritopolous, for example, wrote one of the first grammars of modern Greek, entitling the first draft “The Nine Errors of the Modern Greek Language.” (Davey, 98; see also Peter M. Doll, Anglicanism and Orthodoxy: 300 Years After the ‘Greek College’ in Oxford (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2006), 69.) For specifics of the nine errors, see Hadjiantoniou, The Protestant Patriarch, 94.

123 Quoted in Hadjiantoniou, The Protestant Patriarch, 94. This defense was well made since when the next demotic Greek New Testament was published in 1704 it was officially condemned by the Patriarch Gabriel III. Doll, Anglicanism and Orthodoxy, 269.

124 Indeed, when the 1704 translation was condemned, this was done so to counteract the “Anglican infiltration in the Orthodox East.” (Doll, Anglicanism and Orthodoxy, 269)

125 See Costas, An Outline of the History of the Greek Language, 94-96. “But despite the many local variations of the vulgar tongue, and the few differences between the official, the church and the literary languages, the linguistic unity of Byzantium was never seriously impaired. Unlike the situation in western Europe, where Latin gives way before the local dialects and soon disappears entirely as a spoken language, in Byzantium, Greek remained essentially one, owing, especially, to the conservative influence of the church and the school which never allowed the gap between the vernacular and the written language to become so wide as to render them mutually unintelligible…. [however] learned Byzantine literature…. may be said to come to an end with the downfall of the Eastern empire.”
difference is here Lucaris was proposing widespread dissemination of accessible scriptures, which brings into the discussion who should be allowed to read them.¹²⁶

Again to further his goals of having a better educated church, Lucaris had planned on printing books on theological matters - though his hopes of this were dashed along with the printing press. He also had intended to prepare a catechism, which being otherwise occupied he never achieved. He did however write a confession of faith that was the cause of much trouble for him and that has been the focus of many studies of Lucaris.

The Confession of Lucaris - Important Notes:

Much of the content of Lucaris’ Confession is considered in Part II of this paper, but there are certain aspects to the Confession itself that deserve separate attention. Because the Confession is so contentious, further explanation is still necessary in order to establish, not only disputed points like the authorship itself, but how the background of this “Calvinist symbolic book” supports our main thesis that the evaluation of Lucaris as a convinced and committed Calvinist needs to be attenuated.

First is the question of authorship. As this has been explored satisfactorily by other scholars and there seems to be a consensus saying that Lucaris is indeed the author, this treatment is brief. Once one recovers from the disbelief that such a document could have ever been written by an Orthodox Patriarch, especially one as generally well liked as Cyril was, and

¹²⁶ Lucaris advocated that every Christian should be allowed to read the scriptures, but he recognized that this was a question the Orthodox had, and so includes his reasoning in the first three question that he appends to the Greek translation of his Confession. For an English translation of this edition of the Confession, see the appendix of J.N.W.B. Robertson, trans. The Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem, Sometimes Called the Council of Bethlehem, Holden Under Dositheus, Patriarch of Jerusalem in 1672. (New York: AMS Press, 1969): 185-215.
realizes that the fact of it being written in Latin and published in Geneva does not perforce mean that it is a Calvinist forgery, the evidence that it is his is overwhelming. There is an extant manuscript that is clearly in Lucaris’ handwriting. The language used echoes that of his other writings. We have multiple records of his having admitted it to be his, and none of his denial of it, nor of any effort to counter it.

Next, the audience of the Confession must be considered. In its conception, it was always to be addressed to Western Christians - Reformed Protestants, specifically. The introductory sentences tell of what is hoped for in the publication of this Confession:

Cyrillus the Patriarch of Constantinople, to those who desire to understand the Religion of the Eastern Church, which is the Greeke Church, (that is to say, what wee believe, & what wee thinke of the Articles of true & right believe) in the name of all Christians by common consent setteth out this short Confession, that it may be as a witnesse before God and the whole Church, without dissimulation, but with a good conscience.

It makes sense that Lucaris would see this as a worthwhile undertaking, for as we have already seen, these Protestants could make useful allies, but also because the correspondence he had with especially the Reformed from the Netherlands had proven to him that the Protestants lack a good grasp of what the Orthodox believe, and had been asked by them to provide a written confession

127 Philaretos Vapheides compared the handwriting of a copy in the Museum of Geneva to that of letters Lucaris had written and deems them to all be written in the same hand and that to be Cyril's. Philaretos Vapheides, Νεα Εκκλησιαστικη ιστορια (1453-1908), vol. 3, Εκκλησιαστικη ιστορια απο του Κυριου ημων Ιησου Χριστου μεχρι των καθ ημας χρονων, (Constantinople, 1912), 54-73.

128 The 1672 Jerusalem Synod argues that there is “a long book written in Cyril's own hand containing a number of sermons preached by him on Sundays and feast days in Constantinople, which testify exactly to the opposite point of view from that of the Confession,” and also says that he “affirmed with an oath that he was not the author…” Yet, as George P. Michaelides reminds us, “the Council gives no details as to the "long book," nor as to the circumstances under which Cyril made his declaration under oath.” Michaelides, “The Greek Orthodox Position on the Confession of Cyril Lucaris,” American Society of Church History 12, no. 2 (1943): 120.

of his faith. It is curious that the Confession that he comes out with does not fulfill this mission, failing to correct Protestant assumptions or provide an accurate sense of Orthodox belief. It should be remembered that in translating Orthodoxy into Reformed terms, it might make sense to focus on such items that were questions being raised by his Reformed audience. Still, his original plans for the document, not to mention the fact that he wrote it in Latin, show even more clearly that he was aiming it towards the West.

He had intended to have the Confession printed in England and dedicated to King James, but plans changed upon the death of the England’s king - which Lucaris laments to Archbishop Abbot in a letter dated January 16, 1627. It does seem that in this same year, spurred by the difficulties the Jesuits were posing to him and with the opportunity presented by his own printing press, he was preparing to have it published in Constantinople. Nevertheless, even if he had succeeded in printing it in Constantinople, the text was in Latin, limiting his readership, and he was still “determined to dedicate it to King Charles,” in order to maintain the support of his English advocates and protectors. This early publication plan also fell through, but eventually the Confession was published in Geneva through the aid of Antoine Leger.

On a final note, it seems Lucaris never expected the Confession to receive much attention. He appears baffled by the repeated questions about whether or not it is his. Diodati, a Genevan who had sent Cyril a copy of his translation of the Bible, hears about his surprise in Lucaris’ return letter, which included a copy of the Confession:

I did not expect that this confession would have given the Papists so much offense as they show that it has: for the truth which by the grace of God, is contained in that confession, ought not to be

---

130 For example, he refers to Uytenbogaert’s request for a confession of faith in his reply letter dated Nov. 1, 1613. Quoted in Beaven, “Cyril Lucar, part I,” 245.

hateful to them...I am certainly surprised that these people are so anxious about my confession; and if I had known this before I published it, I would have made it fuller, and more copious.\textsuperscript{132}

It is interesting to note here that first, it is the Catholics who are the most inquisitive, even though Cyril also says in that letter that he had distributed it among his friends in Constantinople (though importantly, he does not specify which friends - Orthodox or Protestant), and second that Cyril is of the incredible opinion that the \textit{Confession} should not be an issue for the Catholics. And he says this not because that which is an intra-Orthodox affair should not be their concern, but because he sees what he wrote as truth, failing to see it as the controversial document it is. This gives all the more reason to be careful in reading the confession. For with the assumption that it is Calvinist, it appears extremely Calvinist. But under an operative assumption that it is a document cautiously written to \textit{avoid} contention, one can find just as much evidence supporting that interpretation, as will be occasionally remarked upon as we proceed through the messy realm of Lucaris’ beliefs. However, given that Lucaris’ interpretation is not the one traditionally used, we must first consider the possibility of connections to other Reformed Confessions that Lucaris may have known.

\textbf{Comparison to Other Reformed Confessions:}

Karmiris notes that “because of this amazing similarity to the teaching of Calvin, the content in his Institutes and other Calvinist Confessions, it would be reasonably possible that someone, not knowing its writer, would treat this as the work of the Reformer of Geneva or

\textsuperscript{132} Letter to Diodati, dated April 15, 1632, quoted in Neale, \textit{History of the Holy Eastern Church}, vol. 2, 435, 436. The original letter is in Aymon, \textit{Monumens Authentiques}, 27-36. This letter is one of the cases in which Lucaris writes in multiple languages within the same paragraph, sometimes even within the same sentence, alternating between Latin and Italian.
another of his associates.” Yet, as Karmiris also notes, *The Institutes* is not the only parallel that can and should be drawn:

“The teaching of the so-called Lucaran Confession, generally considered and compared to the teaching of Calvin, coincided in almost all these points, word for word, and followed first and foremost the *Institutes of the Christian Religion* of Calvin, and secondly and partly, the French Confession of Faith and the Belgic Confession, namely those symbolic books which are quite widespread among the Calvinists of the Netherlands, in whatever was adopted, even the anti-Orthodox Lucaran Confession.”

This would call for some further reflection and comparison with these and other reformed confessions, which, at least with the Belgic Confession, has been done by Richard Schlier, who arrives at the conclusion that “neither the structure of Cyril’s Confession nor its basic thoughts are derived from the Belgic Confession.” Our interest though is not in the comparison of Lucaris’ Confession with that of the Belgic, but to determine whether Lucaris was familiar with this or other reformed confessions. The answer to this question is in the affirmative. Lucaris himself referred to the Belgic Confession and record exists of him being sent a Greek translation of it. A brief comparison shows that he also read it and was willing to incorporate some of its ideas in his own *Confessio Fide*. There are four areas in particular, which through borrowed/

---

133 “…διότι παρουσιάζει τοιαύτην καταπληκτικὴν ὁμοιότητα πρὸς τὴν διδασκαλίαν τοῦ ΚαλΒίνου, τὴν περιεχομένην ἐν τῇ Ἰνστιτου ἀυτοῦ καὶ ἄλλας καλβινικὰς Ὄμωλογιας, ὥστε εὑρόμοις ἢ ἡδονάτῳ τις, ἄγνοιον τὸν συγγενείαν αὐτοῦ, νὰ υπολάβῃ αὐτὸ ὡς ἔξελθον τῆς γραφίδος αὐτοῦ τοῦ Μεταρρυθμιστοῦ τῆς Γεωργίης ἢ ετέρου τινός τῶν συνεργατῶν τοῦ.” Karmiris, Τὰ Δογµατικὰ καὶ Συµβολικὰ νµηµεία, 644.

134 Ἡ διδασκαλία τῆς λεγοµένης Λουκαρείου Ὄμωλογιας γενικῶς ἐξεταζοµένη καὶ συγκρινοµένη πρὸς τὴν διδασκαλίαν τοῦ ΚαλΒίνου συµπίπτει ἐν τοῖς πλείοσι σηµείοις σχεδὸν κατὰ λέξιν πρὸς ἐκεῖνην, ἀκολουθοῦσα πρῶτον μὲν καὶ κυρίως τῇ Ἰνστιτου ἱστιανας Ὄμωλογιας τοῦ ΚαλΒίνου, κατὰ δεύτερον δὲ λόγον καὶ ἐν μέρει τῇ Confessio Gallicana καὶ τῇ Confessio Belgica, ἤτοι τοῖς συµβολικοῖς ἐκεῖνοις βιβλίοις ἄτινα ἢυπὸ μᾶλλον διαδεδοµένας μεταξύ τῶν καλβινιστῶν τῶν Κάτω Χωρῶν, ἐν αἷς ἐκυφορηθεὶ καὶ ἢ ἀντιθεδοξος Λουκάρειος Ὄμωλογια. Karmiris, Τὰ Δογµατικὰ καὶ Συµβολικὰ νµηµεία, 643.

similar language, seem to display something of an influence, even if these areas “do not constitute a large part of his Confession.”\textsuperscript{136} The four areas are as follows, paralleled with the relevant sections of the Belgic Confession:

**Article 3 Lucaris**
We believe God has predestined...without any respect to their works...His justice is the cause, for God is merciful and just.

**Article 4 Lucaris**
For this ought to be a sure rule that God is not the author of evil, nor can he with good reason be declared to be guilty.”

**Article 5 Lucaris**
We should rather adore than investigate [providence] Since it is beyond our capacity, neither can we truly understand the reason of it from the things themselves, in which matter we suppose it better to embrace silence in humility than to speak many things which do not edify.

**Article 13 Lucaris**
When we say ‘by faith’ we mean the correlate of faith, namely the righteousness of Christ, which faith embraces and makes its own

**Article 16 Belgic**
We believe that...God showed himself to be as he is: merciful and just...saving...those who...have been elected...without any consideration of their works.

**Article 13 Belgic**
Yet God is not the author of, and cannot be charged with, the sin that occurs.

**Article 13 Belgic**
We do not wish to inquire with undue curiosity into what God does that surpasses human understanding and is beyond our ability to comprehend. But in all humility and reverence we adore the just judgments of God, which are hidden from us, being content to be Christ's disciples, so as to learn only what God shows us in the Word, without going beyond those limits.

**Article 22 Belgic**
However, we do not mean, properly speaking, that it is faith itself that justifies us— for faith is only the instrument by which we embrace Christ, our righteousness. But Jesus Christ is our righteousness in making available to us all his merits and all the holy works he has done for us and in our place. And faith is the instrument that keeps us in communion with him and with all his benefits.

\textsuperscript{136} Gootjes, The Belgic Confession, 180.
The verdict reached by Schlier is that while “Cyril must have known and used the Belgic Confession, but the content of his confession was not determined by the confessional statements of other churches but by the need of the Greek church.”\textsuperscript{137} As this suggests, other Reformed confessions, such as the French Confession Karmiris points to, or the Heidelberg Catechism, or the Canons of Dort, similarly show that they may have been known by Lucaris, but his Confession bears little resemblance to any of them in particular. In fact, there is a lot of material that one would expect to see in a Reformed Confession of that time that is conspicuously absent. The four confessional documents already mentioned that Lucaris may have had some familiarity with, i.e. \textit{Confessio Belgicae}, \textit{Confessio Gaulicae}, the \textit{Heidelberg Catechism}, and the \textit{Canons of Dort}, include statements on: conversion, preaching, original sin, atonement, commandments, sanctification, perseverance of the saints, repentance, and the keys. Lucaris’s Confession discusses none of these. Such an \textit{argumentum ex silentio} may have its weaknesses and limitations, as it is perfectly possible that Lucaris was thinking about these matters even if he never wrote them down. The claim is not that Lucaris was ignorant of these issues, he probably was aware of them, but rather that his silence is worth note, if open to interpretation. Perhaps he felt these matters were not as pressing, perhaps he felt undecided or even opposed to the reformed take and didn’t want to antagonize his friends and allies by standing against them. Whatever the case may be, Lucaris’ confession does not uncritically follow the reformed examples in front of him.

The second part of Schliers’ claim is more tenuous, that being his assertion that Cyril’s concern in writing his confession was for the Greek Orthodox. But it is not unjustifiable. Yet, if

\textsuperscript{137} Gootjes, \textit{The Belgic Confession}, 180.
certain items were conspicuously missing in comparison to reformed confessions, there are glaring omissions (not to mention contradictions) if one attempts to categorize it as Orthodox. Nowhere is mentioned such items regarding which the Orthodox may want to correct Reformed beliefs, such as icons, the role of tradition, of the saints and the theotokos, of monasticism, hesychasm, theosis, the distinction between οὐσία and ἐνέργεια, baptism by immersion, etc.\textsuperscript{138} The total lack of mention of these issues lead Karmiris to classify the Lucaran Confession as “a Calvinist symbolic book under Orthodox influence, and not an Orthodox one under Calvinist influence.”\textsuperscript{139} But once again, this silence is necessarily open to interpretation. And some interpretations fit better with the character of Cyril we see elsewhere than do others. Perhaps this is a case of Cyril disregarding his own tradition, choosing silence in place of denouncing traditional Orthodox stances. Or again, realizing that this was written for a western audience, perhaps his silence is to avoid chastising potential allies or doing anything that would cause them to think unfavorably of the Greek church. In fact, he did speak on these themes both in his letters and in his sermons, which were of course, directed at an Orthodox audience. It is too much to presume that he was carefully avoiding speaking against his church when it is just as plausible that he was trying to paint them in a favorable light, agreeable to Protestants. There are multiple ways to interpret the evidence, and these should be considered carefully, since, as can be seen in the following exploration of Lucaris’ beliefs, he may not have been as familiar with or accepting of Calvin’s thought as he can be made out to be.

\textsuperscript{138} In the later Greek edition of the \textit{Confession}, the question of icons is raised. The rest of these matters still are not.

\textsuperscript{139} “καλβινικοῦ μᾶλλον σωμβολικοῦ βιβλίου ύπο ὀρθοδόξου ἐπίδρασιν, καὶ οὐχὶ περὶ ὀρθοδόξου ύπο καλβινικὴν ἐπιδρασιν.” Karmiris, \textit{Tά Δογματικά καὶ Συμβολικά μνημεία}, 644.
PART II: LUCARIS’ BELIEFS

There have been various attempts to determine if any of Lucaris’ Confession would be in agreement with traditional Orthodoxy, with results varying from none, to one chapter, to two or three, to half of the entire Confession. As little agreement that there is on this point, there is even less consensus when it comes to what Lucaris himself believed. Initially, when the priority was to denounce the Confession, Lucaris was condemned with it, based on the reasonable assumption that as its author, he agreed with its content.

The Synod of Jerusalem in 1672 disagreed and strove to clear Lucaris’ name by providing excerpts from sermons he delivered which seemed to demonstrate that he could not have actually held the Calvinist beliefs espoused in the Confession. Looking at Lucaris’ sermons does give a different view on the man and his beliefs, and yet, even though these documents are more “official” than his letters, they are also discounted for that very reason. His desires to reform his church - whatever they may have been - are irrelevant because, as he told de Wilhelm, “God knows that it is impossible for me to succeed in this purpose.” Therefore, it is generally thought that Lucaris did agree with his Confession, but felt unable to champion theological positions that he knew would be offensive to doctrines and customs too ingrained within his Church to be easily reformed. However, this is something of a misuse of the quote. It should also be noted that this oft-cited line “If I could reform my church, I would do it willingly; but God

140 C.f. notes 8-9 in the introduction.

141 For Lucaris’ sermons, see Keetje Rozemond, ed., Cyrille Lucar: Sermons, 1598-1602 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1974). Though Beaven argues, in part IV of his work on Lucaris, that there is no significant difference between the doctrines espoused in his sermons and confession, the two platforms are different enough that one can more easily excuse the slight Calvinisms in his sermons whereas they seem more glaring in the confession.

142 “ma Iddio sa che traciatur de impossibili.” from an undated letter to David de Wilhem from Cyril Lucaris, in Aymon, Monumens Authentiques, 194.
knows that it is talking of impossibilities” is in the context of a short note of apology to de Wilhelm, over a breech in etiquette: “That was an uncivil person who forbade your gentlemen to enter the choir; but you know well that we must forgive errors of ignorance. I feel sure that you will make little account of it…” It is from this point that he brings up desire for reform. The “reform” he is speaking of in this context seems to be one of ethics and education.

Lucaris did hold and defend many Reformed theological views - unofficially at least. But, especially now that we know how consistently he was bombarded with Protestant theology throughout his life, his sympathy of his towards his friends’ beliefs may not be as shocking as just how cautious he was in this regard. Cyril wrestled with many of these beliefs for a good number of years, and does seem to be asking the right questions, i.e. his concerns are the ones that would be expected of an Orthodox Christian. The present section explores Lucaris’ beliefs, noting how on many points, his thinking shifted gradually, and likewise, how on some points, he was never convinced fully. Before we get to this exploration, a few words must be said regarding the sources cited and methodology used.

**Sources, Method, and Limitations**

Determining anyone’s genuine beliefs with absolute certainty is an impossible task. This does not mean that nothing can be said regarding it, as clues abound in the various writings a person leaves behind. Lucaris is no exception, and there is much evidence to comb through from which can be extrapolated an approximation of what Lucaris likely thought regarding specific issues, as well as whether and how these thoughts shifted over time. The evidence referred to in
this section is largely epistolary, as various theological subjects were often the topic of Lucaris’
correspondence, especially with Protestant divines.

Most of these letters cited are found in Aymon’s collection, *Monumens Authentiques de la
Religion des Grecs*, in which we are provided with the letters in their original languages,
variously Greek, Latin, and Italian, alongside French translation. In areas in which the language
of Lucaris is not clear, the meaning Aymon assigns is usually followed, though avoided when
possible, given the uncertainty of what he was actually trying to convey. Many of the same
letters are also found in Legrand’s collection, *Bibliographie Hellenique ou Description
Raisonnee Des Ouvrages Publies Par Des Grecs au XVII Siecle*. Legrand also includes earlier
letters, such as those to his teacher at Venice, Margunios.

The nature of such source material dictates a good deal of caution. These most often are
not “official” statements that Lucaris gave, which while allowing us a glimpse into a less
guarded side of Cyril as he played with theological ideas, also means that epistolary statements
examined in this section are in the context of generally friendly conversation, and are often part
of maintaining and developing relationships. It is therefore important to keep in mind the
occasion of various letters and their intended audience as well as when they were written and
what they say in context. These matters are brought up as each letter is cited, though it may be
helpful to set out the primary correspondents and a basic timeline at the outset.

There are three people who deserve specific mention, as Lucaris wrote to with some
frequency and depth on theological issues. The earliest letters we are looking are those addressed
to Uytenbogaert, a Dutch Remonstrant preacher, written in the years of 1612 and 1613. A few
years later in 1618, there is another very lengthy and very interesting letter written to a former
archbishop of Spalatro, Marcus de Dominis. The final set, chronologically, cover a span of time from 1618-1630, and are addressed to David de Wilhelm, another Dutch pastor.

Another crucial source of information regarding his private theological opinions is found in the marginalia he wrote into his copy of Bellarmine’s Catechism. These notes were likely written between 1618 and 1620, and represent an interesting case in that they have no audience that Cyril is performing for, and so these may best represent what he himself was thinking. These notes have been compiled by Keetje Rozemond, providing both the original Greek alongside Latin translation.

Finally, the Confession of Lucaris is also considered, since on some level he owned that he had written the document and would hold to it. The Confession does not offer a full account of his beliefs - the document is rather brief and vague on many points - but it is worth considering this text in which we see a more Calvinist side of Lucaris. It is assumed that this Confession, brief and vague as it may be, represents something of his most mature thought - not in that the ideas are here the most fully formed, but because he was certain enough to write it into a semi-official document. In the end, this is what he was willing to espouse, and not just to Protestants, but to his struggling Orthodox flock.

**Lucaris and Language**

Though many Protestant writers of the Reformation era opted to write in their own vernacular as opposed the the more scholarly Latin, the latter language was by far the most crucial in the spread of Reformation ideas as it was something of a common language. A command of Latin would be a prerequisite for any outsider trying to understand Protestant
thought, and Lucaris was no exception. He had learned the language when he was a boy studying in Venice, and he used it in in his studies in Padua. Even so, his degree of mastery is somewhat questionable.

Cyril’s mind was not that of a scholar and he would not be thought of as particularly intellectually gifted, nor was he especially driven, as he had the reputation for cutting class.143 As Neale fairly describes, “Cyril seems to have been possessed but of moderate though highly respectable talents.”144 Included among these respectable but moderate talents was Lucaris’ language ability. To his credit, he was able to both read and write in Latin and Italian as well as in his native Greek. However, to put it bluntly, “Cyril’s Latin style is extremely bad.”145 It is not uncommon for the few attempts that have been made to translate his writing to simply admit “the Latin here makes no sense.”146 These confusing passages are not so because of the complexity of the grammar employed, as Lucaris’ writing tends to be straightforward, if unsophisticated, but rather because of the lack of conformity to grammatical rules, and a certain tendency towards run-on-sentences.

The content of his writing gives clues to his linguistic preferences. One example is that of his regard for the Belgian Confession, which as already established, he was familiar enough with to draw upon, however limitedly, for the writing of his Confession. Indeed, the Belgian Confession is the only one he mentions by name. Almost certainly, the version that Lucaris read was the

---

143 Maximos Margunios, the exiled bishop of Cythera, having taught Lucaris in Venice and maintaining correspondence with him, rebuked him in a “severe letter” for having ceased to attend public instruction at the University. Hadjiantoniou, The Protestant Patriarch, 25.


1567 Greek translation, which is known to have “found its way to Constantinople.” As mentioned in the section concerning the plot of the Protestants to forge a union with the Orthodox, the *Belgic Confession* was translated into Greek and sent to Constantinople in the hopes that someone like Lucaris would read it and be swayed by the reason of their doctrine. Latin editions would have actually been less common in that part of the world. On the same note, the reason Lucaris may have been so captivated by the Reformed, rather than by the Lutherans for example, was that it was Reformed doctrine that was available to him. Tsakiris tells us that the *Ecclesiarum Belgicarum Confessio* “was the only Greek translation of a Protestant Confession which could easily be found in the Orthodox East.”

Also as previously mentioned, Lucaris suggested that the Latin of Arminius was beyond him, explaining that he could not comment on his thought since “he lays down propositions, in which many points are implied which are not expressed.” He goes so far as to say that “it is fitter for graver and more learned men” than himself to enter the discussion of freewill, predestination, and justification. All these points should be kept in mind in making any sort of judgement on

---


149 It is conceivable that Lucaris could have come across one while he was studying elsewhere since it was originally composed in 1561, twenty three years before he was born. But this is not overly likely. It is known from a letter written from Lucaris to a Calvinist theologian Festus Hommius, that he had indeed been sent a copy of the Greek translation in 1627. For information about Hommius see Jean-Noël Paquot, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire littéraire des dix-sept provinces des Pays-Bas, de la principauté de Liège, et de quelques contrées voisines*, Volume 7 (Louvain, Belgium: de l'imprimerie academique, 1766), 233-241.


151 Letter to Uytenbogaert translated in Neale, *History of the Holy Eastern Church*, vol. 2, 381. The original Latin reads: ...

...opus esse arbitror, quia gravioribus, doctioribusque convenit sine metu laborem istum subire; ut summatisim fecit Jacobus Arminius qui meo judicio doctus vir fuit. Quia vero theses seribit, in quibus implicite continentur materie.
Lucaris. He was not a scholarly theologian, and he was likely unaware of the nuances and attendant baggage surrounding some of these doctrines.

**Some Consideration of What Lucaris Did Say**

**The Trinity and the Filioque Clause:**

Let us begin with the issue that opens Lucaris’ Confession: the Trinity, and more specifically, the procession of the Holy Spirit. In this case, despite the critique his formulation engendered\(^\text{152}\) (i.e. the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father *through* the Son), Lucaris’ own beliefs were arguably acceptably Orthodox\(^\text{153}\) and do not appear to have changed much over time, despite his engagement with Protestant authors whose writings attempted to sway his opinion. Through such discourse, Lucaris arrived at a sophisticated understanding of the contentious issue of the procession of the Holy Spirit, which he explicates in a letter dated October 10, 1613 - when he was 12 years into his time as Patriarch of Alexandria - written to


\(^{153}\) Interestingly, Lucaris’ statement that the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, was one of the very few issues that did *not* cause alarm at the 1638 Synod at Constantinople which anathematized Cyril on nearly every point of his Confession. More recent authors have also minimized the scandal of Lucaris’ wording. 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.” (Carnegie Samuel Calian, “Cyril Lucaris: The Patriarch Who Failed,” *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 10, no.2 (1973): 327.)
Uytenbogaert. In this letter he demonstrates that he is very aware of all sides of the debate (his mentor at Venice, Maximos Margunios, is known chiefly for his work on the procession of the Holy Spirit); and he brings into the discussion the fact of the Filioque clause, especially the offense of adding anything to the Creed, as per the canons of Ephesus (at which, Lucaris was sure to remind his friend, the original Cyril of Alexandria was instrumental). \(^{154}\) Yet the reigning Cyril of Alexandria is happy to delve into the theology on this point, showing how, by his reasoning, it is absurd to say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son in the same way as from the Father. In his mind, this double procession equates with a Spirit that has its origin in two separate principles. What he is prepared to accept is that the Holy Spirit can be said to “come from” the Son in a variety of other ways that \textit{do not involve the source of hypostatic essence}:

\[ \text{If, however, one would say that the Holy Spirit is of the Son, from the Son, given, flows, poured out, inspired, sent, or many other things, which have been in the writing of the Fathers, these we admit to be true indeed, for the Holy Spirit is sent, given, also from the Son, and the Son is, just as also is the Father; who will deny what I say?} \] \(^{155}\)

Thus, Lucaris was able to massage out much of the tension on this point, without resorting to much of a compromise - though his critics would claim even this went too far. For Lucaris leaving it alone would be saying too little. He is aware of Protestant views. At the very least, he managed to read what Arminius wrote on the Trinity, as he relates to Uytenbogaert:

\(^{154}\) It should also be noted that the Confession as well as Lucaris’ letter here deal primarily with the theology surrounding the procession of the Spirit and \textit{not} the related issue of changing the Creed. It is highly doubtful given his words here and those in sermons as noted by the Jerusalem Synod (\textit{Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem}, 20-21) that Lucaris would promote using the alternative formula in the recitation of the Creed, and if he did, no record of it survives. It is most likely that changing the Creed was not something Lucaris had intended.

\(^{155}\) “\textit{Si autem quis diceret Spiritum Sanctum Filii esse, a Filio dari, profundi, effundi, inspirari, mitti, & multa alia, quae in Patrum scriptis habentur, haec quidem vera esse fatemur, Spiritum enim Sanctum, mitti, dari, & a Filio, & Filii esse, sicut & Patris, quis inquam ibit inficias?}”

from a letter to Uytenbogaert from Lucaris dated October 10, 1613. in J. Aymon, \textit{Monumens Authentiques}, 140.
Jacob Arminius, indeed, a person whom I greatly respect, in a book of disputations which, sir, you lately sent me, in the sixth of his public theses, enters into a discussion concerning the Holy Spirit; and, besides other things relating to the person of the Holy Spirit, undertakes to prove that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both, in which he is not successful; for everything which he brings forward may be understood without doubt according to the doctrine of the Greek Church.\textsuperscript{156}

And so Lucaris wants to make sure that his Protestant audience will understand that his omission of the Filioque does not mean what Arminius assumes it does. It is clear from reading Arminius that what he means by “procession” are those actions in which the Spirit is said to “proceed and go forth from, to be given, poured out, and sent forth” from the Father and the Son.\textsuperscript{157} Nowhere in Disputation 6 does Arminius consider this “procession” to mean that the Spirit has its hypostatic source in the Father or the Son, which is the meaning the Orthodox assume. Therefore, in order to contradict the notion that maintaining that the Spirit proceeds from Father alone is synonymous with a denial that the Spirit can be meted out by Christ, and therefore also a denial of scriptural teaching, Lucaris needed to add in something, and he chose for this job the preposition \textit{via}, through.\textsuperscript{158} In doing this, he maintained the definition of procession being about source, which is why procession is from only the Father, and clarifies this usage by inserting a different word for the relationship the Spirit has to the Son. Far from being a compromise, this is Cyril’s way of maintaining Orthodoxy.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[156] Jacobus Arminius, \textit{quen ego pluris facio, in libro disputationum, quas nuper ad me Dominatio tua misit, in publicis thesibus, sexta, disputat de Spiritu Sancto, & praeter alia ad Spiritus Sancti personam pertinentia, profitetur se probare velle, Spiritum Sanctum ab utraque procedere, quod non perficit. Cum ea quae dicit omnia, sine dubio intelligantur, secundum assertionem Graecae Ecclesiae.} from a letter to Uytenbogaert, Aymon, \textit{Monumens Authentiques}, 136-137.
\item[157] Jacob Arminius, “Disputation 6, Article VIII,” in \textit{The Works of James Arminius, D.D.}, Vol. 1, James Nichols, trans., (Auburn, NY: Derby and Miller, 1853), 476. These are the same words that Lucaris used in the above cited letter to Uytenbogaert, and such a reference is likely what he had in mind.
\item[158] The formulation of “and through the Son,” which Lucaris employed was one already in use. In fact, it was the phrase of choice used by the new “Eastern Rite” Catholics that had resulted from the Synod of Brest. See Article One of \textit{The Thirty-Three Articles from the Union of Brest} (1595).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Given the absence of evidence of any further discussion on the matter, but more importantly the statement in the Confession (where Lucaris is generally seen at his most Calvinist) of the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father, through the Son, his views on the matter do not seem to have changed appreciably, nor was he ever willing to say that the Spirit proceeds from Father and Son. The effect then that his knowledge of Arminius played was in aiding him to better express what the Orthodox belief was in midst of terms whose definitions were no longer distinct.

Predestination/Election and Limited Atonement:

Among important distinctives of Reformed theology are predestination and its related doctrines of election, limited atonement, etc. This was, and remained, a troublesome matter for Lucaris. Initially it was not so, as he dismissed the doctrine of predestination without second thought. As he tells de Wilhelm in 1618:

I assure you that I am well aware that Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, and a very few Latins, besides several heretics, have written as he [Adolf Venator (a Dutch Pastor)] does on the subject of grace bestowed on idolatrous Gentiles; but, as that is not my opinion concerning grace, I cannot agree with him. And much less in the doctrine of predestination, and on the subject of the church, in which he includes all, and teaches that all must be saved, of what religion soever they may be, provided they believe in Christ. This is intolerable, because it is a point which does more mischief than others.159

These mischief-causing ideas were ones that Lucaris did continue to wrestle with, despite his initial resolute refusal. The subject of predestination in particular occupied him for several years

---

159 Letter from Lucaris to de Wilhelm translated in James Beaven, “Cyril Lucar, Part II,” 624. For the Italian see Aymon, Monumens Authentiques, 180. The doctrines of Adolphus Venator, also known as Adolf de Jäger, are not readily accessible, but it seems he is more Remonstrant than properly Calvinist, and the doctrine of universal salvation Cyril points to as intolerable directly contradicts that Calvinist doctrine of limited atonement. Even if Venator’s take on predestination differs from the Calvinist, it remains that Cyril found it suspicious and wanted further information on this troublesome doctrine.
while he was in Egypt. About a year after the letter just cited, he wrote again to de Wilhelm asking for books that might enlighten him on the subject:

You would do me, Sir, a great favour, if you would have the kindness to supply me with some author who treats of predestination, not incidentally, but formally; for I think that controversy alone of all which are now agitated, most difficult and hard to understand; and I shall feel deeply indebted to your kindness if you can at all assist me in this matter.\textsuperscript{160}

This was the last of the fourteen extant letters Lucaris sent to de Wilhelm, so we lack the knowledge of what works may have been sent his way in fulfillment of his request. What can be said with certainty is that predestination proved a difficult concept for Lucaris. Even in his famous confession, he seems to be of two minds, as both Neale and Beaven have highlighted. He does have an article on predestination which reads thus:

We believe that the most merciful God hath predestined His elect unto glory before the beginning of the world, without any respect unto their works and that there was no other impulsive cause to this election, … In like manner before the world was made, He hath rejected whom He would…\textsuperscript{161}

Neale explains the mitigating point to this seeming full acceptance of not just predestination, but double predestination:

Yet it must also be observed that absolute, irrespective predestination is nowhere asserted. As a set-off against this Article, we shall here introduce part of the XViTh, on Baptism; which it will be seen is perfectly Catholic.

"Wherefore, whoever is baptized as it is commanded in the Gospel, we do not doubt that his sins, actual as well as original, are remitted: so that they that are baptized in the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST, are regenerated, purified, and justified."

It may be said that these two articles are inconsistent with each other, and, strictly speaking, perhaps they are so: the natural consequence of a state of mind like that of Cyril, who still

\textsuperscript{160} Letter from Lucaris to de Wilhelm dated May 12, 1619, translated in James Beaven, “Cyril Lucar, Part II,” 626. For the Italian see Aymon, \textit{Monumens Authentiques}, 196.

\textsuperscript{161} Article 3 of Lucaris’ \textit{Confession} as found in Hadjiantoniou, \textit{The Protestant Patriarch}, 141-142.
Falkowski, 66

retained very much of Catholic Truth, but had unawares and by degrees imbibed no small portion of Calvinian heresy. 162

Indeed, the articles on justification strictly speaking are inconsistent with that on predestination, at least insofar as justification is linked to baptism, or inasmuch as baptism would be something God might take into account, or even to the degree that justification relates to predestination, i.e. if justification is a guarantor of predestination to glory. These qualifications may defeat Neale’s hopeful caveat, but his note does highlight a fundamental tension that is in Lucaris’ thought. Some part of his mind likely did accept the reformed doctrine, but not so entirely as to be completely consistent in his theology.

Following Neale’s interpretation of Lucaris’ article on baptism, it seems that regeneration, purification, and justification are given to all who are baptized, regardless of whether they are of the elect or the reprobate. This would seem to be at odds with his statement on predestination, and even more so as one considers how various possibilities of logical congruence between his ideas are unable to sit comfortably with existing evidence. For instance, it could be argued that being baptized would signal that one is of the elect, being associated with electedness without any causal import. But Cyril is partial to the idea of the visible and invisible church whereby “in particular visible Churches, tares may be found among the wheat.” 163 The “tares” may be baptized, but they are not “the saints, chosen into eternal life,” as this article posits that “from the number and fellowship of [the true Church] hypocrites are excluded.” 164 The tension might also be smoothed out if Lucaris had allowed for an understanding of predestination grounded in foreknowledge, which would at least allow some degree of human agency cooperating in the


164 Article 11 of the Confession, Hadjiantoniou, The Protestant Patriarch, 143.
reception or resistance to the grace of baptism. But this is not the case. Lucaris is clear in the
_Confession_, giving the role of foreknowledge to be to steer the inhabited world as has been
proclaimed. That is, in his understanding, foreknowledge is dependent on what has been
predetermined, and not the other way around. He explains very explicitly, “If anyone would
look…he will find unambiguously the cause is the divine will.” The problem of the
unambiguous cause being God’s will alone is that it leaves little room for human effort or
cooperation, matters which elsewhere Lucaris does seem to think matter in the question of
salvation. Such is seen in the last article of the _Confession_, concerning purgatory. Here Cyril
writes:

> We believe that the souls of the dead are either in blessedness or in damnation, according as every
one hath done, for as soon as they move out of the body they pass either to Christ or into hell; for
as a man is found at his death, so he is judged, and after this life, there is neither power nor
opportunity to repent…

This wording suggests that the judgment does consider, and is indeed based upon, what “every
one hath done” in this life, and also points to the efficacy of repentance. All this seems to be less
than congruent with his article on predestination which explicitly denies that any foreknowledge
of works or any other thing that might sway God’s judgement - recall he said individuals were
predestined “without any respect unto their works” - the only cause is will of God.

---

165 ἐὰν δὲ τις αὕτης εἰς τοὺς τῆς εὐταξίας νομοὺς τε καὶ κανόνας στραφεῖ, ἢς ἢ ἄνω πρόνοια εἰς τὴν τῆς
οἰκουμένης κέχρηται κυβέρνησιν, αἰτίαν τὴν δικαιοσύνην κατανοήσει. from Article 3 of the _Confession_, based on the Greek edition found in Kimmel, Ernest Julius, _Monumenta fidei ecclesiae orientalis: primum in unum corpus collegit variantes lectiones ad fidem optimorum exemplorum adnotavit prolegomena addidit indice rerum praecipuarum instruxit._ (Jenae: F. Mauke, 1850), 26. Cyril was likely more able to express himself accurately in his native language than in the earlier Latin editions.

166 Article 3 of the _Confession_, Kimmel, _Monumenta fidei ecclesiae orientalis_, 26.

167 Article 18 of the _Confession_, Hadjiantoniou, _The Protestant Patriarch_, 145.
Predestination and election were problematic, and as we have seen, caused Cyril to think about this issue deeply. Yet even a decade after this exploration began, even in the fullest Calvinist statement we have from Lucaris, he is not in full agreement with himself on the matter of predestination.

**Form of Government, Presbyterial vs. Episcopal:**

One of the hallmarks of the Reformed churches is their refusal of the episcopal form of government. In their desire to remove the abuses that developed in this hierarchical bureaucracy, they developed a different system based on elders/presbyters - *presbuteroi* instead of bishops - *episkopoi*. This form of government was ostensibly part of the attempt to recover a more ‘primitive Christianity,’ but it was not one that Lucaris had any interest in implementing. Perhaps it could be argued that this was one of the “impossibilities” that he wrote to de Wilhelm about, being too large a task to even consider tackling, not to mention that fact that the influence he had came on account of his holding the position of Patriarch - a role non-existent under the new form of government. While possible, there is nothing to suggest that he ever had any interest in this type of reformation. In Davey’s enumeration of the ways in which Lucaris was not as reformed as he can be made out to be, he comments on this specific issue:

> Nor, in particular, did he [Lucaris] ever adopt their views on church government…On this point it is significant that in about 1619 he would write to David Le Leu Wilhelm that ‘I rejoice that

---

168 It is interesting that George Abbot, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who is known for having “never wavered from his Calvinist theological position” does not follow this pattern, being “unlike many of his fellow-Calvinists in his acceptance of episcopacy and the need for a modicum of uniformity in worship.” [Paul A. Welsby, *George Abbot: the Unwanted Archbishop* (London, 1938), 149. quoted in Davey, *Pioneer for Unity*, 84-85.] In fact, Abbot wrote to Lucaris in attempts to convince him of the Anglicans’ agreement with the Orthodox using this argument: “As to discipline, we differ from the other Churches which have been purged from the dregs of Popery: we retain the most ancient form of Ecclesiastical rule, and the distinct orders of the ministers.” (letter from George Abbot dated 17 November 1617, translated in Neale, *History of the Holy Eastern Church*, vol. 2, 388).
we agree in the most necessary points of faith…I am of the opinion that all those points might be reduced to three…let ambition, covetousness, and superstition, be exploded, and humility (after Christ’s example), contempt of earthly things, and the simplicity of the Gospel be introduced instead.’ …We see here that Cyril hopes for a moral reformation of the Orthodox Church, not for instance, the introduction of the Presbyterian system of church government. A desire to educate, within the context of Orthodoxy, not to go to the lengths of the Reformers’ attitudes to worship, monasticism, and so on.169

Not surprisingly, his views prior to the mentioned letter to de Wilhelm, such as that found in his first letters to Uytenbogaert echo this disinterest in institutional overhaul with an explicit endorsement of his ecclesial governance:

> With regard to our Church government, it is not monarchical, but mixed and limited. Each [Bishop] is a king in his own particular church; but he will not be a monarch there unless he desires to be a tyrant. And be he monarch or not, if he is found guilty of contumacy, he subjects himself to the sentence of the aristocracy of Bishops. To this government we are very much attached: for we know that such was the order established by God in the Jewish Church, of which Moses was head; but yet an aristocracy was ordained. That appears to me the proper method of governing Churches; and if we at the present time are somewhat wanting, the cause of it is the tyranny of the unbelievers, to which perverse men frequently have recourse; and thus confound the order of our Church, which my eyes have often seen in these times…170

Lucaris is as loyal to the way his Church operates as he is to the rest of Orthodoxy in general at this stage in his life while he is serving as Patriarch of Alexandria. In the letter cited, he continues for several paragraphs describing the four patriarchates and and their relationships and the system of bishops, etc. The closest hint at dissatisfaction would be in the section quoted above, but he gives no sense that “the tyranny of the unbelievers” would be eradicated by

---

169 Davey, Pioneer for Unity, 64.

170 Letter from Lucaris to Uytenbogaert dated October 10, 1613. Aymon, Monumens Authentiques, 147. Quod attinet ad Ecclesiasticum regimen nostrum, de quo ei placet intelligere, Monarchicum non est, mixtum est & temperatum. Monarcha est unusquisque in sua Ecclesia particulari; imo nec ibi Monarcha erit, nisi tyrannus esse velit. At sist Monarch, ubicontumacia captus fuerit, subdit se judicio Aristocratie Episcoporum. Quod maxime amplectimur : comprobatum enim habemus talemordinem fuisse a Deo institutum in Israelitarum Ecclesia cujus quidem princeps Moses, Aristocratia tamen ordinabatur. Iste mihi videtur proprie modus regendi Ecclesias; quod si nos hoc tempore in aliquo deficitum, causa est infidelium tyrannis, ad quam multoties confugit hominum perversitas, confunditique ordinem Ecclesiasticum nostrum, quod non semel hisce temporibus oculi viderunt nostri, &c.
adopting a different ecclesial organizational system. And though he admits that some bishops wish to be tyrants and some refuse proper authority, he insists that they have a system to deal with such situations. Later on in his life, he would still maintain this. Just a few years before his death, he is reported as telling the French ambassador, the Count de Marcheville, who was condemning him as a heretic:

> I am under no obligation whatsoever to give an account of my beliefs to the Pope. There are metropolitans and bishops of the Greek Church, and to these, assembled in a Council, I am ready to justify my position, by reference to the Word of God and to the early Fathers of the Church.\(^{171}\)

Clearly, even after writing the *Confession* and appropriating whatever Calvinisms he did, he still maintained that he saw himself as subject to the discipline of his church and recognized the authority of the Synod.

---

\(^{171}\) Van Haga’s account of the meeting in a letter he wrote dated January 17, 1632, given in Smith, *Collectanea*, p. 46. The Latin reads:

> ...ante quingentos annos Ecclesiam Graecam a Romana secessionem fecisse; nihil sihi esse cum Papa, neque ad rationem Pontifici adpostulant, aut cuipiam, qui ejusdem authoritye fultus exegerit, reddendam aliquo jure ovoxium; ipsius jufisdictioni plusquam centum Metropolitas & Episcopos, praeter ingentem minoris dignitatis Clerum, subsesse; quibus satisfaciendis, si opus fuierit, legitima totius Ecclesiae Synodo convocata, semper fore paratissimum, & quicquid de hisce rebus controvertitur, Scripturis sacris & priscis Patribus referre decidendum.
while in Alexandria. He writes to Uytenbogaert in 1612, laying down ground rules of sorts for their correspondence, that it would be trouble if “one or the other of us, not regarding the ancient authority of the Fathers, to say nothing of Scripture, admits into the Church human opinions and innovations, with which the Church is now overwhelmed and appears to be at its last gasp.” Holding the Fathers as authoritative is for him as much a means for persevering against innovations as are the Scriptures themselves.

Yet he was not uncritical and would not accept any teaching on the basis of being associated with a patristic name. For instance, if one recalls the discussion on predestination, we see him tell de Wilhelm that even though he is “well aware that Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, and a very few Latins” have held opinions similar to Venator, he also knows “several heretics” have as well and he claims the doctrine in question to be “intolerable.” Thus we see that for some time into his exploration of Protestant theology (this undated letter was likely written in 1618, six years after the letter to Uytenbogaert), Lucaris was loyal to the living patristic tradition, as codified in the first seven councils, more than to any individual Church Father. It was not enough that an idea was “ancient” it also had to agree with the received tradition to be granted his approval. However, this can also be seen as a move towards admitting the fallibility of the Fathers.

The authority of the Fathers did shift for Lucaris eventually, being displaced by his giving an exclusive priority to Scripture. In the same year that he told De Wilhem that occasionally individual Fathers could be wrong, he tells Mark Antonio Dominis,


173 Translated in Beaven, “Cyril Lucar, Part II,” 624. For the original Italian, see Aymon, Monumens Authentiques, 180.
Leaving the Fathers, I took for my only guide the scriptures and the Analogy of Faith. After a long time, through the grace of God, understanding that the just cause of the reformation was more congruent with the doctrine of Christ, I embraced it. I cannot longer bear to hear it asserted that the comments of human tradition are of equal weight with Holy Scripture.\textsuperscript{174}

This would seem to show a difference in opinion arrived at within a few months at most.\textsuperscript{175}

However, this can also be accounted for by the limitations of our epistolary evidence. The notes to de Wilhelm, as already seen, were part of a serious theological discussion between the two of them as they discussed the various writers de Wilhelm was sending to Lucaris. Lucaris was careful and critical in this exchange, asking questions and challenging de Wilhelm’s own beliefs.

The letter to de Dominis is of a different genre altogether, and to understand what Lucaris is thinking regarding the authority of scripture and tradition, as well as other doctrines whose discussion draws upon this letter, something must be understood about who de Dominis is and why Lucaris is confessing his agreement with the Protestants to him. While still archbishop, de Dominis wrote a sizable volume entitled \textit{De Republica Ecclesiastica}, which would be followed by sequels of the same vein. He had a number of ethical issues with the Catholic Church, including clerical abuse, manipulation of the uneducated and misrepresenting Protestant beliefs, not to mention his other critiques, e.g. worship of relics, saints, and statues, the teaching of purgatory, but his chief complaint was the matter of church government, which as the title of his book suggests, he thought ought to be more of a republic than a monarchy. He had a particular

\textsuperscript{174} \textit{In tribunali conscientiae justum me judicem constituebam; titubabam aliquando, sed justa lance sententias partium ponderabam; missis patribus, scripturae adhaerebam et fidei anaolgiae. Tandem per Dei gratiam, quia justiorem causam esse reformatorum cognovi, Christique doctrinæ magis congruam, isti me applicui. Non amlius patiar assentientes audire sacrae scripturæ humanarum traditionum commenta aequiparari.}


\textsuperscript{175} The note to De Wilhem is undated, but judging by it’s arrangement with the other notes adressed to him, it was likely written in 1618. The letter to de Dominis is dated September 6 of the same year.
interest in the Eastern Church, as in his view, the Orthodox Patriarchs “understood their interrelations very correctly, as equal and fraternal.” Due to the threats that were leveled against him, he fled to England and was under the protection of the Archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot, whom we also know was a friend of Lucaris. Perhaps through this connection, de Dominis wrote to Lucaris and sent him the first volume of *De Republica Ecclesiastica*. It is upon receiving this book and going through it that Lucaris writes the letter in question.

Much of the letter, not contained in most collections of Cyril’s writings, reveals Lucaris at his most Protestant, or as Neale interprets it, Lucaris used this letter to “announce his apostasy from the doctrine of the Oriental Church.” Yet even Neale allows that Cyril did not recognize that he was doing any such thing, being as he was but “an unconscious heretic.”

However there is another piece to consider, and that is Lucaris’ purpose in writing. What has been discussed above regarding de Dominis makes him seem rather Protestant, and yet “Time and again de Dominis stressed that he never ceased to be a true Catholic and there was a proof for it. Namely, during the time spent in England, he always described himself as

---


177 Holjevac claims that de Dominis wrote to two Patriarchs both named Cyril - one of Alexandria, the other of Constantinople. However, since Lucaris, there has not been another Patriarch of Alexandria with this name. Nor was there a Patriarch of Constantinople named Cyril before him. It seems most likely, especially given the years involved, right around 1620 when Lucaris ascends to the throne of Constantinople, that it was the same Cyril whom de Dominis wrote to on separate occasions. Holjevac is also incorrect in claiming Lucaris had studied in Geneva, and that he was excommunicated in 1672 (in which year he was partially and posthumously exonerated).

178 This letter is not found in Aymon’s collection, or that of Smith. Neale considers it to be unpublished. The entire Latin text though is provided both by Neale (p. 390-396) and by Legrand (p. 329-340).


‘Archiepiscopus Spalatensis, primas Dalmatiae et Croatiae’. Indeed, he was eventually banished from England on order from King James because “his closeness to the Catholic Church was becoming increasingly obvious, both from its dogmatic and its political point of view.”

Lucaris’ purpose, as much as we can surmise, was to demonstrate that he was not the only one upset at the state of his Church and hopeful that the Protestants might hold the answer. This letter, far from being a theological treatise or even part of a serious theological discussion, is one of commiseration, which again, lessens the degree to which we can point to this letter as that “announcement of apostasy.” In fact, especially if they had a continuing relationship, it could be Lucaris who was looking to de Dominis in hopes of navigating such a fraught religious and political situation as both men were in.

The Lord’s Supper and Transubstantiation:

While several of the other doctrinal issues discussed are interesting, none are quite so central as is the matter of the Lord’s Supper and in particular the question that separated seventeenth century communions from one another, i.e. the nature of the “change” of the eucharistic elements. Being so central a matter, it is perhaps the one that most clearly demonstrates Lucaris’ departure from Orthodoxy at a meaningful level, though again one that also shows some evolution of nuanced yet conflicting thoughts. He indeed reflected a great deal about the Sacrament, but did not go into this particular problem as much as might be thought, at least not that surviving records show. Returning to the consideration of the correspondence with

183 See note 177.
de Wilhelm, Neale notes that the “two principal subjects of their conferences were the Holy Eucharist and Fasting.” For the first of these, we see only the tail end of the conversation which shows that in general and insofar as he understood what the Reformed were saying regarding the Lord’s Supper, he agreed. There is an oft-quoted line from the first letter to de Wilhelm that deals with this issue, usually taken to mean that Lucaris thought there to be basically three ways of understanding the Lord’s Supper: the Catholic, the Lutheran, and the Orthodox, and that he holds to the third. Taken in context, this is not actually the case. The letters we have of this debate start late in the conversation, with Lucaris opening saying that he has read all that de Wilhelm has written on the Lord’s Supper, a work which seems to have been split into three parts, the first explaining the Catholic view and the problems he had with it, in the second the Lutheran was likewise expounded and refuted, and the third contained what de Wilhelm would consider Reformed orthodoxy. As to his agreement with the third position, this is a case in which Lucaris almost certainly came to believe as his Reformed friend did. However, this letter does not tell us specifically which aspect or aspects of the Supper he was referring to here. For there are a couple of facets to the conversation that are useful to separate. First, there is the question of transubstantiation, and second, the question of the role of faith in the efficacy of the Sacrament. But before looking into either, it should be noted that neither were questions Lucaris seemed to have great interest in. In the notes jotted in the margins’ of Bellarmine’s Catechism, his main concern with the Eucharist was the mode of reception, regarding which he insisted that wine and bread be together in the cup. It took him some time before he started questioning the

---


185 See further discussion on p. 80-81.
particulars of the change, and even then only brought it up in discourse with Protestants, and not when he was reading for his own interest.

Examining the matter of transubstantiation, he initially does not seem to have this as a category on his radar, but once he knows of the trouble, he moves from silence to a sort of denial of the doctrine. The earliest available letter that touches on such matters is one to Uytenbogaert, written in 1613. In this letter he writes at some length of the sacrament of the Eucharist (as he calls it at this point, in later writings he seems to prefer the term more common among the Reformed, i.e. the Lord’s Supper). Indeed, it seems he would have written even more had he not repeatedly stopped himself before going too far on various tangents, such as one giving a description and explanation of the sacred particles that he cuts short saying:

But it is not of much importance if that devout and peculiar ceremony of the East, which has little or nothing to do with the essence of the Sacrament, be not known any further, since it is not necessary that others should be informed concerning it.

This goes to show that Cyril had a liking for the rituals of his church and was eager to tell of them, even if he restrained himself so not to overwhelm his correspondent whom he knew to be distrustful of such rituals. It also shows that he distinguishes the essence of the Sacrament from particular rituals associated with it. Getting himself refocused, he says after the ceremony of the particles,

…we begin to repeat some prayers, and having finished the rehearsal of the words which the Evangelists relate…we immediately invoke the Holy Spirit, saying, ‘And make this bread the
honored Body of your Christ, and that which is in this cup his precious Blood,’ which words St. Chrysostom in the book which we call the Liturgy, and before him St. Basil, appoints.\(^{186}\)

It might be noticed that this is a clear appeal to patristic liturgical tradition. It is also the closest he comes to weighing in on the transubstantiation controversy - perhaps he was not yet aware of this trouble, or not sure where he should stand.\(^{187}\) Either way, this statement he makes cannot truly be construed as showing commitment to either side on that debate, as this is almost certainly not his intent in writing this letter. In fact, he stops his quotation from the Liturgy directly before the “contentious” line, which simply reads “changing [\(\mu\varepsilon\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\lambda\omega\nu\)] them by your Holy Spirit,” - \(\mu\varepsilon\tau\alpha\beta\omega\lambda\acute{\ell} \) being different from \(\mu\varepsilon\tau\o\u\omicron\sigma\iota\omega\si\acute{s} \), the term closest to the idea of a change in substance such as denoted by transubstantiation. Instead, Lucaris was relating the Greek Church’s sacramental practices. The only important part for him that would be relevant, at the time when he wrote this letter, was that the Holy Spirit is responsible for making the change. To claim he was saying any more at this point seems disingenuous.

When the thoughts forming in Lucaris’ head regarding this begin to get interesting is when he accepts the basic framework of the debate as being physical presence versus spiritual presence. On this note, much seems to hinge on the understanding of the term \(\textit{substantia}. \) While in more Aristotelean terms, the word roughly corresponds with the Greek \(\omega\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\), meaning nature

\(^{186}\) \textit{Expedita caeremonia partium orationes aliquot recitandas aggregimur, & finitis narrative verbis, quae vel de Coena Domini dici, vel ipsum Dominum retulisse memorant Evangelistae...Statim Spiritum Sanctum invocantes dicimus, \(\textit{Καὶ ποίησον µὲν Άρτον τοῦτον, τίµιον Σῶµα τοῦ Ἑρωτοῦ σου}. \) \(\textit{Τὸ δὲ ἐν τῷ Ποτηρίῳ τοῦτοι, τίµιον ἅµα τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου} \) (& facito quidem hunc pa nem pretiosum corpus Christi tui: \(\textit{hoc quod in puculo est, pretiosum sanguinem Christi tui} \) quorum verborum D. Chrysostomus, in libro qui apud nos dicitur λειτουργία (\textit{Ministerium publicum}) & ante ipsurn D. Basilius, ordinator est. letter to Uytenbogaert, in Aymon, \textit{Monumens Authentiques}, 146-147.

\(^{187}\) He was very aware either of the Protestant insistence on communion in both kinds, or of the Catholic claim that this wasn’t necessary, or both, and is sure to include that clergy and laity alike communicate in both kinds. Therefore, he was not fully ignorant of all issues driving Protestant/Catholic tensions, but it is in no way clear what he did and did not know.
or essence as distinct any material physicality, *substantia* can also refer to the materiality of a thing, which is, it seems, how some of the Protestant works he read used the term.\(^{188}\) It is unclear exactly what meaning Lucaris had in mind when he read or even wrote this word. It is interesting though how a significant portion of his thought on the Eucharist is spent considering if Christ’s presence in the elements is physical or spiritual.

About seven years after writing to Uytenbogaert, having been acquainted with different ways of understanding the change, he writes to de Wilhelm that his “opinion is one which admits a Figure in this mystery” - which seems to mean that he is comfortable with a more figurative understanding.\(^{189}\) He does not mention transubstantiation explicitly in these letters to de Wilhelm, and it is not even clear at this point what exactly he understands of the controversy, but he seems to think that de Wilhelm has a decent grasp of what happens in the Eucharist. Voicing his approval, he writes:

> I believe in a spiritual eating; so that he who approaches the Lord’s table in faith, not only receives the visible sacrament of the body and blood, but also spiritually and inwardly partakes of the real body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.\(^{190}\)

This “spiritual eating” may have more to do with the qualifying phrase “who approaches the Lord’s table in faith” than with the nature of presence, an issue that is examined in the following section. At present, it is relevant here that his words suggest that the “real” body and blood are spiritual rather than physical, or that somehow, the spiritual consumption is superior to the

---

\(^{188}\) Zwingli for example thought “substantial” presence had to do with Christ’s physical body which being at the right hand of the Father could not also be on earthly altars.

\(^{189}\) *nostram esse Sententiam illam quae Figuram admittit, in hoc Mysterio.*

\(^{190}\) *mandacationem Spiritualem credimus: ita ut qui fide accedit ad Mensam Domini, non visible tantum Corporis & Sanguinis Sacramentum accipit, sed Spiritualiter & interne participat vero Corpori & Sanguini Domini Nostrri Jesu Christi.*

---

physical, quite possibly along the lines of the spiritual eating being that by which the benefits of
the sacrament are received. He does though refer to the visible sacrament as the body and blood,
which may suggest less than a complete denial of physical presence. It could be that he is trying
to hold a more holistic view in which Christ’s presence in the Sacrament is both spiritual and
physical. Still, the very fact that he makes a distinction between the physical and spiritual is
relevant, and the distinction becomes even more pronounced and the two categories become
more dissociated the closer one examines his writings. For example, when the letter to de
Wilhelm just considered is read together with his earlier letter to Uytenbogaert, his words seems
to resonate with the sense that there are two “communions” taking place, one commemorative
and one more “actual.” In the earlier letter he avers: “it is beyond doubt that this mystery was
delivered to us for two ends - for the commemoration of Christ’s death, and for the receiving of
his body and blood.” And after reading his words to de Wilhelm, it seems the first seems to be
done on the physical plane, the second on the spiritual. It is clear at this point that his thought
was not that of his Church which had little interest in these questions.

It was around this time that Lucaris was writing to de Wilhelm that he is also thought to
have made his notes in Bellarmine’s *Larger Catechism*, and some of his jottings are relevant
here. When he was reading Bellarmine, likely between 1618-1620, he still took it for granted that
“from the point of consecration, what is found inside the cup is the true blood of Christ.” He
also pushes beyond this and claim that Christ is more than merely physically present, claiming

---

191 *...duo hoc tantum Mysterium traditum esse nobis constet in commemorationem moretis Domini, & in
corporis & sanguinis sumptionem...*


192 “παρευθής ὦ φιλέ άγιασθή, εὑρίσκεται μέσα εἰς τὸ ποτήριον τὸ ἀληθινὸν ἁμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ.”
Keetje Rozemond, *Notes Marginales de Cyrille Lucar Dans Un Exemplaire du Grand Catechisme de
that in the cup is “the blood together with the body, and both the soul and divinity of Christ, and with the entire Christ, God and man.” It could very well be that for him, physical presence and spiritual presence were both involved. But this talk of presence is not exactly the specific issue of transubstantiation.

Transubstantiation is actually most fully dealt with, or at least called by that name, in the Confession, which hardly gives a full treatment of any theological position, inclusive of this one. But what he says in his Confession certainly does deny the physical transformation of the elements, holding instead to something felt in the soul, connected to the faith of the communicant:

…we profess the true and certain presence of our Lord Jesus Christ; that presence, however, which faith offers to us, not that which the devised doctrine of transubstantiation teaches. For we believe that the faithful do eat the body of Christ in the Supper of the Lord, not by breaking it with the teeth of the body, but by perceiving it with the sense and feeling of the soul…

This article of the Confession, unlike the letters and especially the marginalia just considered, does constitute a clear denial of physical presence and advance that there is only a spiritual sort of presence. What changed in the intervening years between his letters and the Confession is left to speculation in lieu of further evidence. But the difference is notable, and shows evolution of his thought, or evolution of what he felt comfortable telling to his Reformed allies.

---

193 “εὑρίσκεται μέσα εἰς τὸ ἅγιον ποτήριον ἀντάμα με τὸ ἁμα τὸ σῶμα, καὶ ἡ ψυχή, καὶ ἡ θεότης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ με τότε ὅλος ὁ Χριστός θεός καὶ ἄνθρωπος.” Rozemond, Notes Marginales, 50.

194 The Confession of Lucaris, article 17: ...
...praesentiam veram realem Christi Domini consitemur et profitemur, at illam quam fides mobis offert, non autem quam excogitata docet transsubstantiatio. Credimus enim, fideles Christi corpus manducare in coena Domini, non dente materiali terendo, sed animae sensu percipiendo...
Kimmel, Monumenta fidei ecclesiae orientalis, 36-37.
Perhaps it should be specified in this consideration of transubstantiation that the Eastern Church was not entirely of one mind for or against it in Cyril’s lifetime. This was largely due to the influence of the Latinizing Greeks who were put in influential positions within the Orthodox Church who were advancing transubstantiation as true Orthodox doctrine. Still, there were plenty among the Orthodox who countered the trend. When Lucaris was attacked for his heresy in denying this specific doctrine, (at a council held months after his death), there was a protest made, and we have record of one Greek priest who arose to his defense, adamant that “the word [μετονομίωσις - transubstantiation] was not to be found either in the Greek Fathers or in the ecumenical councils, that it was invented by the Latins, and that Greeks ought not to use this phrase or expression.” With this in mind, it cannot fairly be said that this was the case of Lucaris simply accepting Protestant eucharistic doctrine. All that can be said is that he did not agree with the Roman doctrine and his stubborn mind never moved on this question.

Sacraments and Faith:

Much the same can be said for the second question relating to the Eucharist, i.e. that of the role of faith in determining the efficacy of the Sacrament. For Lucaris, this flows naturally and necessarily from the previous discussion of spiritual eating, as can be seen in his Confession where he writes:

---

195 This information is found in the account of M. de Nointel, the French ambassador at Constantinople, translated from the French (provided in Aymon, 317) in Beaven, “Cyril Lucar, Part IV,” 603. The priest was mistaken and μεταβολή had been used previously, but was not in common use in Lucaris’ time - with the exception of the Greeks who had studied in the Jesuit schools, and the word would be further suppressed for its becoming the technical Greek equivalent of transubstantiation. The preferred word to describe the change was μεταβολή. For more on this discussion, see Beaven, “Cyril Lucar, Part IV,” 601-603.
since the body of Christ is not that which is visible in the Sacrament, but that which faith spiritually apprehends and offers to us; from whence it is true that, if we believe, we do eat and partake, if we do not believe, we are destitute of all the fruit of it.\textsuperscript{196}

If the change is not a physical one in which the bread and wine become body and blood, but a “spiritual” one, then it would naturally be received by the spirit rather than the body, and therefore, faith would be required for the spirit to recognize and receive the “true body and blood.” Here, the Reformed understanding is clearly stated, namely that faith is necessary to receive the benefits of the sacrament, and without such faith, what is invisible is not received, suggesting again that the “invisible and spiritual” presence is not one related to “essence,” as it is able to be separated out from the thing itself. For Lucaris, an essential change not dependent on the disposition of the communicant is not effected in the eucharist, showing a definite departure from Orthodox understanding. But this is also Lucaris at his most Calvinist in the Confession, and one must also attend to his other writings on the subject to see how in this case, his thought always seems to have been in tension with that of his Church, without much manipulation by Protestants.

Returning to the 1613 letter to Uytenbogaert, Cyril espouses much the same opinion regarding the role of faith in sacramental efficacy, and in greater detail. Speaking of baptism and the eucharist specifically, he tells the Dutch pastor:

\begin{quote}
We esteem so necessary [the use of Sacraments] that without it we conceive that no one can be certain of his faith; for although they are seals, conferring the grace of the gospel, yet they ought not to be totally separated from faith; because, in the same manner, as they cannot be efficacious without faith, so, because they are ordained, faith cannot be so without them. Hence their use must be perpetual in the church: although one of them cannot be repeated, and without it the
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{196} The \textit{Confession} of Lucaris, article 17:
\textit{...quum corpus Christi non sit illud, quod oculis in sacramento esse offert, sed illud quod spiritualiter Fides apprehendit, nobisque præbet, unde verum est, si credimus, manducamus et participabamus, si non credimus, omni fruto destituimur.}
Kimmel, \textit{Monumenta fidei ecclesiae orientalis}, 37.
Sacraments cannot be efficacious without faith, which again suggests that faith plays an instrumental role. Baptism does not save the impenitent, and taking the eucharist “in opposition to faith and the truth of its use, order and institution” does not confer grace. Such statements as these, written before much in-depth study of Protestant thought, may display an early consonance with Reformed theology, and most certainly a departure from Orthodox theology.

There is a caveat here, and before one get carried away in finding this Protestant doctrine flowing from the pen of an Orthodox Patriarch unbidden and un-manipulated, one must pay attention to the textual context. In the excerpted lines from the letter above, note the beginning and ending clauses which are supported by the theme just explored, i.e. that faith is necessary to the sacrament. His main point was not really that faith determined the effect of the sacrament, but that this reliance means faith and the sacrament are connected, and therefore, that the sacraments are actually necessary for faith as much as the other way around. Indeed, reading closely, one wonders what Uytenbogaert had said that would inspire this reply that amounts to an argument for the necessity of the perpetual use of these two sacraments in the church. The last lines of this excerpt in particular for the crucial importance of the sacraments for justification,

---

but also belie a more Orthodox sense that the point of the eucharist is to partake of the divine nature.\textsuperscript{198}

Still, in seeing how little his thoughts changed on this matter from 1613 through until at least 1633, we see that this “appropriation” of Reformed doctrine was done by man who already had similar opinions and thus was not “coerced” into accepting what he did not previously belief. Rather, he accepted what resonated with his beliefs easily. Beliefs that did not have this immediate resonance he exhibited much less interest in, as is seen in the following section.

\textbf{Fasting:}

The second issue that Lucaris and de Wilhelm were continually debating was fasting. Though we do not have evidence such that would display how his thought changed over time on this matter (these letters span a year or two at most) and it was not included in the articles of his Confession, it is worth considering what he says on the matter since it seems he spent the year of 1619 preoccupied with this discussion. The matter of fasting also provides a prime example of Lucaris pushing his beliefs on the Protestants instead of the other way around, thus displaying a

\textsuperscript{198} This assumption on Cyril’s part that the purpose, even a partial purpose, is the “partaking of the divine nature” is one area in which seems to display that he may have had a different sense of what the benefits of the eucharist were than did his Reformed audience, who were more likely to speak of eternal life than divine nature when speaking of what true communion with Christ is for. (Cf. John Calvin, \textit{The Institutes of the Christian Religion}, IV.17.5-11). Nevertheless, it should also be remembered that Lucaris seemed to accept that the spiritual eating was done for the benefit of the soul, and in all the sources available, omitted any mention of more “body-inclusive” benefits of the Supper such as are found in the pre-Communion prayers Lucaris would have been familiar with, e.g. “Let these holy gifts give me healing and cleansing, enlightenment and protection, salvation and sanctification of soul and body. May they avert every fantasy, evil practice, and operation of the devil enacted in my members by design,” and, “for the remission of sins, for eternal life, for sanctification and enlightenment, for strength, and healing and health of both soul and body,” among other prayers with similar sentiments. This would suggest a tension between what Lucaris was writing and what his Church teaches on the question of the purpose and benefits of the Eucharist, demonstrating his sympathy towards more Calvin-esque sacramental sensibilities.
different side of his character than is usually revealed. Only Lucaris’ side of the conversation survives, but it seems that he was the one to bring up the subject, perhaps in answer to the question begged by the closing of his last letter: “I rejoice therefore, that our opinion on this matter is one and the same on this truth. I wish it were so in other things in which we differ.”

Where do they differ? Perhaps the understanding of grace, or predestination, as both of those had already come up as sticking points for him. Or perhaps here he offers another example: Fasting.

In Orthodox fashion, he offers liturgy as theology and tells de Wilhelm: “I have thought it fit to jot down what we sing [in our church services] on the subject of fasting, that you may conjecture what we hold on that subject.” He proceeds to quote hymns (in the Greek/ untranslated) promoting two visions of fasting. The first is that “true fasting is abstinence from evil, government of the tongue, refraining from passion, departure from evil speaking, lying, and perjury.” The second focusses on “bringing into subjection the flesh which lords it over us” so that “we may become worthy to partake of the Lamb that was willingly slain for the world - the Son of God.” Lucaris then challenges de Wilhelm: “See if you can find any absurdity in this, for it is all conformable to the Word of God.”

---

199 Translated in Beaven, “Cyril Lucar, Part II,” 624.

200 The Greek text of the two hymns in question is provided in Legrand, “Documents Concernant Cyrille Lucar,” 321.

201 Beaven, “Cyril Lucar, Part II,” 624.
In the next letter, it is clear that de Wilhelm tried to do just that, presumably, arguing in good Protestant fashion that the problem is in the specificity and prescription of fasting rules that could detract from the true spirit of fasting. Again, we do not have de Wilhelm’s contributions to the conversation, but one would assume his thoughts would be similar to other Reformed minds of the time, such as Johannes Dallaeus, who in his work *De jejunii et Quadragesima liber* (On Fasting and Lent) who “nicely captures the types of arguments made by the Reformed side in this era, arguing not that fasting should be completely abolished, but that they should be undertaken in the spirit which they were originally intended, as they were in the Bible, particularly in the Old Testament.”

Theologically, the Reformed thinking was “the primary reason to fast is to punish your body so as to avert God’s wrath,” i.e. “witnessing the faithful in active contrition, confessing their sins, and punishing themselves as a way to show their sincere interest in reforming truly pleases God.” In practice, the desire was to move from fasting being “abstinence from meat in specifically prescribed days” towards a voluntary fast, or ideally “year-round frugality.”

Lucaris answers, agreeing with whatever de Wilhelm had posited as the nature of fasting, but insisting that “yet it is true that times of fasting should be marked out,” on the rationale

---


that most people are not capable of keeping “such a fast all through life.”206 (Presumably, de Wilhelm had brought up the year-round frugality ideal).

Later on he continues this conversation, though one can almost sense annoyance/vexation as he tells de Wilhelm, “I had already explained to you, in our conversation on fasting the day before yesterday, what is the nature of fasting in the Greek church…”207 Despite his hints that he is just repeating himself, he proceeds in a manner that is worth some degree of consideration. On the one hand, there is no movement on his part, and it seems that he thought his Protestant friend to have been sufficiently refuted. But on the other hand, what he says the nature of fasting was among the Orthodox truly sounds more Protestant than Orthodox. He describes it thus:

viz., that it was united with prayer, and, moreover, with many other marks of penitence for past mischances, with corporal chastisement, with lying on the ground, with abstinence from flesh, fish, and wine; so that ξηροφαγία is practiced during the whole time of the fast, up to Passion Week, when everyone approaches the Lord’s Supper, professes himself a sinner publicly in the church, and asks the prayers of those who are present, and is admitted to the participation of the sacrament. He is then freed from obligation of the severity of the fast.208

This notion of fasting being primarily penitential and viewed as bodily punishment fits comfortably with Protestant notions that “the primary reason to fast is to punish your body so as to avert God’s wrath,”209 although it should be noted that Lucaris says nothing of the wrath of God, only of penitence and punishment. More curiously, he sends to de Wilhelm the doctrine of Bellarmine on the subject, noting that it is “false and heretical on many points.”210 Despite this, it

206 impediamur posse tota vita nostra tale Jejunium observare
Aymon, Monumens Authentiques, 186.
207 Beaven, “Cyril Lucar, Part II,” 625.
208 Beaven, “Cyril Lucar, Part II,” 625.
210 “Doctrinam Bellarmini falsam & haereticam in multis locis”
Letter to de Wilhelm, Aymon, Monumens Authentiques, 187; Beaven, “Cyril Lucar, Part II,” 625.
seems Bellarmine was useful in that he agrees that fasting is not only a private exercise, but a
corporate one. The whole conversation surrounds the question, not of whether fasting is pleasing
to God, nor what the nature or purpose of it is, but rather if the church has any business
mandating specific fasting seasons. Here Cyril maintains his position answering in the
affirmative, even after de Wilhelm’s persistent arguing towards the negative. Clearly, Lucaris
was far from being a mere puppet of the Protestant powers.

Mediation of Christ / Role of the Saints:

The question of what Lucaris believed regarding the possibility and appropriateness of
intercessions by the Theotokos and the saints rests, perhaps, on the question of just how clever he
was. In a previous section this question was explored some, and doubt was cast on the depth of
his understanding based on his abilities with the Latin language and overall being more of a
pastor than an academic theologian.\textsuperscript{211} The mitigation of the accusation that Lucaris agreed with
the Calvinists that Christ is the Only Mediator is thought to require the ability to be subversive,
and even Neale in describing how this could be smoothed over wonders “whether such
subterfuges were worthy of Cyril.”\textsuperscript{212} It is my contention that this was no more a “subterfuge”
than it was a clumsy attempt to be precise. Much in the same way as we observed that Lucaris’
trinitarian formula had the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father through the Son was most
likely his way of rejecting the Filioque - despite it being interpreted by his detractors as an
acceptance of it, here too it seems most plausible that he was striving to gently correct the

\textsuperscript{211} See above, p. 59-62.

doctrines he had reservations about, and to reword these doctrines in such a way as he could hold them in good conscience. Therefore, it is worth considering what Cyril does and does not say in the Confession. Neale explains:

He does not say that Christ is the Only Mediator: he affirms that He is the only True and Proper Mediator; and this may imply no more than that He is a Mediator in a manner in which the Saints are not; and this was never denied by any. Again, to guard himself still more effectually, he inserts something more, and confesses Jesus Christ to be the only true and proper High Priest and Mediator: and this the Oriental Church could not deny without heresy.\(^{213}\)

Neale’s suggestion is not without merit. The specific language Lucaris uses here does allow for such an interpretation that holds Christ as a superior mediator, not the one and only mediator. However, whereas Neale assumes this to be a sophisticated use of language, and probably an interpretation based on wishful thinking, it may not be. Grammatically speaking, he only added in two adjectives: veri et legitimi, or in the Greek, ἀληθινοῦ καὶ γνησίου; and one noun: Pontificis, or ἀρχιερέας. This does not seem out of grasp of the “but moderate” abilities of Cyril. The word choice is striking when compared to the other Reformed Confessions he had read and was familiar with. This wording of “True and Proper Mediator” is nowhere found in the Belgic and French Confessions, the Canons of Dort, or the Heidelberg Catechism. Instead, those that contain this article are unanimous in their lack of equivocation on this matter. Their wording eliminates the possibility for other mediators, using phrases like “for we should have no access to the Father except through this Mediator”\(^{214}\) and “we have no access to God except through the one and only Mediator and Intercessor, Jesus Christ the righteous.”\(^{215}\) Thus, Lucaris’ choice of words appears significant in this insertion of ambiguity. Further it is known, from Lucaris


\(^{214}\) French Confession, Article 19.

\(^{215}\) Belgic Confession, Article 26.
himself, that he had spoken with at least one other Orthodox thinker did hold this partial “sole” Mediator position.\textsuperscript{216}

If such is the case, and Lucaris, at this stage of his life, would only guardedly hold Christ to be sole Mediator, this would display even more waffling on the matter than he already shows in his letter to de Dominis, in which he describes the progression of his thought and how he had come to think at that point, a decade before the Confession was published:

As for the invocation of Saints, time was, when I did not perceive how they eclipsed the glory of our Lord Christ, and I obstinately defended them by two works against the learned Transylvanian Marcus Fuxia. But in his answer, he so completely refuted my arguments, that I had need of no other book to prove my error; and now I call the Lord to witness, that, in reciting the Public Office, it gives me the greatest pain to hear the Saints invoked circumstantially to the dereliction of Jesus Christ, and to the great detriment of souls.\textsuperscript{217}

Unfortunately, nothing of the works of Marcus Fuxia are known to us, and so cannot say with certainty what the arguments were that he found so compelling to do the theological reversal that he describes. However, based on what he wrote to de Dominis, it seems that his paradigm shifted to one in which the glory of God is alone to be served. He started to see the invocation of the saints as indirectly abandoning Christ. He does seem to maintain the opinion that could ask intercession of the Saints, i.e. they are alive in Christ;\textsuperscript{218} but rather it was the question of whether it was appropriate to do so that Lucaris doubted.\textsuperscript{219}

\textsuperscript{216} In 1635, Lucaris writes about a conversation he had with a Dr. Coressi, described by Neale to be “a native of Chios, educated in Padua, but a warm champion of the Eastern Church; the teaching of which he seems to have stated fairly in his argument with the Patriarch.” Neale, \textit{History of the Holy Eastern Church}, vol. 2, 442-443.


\textsuperscript{218} This is especially evident in reviewing his sermons. For example, in his Homily upon the Dormition of the Theotokos, he explains first that Mary and the Saints are in heaven near to God, second that they care about the earthly church, and third that they do advocate for those who call upon them.

\textsuperscript{219} Note that the specific issue here is \textit{invocation} as opposed to veneration. The two are issues are quite distinct for Lucaris, and the latter is considered in the following section, pp. 93-96.
Yet precisely which arguments caused this shift are not as relevant as the fact that we know that he did not simply read for example the *Belgic Confession* and accepted it. On some level, whatever it be, he did accept it, but to get to that point, he read, he countered, and he considered carefully, he was convinced, and perhaps, he still had some reservations that manifested as the ambiguity discussed earlier. However, this may be, and I do think it is worth note, it would be discreditable to assume that he never did accept the doctrine in its fullness. He writes to Antoine Leger in 1635, three years before his death, with just this sentiment:

Yesterday, speaking of the Mediator, I learned a fine doctrine of Dr. Coressi’s, who said to me that it is quite true that there is one Mediator, Jesus Christ; but then, said he, there are other lesser ones who intercede. Thus said Coressi. M. Leger, on my conscience I say with truth, that Coressi and the rest of his adherents are so ignorant, that their arguments and disputations make sensible men sick, and the Jesuits are their dupes; and I am astonished that they do not perceive how void of sense and judgement they are.²²⁰

Here we see how thoroughly Lucaris was convinced on this matter at the end. It is possible that this was an issue that he easily appropriated, but it is also possible there was more serious thought involved then he is often credited with. One should also notice the reasoning evident in this letter that lies behind his refusal of lesser mediators. There is plenty of derogation against Coressi, true, but it is most interesting that he includes that “the Jesuits are their dupes.” We see a theme that is also repeated in the following section, namely that Lucaris began to accept the dichotomy of Catholic and Protestant. On any disagreement between these two, Lucaris would side with the anti-Catholic and therefore Protestant position, as though this were the best way to refuse the teaching of the Jesuits.

---

Icons, Veneration, and Idolatry:

Especially since the seventh ecumenical council, icons have been particularly important in the East, and it has often been noted how odd it is that Lucaris does not mention icons in the first publication of his Confession, neither to condemn them nor justify their existence or veneration. This should not, and does not, mean that Lucaris did not think about the matter carefully. This is one area in which the marginalia he wrote in his copy of the *Catechism of Bellarmine*, sometime between 1618 and 1620, is particularly instructive. Responding to the exposition of the Hail Mary, he writes regarding the Saints and their Icons that “to honor the saints is right, but not so to invoke them,” and again that “it is not so much true, as fitting to bow our heads and bend the knee in honor of the saints.” As we saw previously, he had reservations about the invocation of Saints due to his ideas of Christ as sole mediator. However, this had little bearing on his ideas about how the saints were to be regarded. In this marginal note, we see his comfort with the bowing of heads and the bending of knees at the very least. He sees this to be right and fitting, and has quite the time over the next several years wrestling with the distinction between honoring the saints and being distracted from God by them.

Lucaris was well aware of Protestant concerns about the second commandment and idolatry. Early on, he seems convinced that the Protestants’ objections were only valid in so far as the respect paid to icons could be confused with the worship due to God alone - but he does not see himself making this conflation, therefore the one is not on such a slippery slope to the other that idolatry would be inevitable. As he writes to de Wilhelm:

---

I have read Rainoldus, and I have not been displeased with what he says upon the subject of idolatry; for, by the grace of God, I do not fall in with that error, as I hope to explain sufficiently in the catechism which I intend to offer to my brethren of the East.\textsuperscript{222}

While he agrees that idolatry is to be avoided, he does not see the practice of his church to be a problem - when properly understood. In his mind it seems, a bit of explanation is safeguard enough against idolatry.

This is also a matter that he mentions in the previously discussed letter to de Dominis. As previously, here Lucaris strays closer to Reformed views, but it would still be too far a stretch to think him an iconoclast. He tells the former archbishop:

> Regarding the reverence of images, if not in former times, however, has become pernicious to such a degree that I can by no means say. With God as my witness, I deplore the present state of the East, of which I see no limit, how is it possible to remedy this deformed and obscene ulcer: in my judgement, images should not simply be rejected, for without being reverenced, they are not able, in themselves, to cause mischief; but the idolatry they cause to blind worshippers, I abhor.

> 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 distracted from the true and spiritual worship and adoration which is due to God alone, I would prefer that all would entirely abstain from this so dangerous handle of sin, rather than by ignorantly violating God’s law, they should stumble on the rock of offense, and condemn themselves eternally.”\textsuperscript{223}

\textsuperscript{222} Rainoldum legi neque titulus Idololatriae potuit me offendere, qui per Dei gratiam huic errori non assentior; prout me in Catechesi, quam orientalibus meis oblaturus sum, satis me explicaturum spero. undated letter to de Wilhelm. Aymon, Monumens Authentiques, 174. The translation is Beaven, “Cyril Lucar, Part II,” 623.

Most likely, the work of John Rainolds that Lucaris refers to is De Romanae ecclesiae idolatria (Oxoniae: Apud Josephum Barnesium, 1596).

\textsuperscript{223} De cultu imaginum, si non antea, modo autem quam evaserit perniciosus, dici haud potest. Testis Deus mihi est, quod deploro presentem Orientis statum, quod non videam modum, quo possit mederi huic tam deformi, obscoenoque ulceri: non quod simpliciter judicem spennendas imagines, cum non adorate per se nil possint affere mali: sed Idolatriam caecis cultoribus causatam abhorreant. Et quamvis in privatis Orationibus observarim aliquando, menti meae subvenisse Crucifixi imaginem, cum offeret commodius speculandum tamen video, jamvulgum, ut non de multis qui se sapientes esse credunt affirmem, praeceptim ferri a vero et spirituali cultu, atque latria, quae unii soli Deo Optimo Maximo debitur: mallem, ut omnes universe ista ansa tam periculosa abstineant, quam ignoranter legem Domini violantes in lapidem infringant offensionis; et sic se atrociter in aeternum condemnet. Neale, History of the Holy Eastern Church, vol. 2, 394.
Lucaris no longer is so dismissive of Protestant qualms, and seems conflicted in this letter. He has definitely lost his previous optimism about how the Orthodox avoid idolatry, and now doubts that mere education can solve the this problem. He suggests that things may be better if all would abstain from the use of images. He does not say that this is worth trying to enact. One should remember when reading this that Lucaris also said that he found images to be themselves harmless, and even personally beneficial. It seems he maintains that if properly understood and not worshipped as God, there is no problem - but he sees that this is not reflected in the practice of his parishioners. Minus the diatribe about this current state of affairs, or “obscene ulcer” as it were, this is the understanding that he writes into a later edition of the Confession.

In the 1633 Greek translation of the Confession, Cyril adds an addendum of a few more questions and answers not found in the earlier Latin edition, including one on this issue of icons. As per Protestant objections, Lucaris approaches the question via the second commandment, but as before, does not wholly reject images, but rejects the worship of said images:

…we do not reject pictorial representations, which are a noble art, and we permit those that so desire to have icons of Christ and of the Saints; but the adoration (λατρεία) and worship (θρησκεία) of them, as being forbidden by the Holy Spirit in Sacred Scripture we reject…

The Greek word choice here is interesting and probative, even if the ultimate interpretation remains debatable. λατρεία is the usual word used to describe the adoration or worship that is due to God alone. Usually in apologies for the veneration of saints, this is set over and against either προσκύνημα (the physical act of prostration; veneration) or δουλεία (service/slavery - the

---

224 Lucaris’ Confession, answer 4.

Ἐξ ἓν δὴν, ἵν τι τὴν ἱστορίαν, ἐπίσημον τέχνην οὐδ’ ὅσαν, οὐκ ἀποβάλλομεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰκόνας ἔχειν καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὸν ἄγιον τῷ βουλομένῳ παρέχομεν • τὴν δὴ λατρείαν καὶ θρησκείαν α’ θέλων, ὡς ἀπηξορευμένην παρὰ τοῦ ἁμίου πνεύματος ἐν τῇ ιερᾷ γραφῇ ἐξουσιοδοθήκει, ἵνα μὴ λάθωμεν ἃντι τοῦ κτίστου καὶ ποιητοῦ χρώματα καὶ τέχνης, καὶ κτίσματα προσκυνεῖν. Kimmel, Monumenta fidei ecclesiae orientalis, 43-44.
word John of Damascus uses in his argument that veneration is not worship). But the word Lucaris pairs λατρεία with θρησκεία, a word that simply means religious worship, being a near synonym of λατρεία. If it is λατρεία and θρησκεία that are not to be directed towards the icons or their prototypes, it is unclear where “veneration” would fit into this scheme.

προσκόνημα is the word one would expect a Protestant to have used, following scriptural use: for example, the LXX reading of Exodus 20:5; Exodus 23:24; Deuteronomy 5:9; and 2 Chronicles 7:19 all use the word προσκόνημα together with λατρεία (Jeremiah 25:6 actually uses προσκόνημα with δουλεία). The same is seen in the New Testament, e.g. Matthew 4:10 and Luke 4:8 - προσκόνημα being used in conjunction with λατρεία. If Lucaris was trying to follow scriptural phraseology, in this case he did not - perhaps because he knew that προσκόνημα was being used by the Orthodox as the technical term for veneration that he was unwilling to stand against so explicitly. This is a chief example of Lucaris being conflicted, and never fully convinced of the Protestant view.

---

225 It is very interesting on this point that “λατρείαν καὶ θρησκείαν” is translated as “worship and service” by Robertson (responsible for the only translation of the Greek Confession into English), reminiscent of the technical terms of John Damascene’s argument, despite this not accurately representing Lucaris’ statement. Cf. Robertson, J.N.W.B. trans., The Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem: Sometimes Called the Council of Bethlehem, Holden Under Dositheus, Patriarch of Jerusalem in 1672. (AMS Press, 1969), 213.
PART III: LUCARIS’ OPINION OF HIS ORTHODOXY

Upon considering Lucaris’ beliefs, even noting his significant hesitation and wrestling with Reformation ideas, one sees that on an ever-increasing level, Lucaris was gaining comfortability and acceptance of at least some aspects of Reformed doctrine. I make no claim to deny this, as I do think he appropriated a fair amount of Calvin’s thought for his own purposes. What I do suggest is that one put aside the glaringly obvious for a moment, and see what is generally overlooked: how this situation likely appeared to Lucaris himself. Such an exploration fleshes out a sense of the situation. As has been seen, a truly “objective” assessment of his status whether it be saint or apostate is nearly impossible to come by, and merely offering another suggestion of how to understand the man could cloud the issue further. Thus, even though a more “objective” assessment may judge that he was wrong in his estimation of his own Orthodoxy, a more subjective analysis is also worth consideration, especially the subjective analysis of Lucaris himself.

Lucaris was naturally aware that he had enemies, hence the banishments, hence the assassination threats and attempts. He was also fully aware of just how much of the antipathy towards him was based on his beliefs which mirrored those of the Calvinists. This was explained to him multiple times, and many instances are recorded for us. One of the most telling is the conversation he had with the French ambassador, the Count de Marcheville, previously mentioned in the discussion of ecclesial government. As Thomas Smith reports the encounter:

Cyril visiting the new French Embassadour, the Count de Marcheville, was received very respectfully,…After dinner, the Embassadour shew'd him his Confession, which the French Embassadour at Rome had sent him, by order of the Pope, with express order to demand of him, if he had made it, and if he would persist in it. The Patriarch, after he had taken up the Book in his hand, and look'd carefully upon it, repli'd, That truly it was his Confession… the Embassadour made no other answer but this, That at Rome, and in France they held his Eminence for a Calvinist; which Sect was much hated by the King his Master: and I wish, said he, that your
Eminence were a Roman-Catholick, as the King is, whose favour and liberality might be gain'd this way. The Patriarch repli'd in these few words: In the affairs of my Belief, and eternal Salvation, I shall neither follow the King of France, nor any person in the world whatsoever; and I shall never doe any thing otherwise then what my Conscience directs me.226

If there was any confusion about what the issue was, this meeting should have clarified that for Lucaris. In fact, he was questioned about that Confession so often that he developed something of a standard answer. He writes to Diodati saying:

I now come to say that my confession has no need for authentication. It will always be authenticated by the testimony of the very professors of Popery; for there came to me other persons beside - friars, seculars, and the very agents of Ragusa - and on their expressing a wish to know if the confession was mine, I gave them the same answer.227

In Lucaris’ mind then, it may well seem that everyone is attacking him for writing this document. It does not seem that in these encounters and other similar ones that he ever admitted to being Calvinist, and even less that he thought himself un-Orthodox for writing and persisting in the faith reflected in his Confession. This section shows how Lucaris may have conceived of his religious affiliation, and how his repeated vehement denials of apostasy show where his loyalty lies - with Orthodoxy. To do this, we first look at his character, insofar as we can, with particular attention to what he thinks about such matters as loyalty and apostasy. Then we turn to how Lucaris processed the religious theological landscape and his place in it. Finally we consider Lucaris’ comments on the matter of his supposed apostasy.

226 Thomas Smith, quoting a letter from Van Haga dated Jan. 17, 1632, in Smith, An account of the Greek church as to its doctrine and rites of worship with several historicall remarks interspersed, relating thereunto : to which is added an account of the state of the Greek church under Cyrillus Lucaris, Patriarch of Constantinople, with a relation of his sufferings and death, (London: Miles Flesher, 1680), 273-275.

**Lucaris’ Values Regarding Loyalty and Apostasy**

There is much that could be postulated about Lucaris’ character. He describes himself as a chatty sort who likes to talk.\(^{228}\) He seems to have a penchant for sarcasm, and some skill in clever insults.\(^ {229}\) But the facet of his personality most immediately relevant is his overwhelming value of loyalty. He is actually quite stubborn in that regard. Cyril Lucaris, with his notorious and scandalous fraternization with Protestants, might be assumed to be a man with an open mind, one that can be swayed with enough reasoned arguments. After all, he was able to see past the heretic label that Protestants had been branded with to see from their point of view, accepting their friendship and their ideas, in as much as he did.\(^ {230}\) This characterization does not fit comfortably with the disposition Lucaris had, which was more narrow minded, stubborn, and very loyal.

Lucaris was very much subject to the “halo” effect, such that once he had decided that someone or something was good, he was blind to any shortcomings it may have. A particularly strong example of this is in the case of his affection for one Metrophanes Kritopulous. After receiving priesthood by Cyril’s hand, Cyril sent him to study theology in England, at the University of Oxford. Metrophanes did well there, but overstayed his welcome, fell in with

---

\(^{228}\) In a letter to Uytenbogeart he writes that “I am a talkative and chatty person” (\*Ego loquax & garrulus sum\*). Aymon, \*Monumens Authentiques*, 158.

\(^{229}\) For instance, in a letter to Antoine Leger dated 10 March 1637, he referred to the *Congregatio Propaganda Fide* (a body determined to depose Cyril) as the “*Congregacione de Propaganda Infidelitate.*” (Aymon, 116). Hadjiantoniou concurs as to this sarcastic humor being characteristic of Cyril, for more examples see chapter 14 “Cyril Lucaris - the Man, in *The Protestant Patriarch*, 123-125.

\(^{230}\) The Protestants did have the ‘heretic’ label among the Orthodox, as Lucaris recalls how the name of Calvin is used to scare his flock in a letter to Leger dated August 17, 1632: “None of these opposers has ever read the books and works of Calvin, or has any knowledge of the doctrine of so great a doctor. Notwithstanding, they alarm the ignorant and simple with the name of Calvin.” (quoted in Neale, *History of the Holy Eastern Church*, vol. 2, 449)
“counterfeits and vagabonds,” and, claiming he would rather lose his books and even his life than go back home, “meant to turn rogue and beggar.” When news reached Cyril of Metrophanes’ lack of gratitude and respect, he was astonished, “but his affection towards him prevailed” and he made excuses for his stray sheep. A couple of years later, it was discovered Metrophanes was still in London, despite having had been sent back to Constantinople. Sir Thomas Rowe relates that despite the facts, Cyril “can hear nothing against him, that affection does not interpret for the better.” Things did not improve the following year either with Metrophanes traveling through Germany and having “many other frivolous adventures” - including attempting suicide - and Cyril holding fast to his faith in the young priest, “willingly hearing nothing against him upon whom he has set his affection.” This narrative does not reflect favorably on either of the characters, but for Lucaris in particular, his character is one who refuses to accept the truth of a situation and stubbornly dismisses facts that do not fit with his preconceived beliefs.

As for what Cyril thought about turning from one’s beliefs, there are two passages from his letters that are particularly informative. The first is an interesting anecdote that he wrote to Uytenbogeart in 1613 concerning a Coptic priest named Peter:

The Copts have a Casis amongst them, (Casis means Presbyter) called Peter. He is much in the habit of coming to visit me, and says that he knows the errors of his own religion, and finds fault

---


with them; but I do not place much reliance upon him, because, if his conscience dictated what he says with his mouth, he would no longer remain a Coptish Presbyter.\textsuperscript{234}

Here it would seem that Cyril expects defection to be the inevitable result of theological conviction, at least if dictated by conscience. Without this, he holds what Peter says with his mouth to be suspect. We are left to speculation when it comes to whether or not Lucaris ever thought differently - we have seen ample evidence that shows that he was capable of changing his mind.

**Lucaris’ Assumptions about the Catholic - Protestant Divide**

Lucaris was not presented with the best of choices of how to deal with the problems of his Church, and especially when it came to dealing with the Catholic Church that had specific plans for, and demands of, Cyril. There is a clear example in an incident recorded by Thomas Smith, in which Cannachio Rossi, a Greek successfully inculcated at Rome, approached Cyril October 26, 1625, telling him “the Pope was willing to expend considerable sums of mony to reunite the Greek Church to the Roman; [but] that they saw not how this Union could be made, if the reports which they had received of the present Patriarch were true.”\textsuperscript{235} Smith relates the list of accusations against Cyril:

[T]hat he denied the Invocation of Saints, and the worship of Images, Transubstantiation, (which they chose to express by the name of the Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament, for at that time the word was scarce known among the Greeks;) Liberty of will, Authority of the Councils and Fathers, the necessity of auricular Confession: thus drawing up a confused charge of Articles


\textsuperscript{235} Smith, An Account of the Greek Church, 259.
against him, whereof some were wholly untrue, (for no person professed a greater respect to the ancient Councils and Fathers then he;) that he sent several Young men to the Universities of England and Germany, in order to his propagating the same Doctrin all the East over; and that he distributed Catechisms amongst his Bishops full of the same Errours, in compliance with the Hugonot Embassadours.\textsuperscript{236}

But indeed, of these charges, as part II of this paper has demonstrated, “some were wholly untrue,” and most of the rest were misleading. He did take issue with the invocation of Saints, and strictly speaking the worship of images. He denied transubstantiation, but to say he denied “Real Presence” - whatever the cardinal had meant by that - would be taking his words too far. There accuracy ends. Even if we suppose Huguenot was used as a term for Calvinist, he never did get around to writing a catechism - though in all fairness he had planned to. We have no evidence of his having qualms regarding auricular confession. He only sent one priest to England, who managed to avoid learning Latin and refused to commune with the English.\textsuperscript{237} But the important thing to note was not the list of charges, but the options laid before Lucaris. The instructions Rossi had from Cardinal Bandini tells Lucaris what it is he must do in the event that these charges are false:

If, therefore, the rumors were baseless and the Patriarch was able to prove to His Holiness that he was innocent, he should so inform the French ambassador or the ambassador of the Emperor and give them strong proofs of his innocence. He should also send to His Holiness through the above ambassadors a Confession of his faith, in which he should accept the terms of the Council of Florence and condemn the errors of the Calvinists and the Lutherans; after which the Holy See would not fail to accord him its favor and to assist the Church of Constantinople in every possible way, so that it should regain its proper place among the Churches dependent on her. His Holiness would impose no other conditions either on Cyril or on the other Greek bishops, save those which had been decreed by the Council of Florence, provided the Greek Church condemned and anathematized, as she had done up to now, the blasphemies of the heretics of the North, such as the Lutherans and the Calvinists.\textsuperscript{238}

\textsuperscript{236} Smith, *An Account of the Greek Church*, 259. To this list Hadjiantoniou adds communing with the Hugenots, lifting the Synodikon, and ceasing to kneel before the eucharist.

\textsuperscript{237} Cf. Davey, *Pioneer for Unity*, 86; 91.

\textsuperscript{238} Hadjiantoniou, *The Protestant Patriarch*, 69.
This ultimatum meant the choice as presented to Lucaris was to either confirm that the charges were accurate or to submit himself and his Church to the Pope. Lucaris wanted to do neither. And neither is exactly what he did, choosing to give no answer at all. Despite in this case finding some sort of way to avoid the dichotomous options, Lucaris did have much the same framework in mind.

As we have seen, the politics in Constantinople were such that he could not remain neutral but would have to pick either the Catholics or the Protestants to be his allies. Both sides were interested in “union” with their apple of discord. Rome wanted institutional subjugation as well as overall doctrinal acquiescence. The Reformed were more interested in the latter than the former. But whichever side was selected, staying out of the West’s religious wars was impossible. It was clear the Rome “would be satisfied with nothing less than a complete surrender of Cyril and the Greek Church to Rome.” And even Lucaris’ attempts at doing nothing were assumed to be admission of guilt. As Smith tells it, Lucaris’

> [S]ilence was taken for a contempt and a refusal, which they could not brook; and therefore in the way of revenge, they stirred up some of the Bishops, whom they had made of their party, to dethrone him, and offered twenty thousand Dollers to fix one of them in his place.

The answer Lucaris arrived at to remedy this predicament was to turn to his Protestant friends for aid, which was in the form of “a Present of ten thousand Dollers” to the Turkish authorities, who then were willing to realize that the charges against Cyril were false and that there was no need to depose him and put another in his place.

---

239 Hadjiantoniou, *The Protestant Patriarch*, 70.


The Protestant/Catholic dichotomy was present in Lucaris’ mind much before this. We know for instance that he had initially thought that, aside from a few matters, the teaching of the Catholic Church was essentially the same as that of the Orthodox. As he writes to Uytenbogaert:

> There was a time, when we were bewitched, before we understood what was the very pure Word of God; and although we did not communicate with the Roman Pontiff, nor receive him for what he gave himself out, namely, the Head of the Church, yet we believed that except in some matters of little moment in which the Greek Church differs from the Latin, the dogma of the Roman Communion were true.  

And further that the opposite to this true dogma were those of the Protestants, as the quote continues “and we abominated the doctrine of the Reformed Churches as opposed to the Faith, in good truth not knowing what we abominated.” This quote shows the acceptance of the polarization of Catholic/Orthodox on the one end and Protestant on the other. When his views shifted with regards to the positioning of the Orthodox Church, it seems he kept the same categories in place, simply aligning himself and his church more Protestant than Catholic. Thus, the answer to what he began to think of as Catholic errors was Protestant theology. In fact, part of his interest in Reformed thought was that it was more than unknown in the East; from Lucaris’ perspective, it was “through the influence of the censures of Rome” that the writings of the Protestants were “never even heard of.” It seems he felt that if the Catholics were trying to suppress something, that it was worth judging for himself.

---

242 Letter to Uytenbogeart dated 10 October 1613.


And yet one should not fault Lucaris unduly for this assumption that the two main positions were Protestant and Catholic. It should be remembered that the Orthodox had not yet definitively taken a stance on many of the issues that formed the battle lines of Catholic-Protestant discourse. We are reminded here of Cyril’s complaint to George Abbot regarding the Jesuit school in Constantinople, saying that the Jesuits trusted “primarily in their show of erudition and the thorny difficulties of the questions they themselves raise,” i.e. the questions being considered are ones that are foreign to the East, being ones that the Western Churches are busy arguing over. Remember again that Cyril expressed to Uytenbogaert an initial unwillingness to weigh in on issues such as “free will, predestination, and justification; concerning which the world is not yet agreed what ought to be held.” Many Orthodox, particularly those having graduated from the Jesuit school, assumed the Catholic position to be the correct one - i.e. the Orthodox one. Lucaris had developed, if not the opposite opinion, a more nuanced one marked by Protestant sympathies. It does not seem to have occurred to

---

245 Here it must be mentioned that the questions had had some degree of previous consideration by the Orthodox, as shown in the interchange between the Lutherans at Augsburg and Jeremias II (Patriarch of Constantinople intermittently 1572-1595). General Protestant ideas, associated with Luther and other reformers as much as with Calvin, were condemned by Jeremias II in his “Reply” written 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.

246 1616 letter from Lucaris to George Abbot, in Aymon, Monumens Authentiques, 45.

247 “…de libero arbitrio, preaedestinatione, & justificatione, de quibus quid certe tenendum nondum sonstar mundo.” 1613 letter to Uytenbogeart, in Aymon, Monumens Authentiques, 160.

248 Indeed, many of the condemnations of Lucaris do so with reference to the Canons of Trent. As William Henry Dunphy puts it, one of the most influential of Lucaris’ condemners, Dositheus, was driven by the “desire to find any stick to beat the dog with—the handiest stick being the decrees of the Council of Trent.” Dunphy, “The Confession of Dositheus,” Anglican Theological Review 23, no. 3 (July 1941): 253.
Lucaris, or to many of his detractors for that matter, that Orthodox teaching need not be aligned with any western opinion.

**Lucaris’ Perception of His Protestant Proclivities**

Lucaris’ Protestant friendships predate a clear interest in their theology. When Lucaris set about his exploration of Protestant theology, one of the first things he addressed in his letters was the establishment of some ground rules. He saw after Uytenbogaert’s initial response that in order to have a meaningful conversation, they would have to agree what sort of authority could be appealed to and how they should interact with one another:

…if I am in error, you will not throw me into a seething pot, nor stretch me over live coals, nor terrify me with the torturer’s appearance. For most assuredly the catholic faith of Christ is not sustained, but miserably overthrown, by such tyranny. You will admonish me, however, as becomes a brother. And I will deal with you in like manner: the mere opinions of men we will both hold in suspicion: the words of the Scripture and the Gospel as true and infallible.249

If this sounds like overmuch of a concession, it was also likely the only one that Uytenbogaert would be likely to accept, and directly after this, Lucaris goes into a gentle admonition of, as Neale terms it, his “true presbyterian insolence”:250

As to your remark that there is no difference between us in rank, it is wisely made: for dignity can never alienate the mind of one who is sincere. Nor can a perishable thing cause its possessor to experience any excess of pride. If we are different in dignity, yet we are both mortals, both servants of God, both needing the Grace of God.251

---


250 This quote is generally thought of as an admonition, though it may seem on the surface to be a sort of acceptance of their equality. Neale remarks that as “humble and unassuming as [Cyril] was, he could not entirely pass over the cool assumption of Uytenbogaert,” i.e. that he had “placed himself on an equality with Cyril.” (Neale, 369). Beaven also agrees with this interpretation of these lines, saying “there was however one little phrase of rather an assuming character…which Cyril could not, with all his courtesy, let pass.”

Regardless of how these lines are interpreted, they set the tone for the relationship of the two men. Based on these lines, we can gather that Cyril understands their relationship to be one that had the potential to become acrimonious if they did not establish their standing with one another in acceptable terms. Later on in the same letter, he adds to what he hopes the character of his correspondence with Uytenbogaert would be, i.e. one of dispute in the mutual search for truth:

You will observe that nothing is ever written in my letters which is not dictated by reason and truth, by which I desire that everything of mine may be tried. Far be it from me, from my conscience, from my character, that truth should be either neglected, or not preferred to all other things. For the truth I dispute even with my own brethren, the Greek clergy.\(^{252}\)

From this discourse, we can assume that when Cyril embarked on his project of building relationships with Protestants, he thought what he was openly searching for the truth. It also illuminates one of the underlying assumptions made that led him towards greater acceptance of Protestant doctrine, i.e. that in his concession of allowing scripture to be the final authority, he allowed their conversation a framework that would favor Protestant conclusions. The larger point he seems to have in mind though is that they are initiating a friendly theological dispute for the sake of truth. The mention of how he disputes even with his the Greek clergy could be indicative of a number of things; perhaps he was hinting at pre-existing dissension between himself and his Church, or perhaps he was referring to his sometimes tense interactions with the Jesuit taught “Romanizers" that accounted for a number of supposedly Orthodox clergy. But in mentioning it to Uytenbogaert, he seems to be emphasizing that this is a discourse between individuals and not between Churches.

It was not long after this that the accusations started that Lucaris was overly Protestant. Indeed the first rumors started around the same time, and actually from one of those Greek clergy\(^{252}\) from a letter to Uytenbogaert, translated in Beaven, “Cyril Lucar, part I,” 252.
Lucaris mentioned disputing with, actually it was with the then-Patriarch of Constantinople, Neophytus II, and his successor Timothy I. However, these first rumors, being based more on association that anything else, did not greatly affect his reputation.\(^{253}\)

After a few more years, the scripture-based conversation led to the first truly discernible shifts towards Protestant thought and began to cause him trouble more difficult to extricate himself from. The letter to de Dominis that has been mentioned before would be a chief example that is difficult to explain away. And yet it is odd that in this 1618 letter to the Archbishop of Spalatro, that Neale understands to be the point at which the Patriarch begins to “stamp himself a thorough Genevan”\(^{254}\) should also contain Lucaris’ instance that he has committed no apostasy:

\[
\text{As if it were apostasy to obey sincerity, and liberty of conscience, and no longer to tolerate the ambition and delusions of the Roman Pontiff! As if it were apostasy to leave a doctrine founded on human dreams, and to adhere to that Orthodox Faith which exactly adheres to the word of God.}\]

This quote clearly shows Lucaris’ view on the matter. He sees himself as adhering to the Orthodox faith. The other content of the letter does indeed display congruity with Reformed thought, and even in this line, we see that he is using scripture as the benchmark of what the Church should be, touting the liberty of conscience as something to be obeyed - rather than submitting to tradition - and he even seems to be trivializing tradition as “\textit{doctrinam humanis somniis}.” Even so, one ought take Lucaris at his word, that \textit{in his mind}, he never turned his away

\(^{253}\) Timothy had spread rumors to the effect that Lucaris was Lutheran in his beliefs.


\(^{255}\) Neale, \textit{History of the Holy Eastern Church}, vol. 2, 397. This letter is unpublished, but Neale provides the full text. The Latin of the quotation given is \textit{quasi sit apostasia velle aliquem in sinceritate et libertate conscientiae deservire, neque Romanae statuae tollerare ambitiosissimis deludi mandatis; vel quasi sit apostasia, doctrinam humanis somniis ortam reliquere, et Orthodoxae, quae ad unguem verbo Dei consentit, adhaerere}. Neale, 391.
from Orthodox belief, or at least orthodox belief. The same can be seen in a letter Lucaris sent to Leger, requesting that he might testify that:

…if I die I am catholic, orthodox in the faith of our lord Jesus Christ, in doctrine, evangelical, which is in conformity with the Belgic Confession, my own confession, and other such confession of evangelical churches which are conformable. I abhor the errors of the Papists and the superstition of the Greeks. I approve and adopt the doctrine of the most worthy doctor John Calvin, and all who with him agree.256

This letter certainly spells out Lucaris’ position towards the end of his life,257 or at the very least, what opinion he wanted Leger to hold regarding him, which is a point that should be remembered. It seems that he has conflated Reformed orthodoxy with Eastern Orthodoxy. And in this quote, there is no sense of caution that characterized much of his earlier correspondence with De Wilhelm, but instead there is an overarching approval, in which any specifics that he may otherwise quibble about are of little consequence. However, this being from a fragment of a letter and therefore excised from its context, both textually within the letter and in the course of events of that last decade of his life, it is hard to put much weight on it. It is a strong statement certainly, but especially in view of how his thought evolved and did not evolve on certain issues as seen in the previous section, the full approval and adoption of Calvin’s doctrine could be something of an hyperbole. In his discourse with Leger, there may not have been much reason to be precise. As Neale has noted Cyril was close to the Dutch pastor, sharing a “very close intimacy” that is

---

256 This letter is excerpted in Hottinger’s *Analecta historico-theologica* (Zurich, 1652), 560. The original letter is not included in either Aymon or Legrand. The Latin reads: *si moriar, me Catholicum, orthodoxum in fide Domini nostri Iesu Christi, in doctrina Evangelica, quae conformis est confessioni Belgica, confessioni etiam meae, ut & aliarum Ecclesiarum Evangelicarum, quaeconformes sunt, morturum. Abhorreo ab erroribus Papistarum, & superstitionibus Graecorum. Probo & amplector doctrinam Doctorus meritissimi, Iohannis Calvini, illerumq omnium, qui cum cosentiant.*

257 The letter, not accessible in its entirety, is of unknown date. However, because it is definitely addressed to Leger (he is called by name in the following line of the letter: *Hac in re volo, Domini Legere, ut testimonium mihi perhibeas, siquidem ex sincera conscientiae, ita ego teneo, ita profiteor, & confiteor, quod & confessio mea monstrat.*), it would have to be written between the decade between 1628 and 1638.
discernible as their letters go from “short notes of business” to the interchange of books, and as Leger is mentioned in many other letters, it seems the two spent a good deal of time together.\textsuperscript{258} All to say that this quote does not necessitate the interpretation that the “approval and adoption” was a complete one.

With such caveat noted, the conclusion remains that Lucaris thought that Calvinist doctrine, at least as far as he accepted it, was actually congruent with Orthodoxy. Though his acceptance went further than warranted, he may not have realized this, or otherwise had his own ideas about what was warranted. He often refers, as he did above, to the superstitions of the Greeks as being problematic for him, and he could have come to the opinion, through Protestant arguments, that more fell into this category of spurious superstition than was absolutely appropriate. This is a common suggestion among those who have speculated what Cyril’s motivations and thought processes were. Markos Renieris, for example, suggests that “…it was possible for Cyril to believe that the Calvinistic interpretation of the texts was in accord with the spirit of his Church, and that if different interpretations and contrary practices prevailed among the Greeks, this was due to the superstition which resulted from the decline and subjugation of the nation.”\textsuperscript{259} D. S. Balanos echoes the same point: “He probably thought, in his delusion, that by his assumption of Calvinistic principles, the orthodox principles were not shaken but were only cleansed and clarified in accordance with the Gospel and that they were completed and freed from human additions.”\textsuperscript{260} In this he may have even thought that he had kept his word to Uytenbogaert that he and his Church “will never consent to those things which, although they

\textsuperscript{258} Neale, History of the Holy Eastern Church, vol. 2, 433.


have an appearance of advantage and usefulness, but are proven by experience to bring about great scandal to all Christians,” as he put it in a letter emphasizing the dangers of innovation.\footnote{Neque unquam iis consentiemus, qui et si apparenser ad aliquod beneficium atque utilitatem videantur, at magno cum totius Christianitatis scandalo ista facere, res ipsa docet. Aymon, Monumens Authentiques, 131.} This would certainly explain how he was able to sensibly cross categories that are usually not combined. Renieris’ suggestion in particular about contrary practices being ascribed to superstition is consonant with Lucaris’ understanding of what “unity” is, even back when he was corresponding with Uytenbogaert. He writes in one of his letters concerning the Orthodox of various nations:

The Greek Church is distributed into many nations - the Iberians, Colchians, Arabs, Chaldeans, Ethiopians, Egyptians, Muscovites, Russians, Bulgarians, Servians or Sclavians, Albanians, Caramanians, Walschians, Moldavians, and Greeks…All these nations persevere in the faith of Christ, obeying the Greek Church and their own rules. Nor will you observe amongst them, beyond ceremonies which vary with the country, any alteration in matter of faith. It sometimes happens that there is superstition in particular nations, arising from barbarism and ignorance, which we indulge without detriment to faith, because, on account of many different difficulties, we cannot hinder it; but in those things which relate to the essence of the faith, they preserve and continue as they received it from the beginning.\footnote{Neale, History of the Holy Eastern Church, vol. 2, 373}

The difference between this statement of Cyril’s and Renieris’ interpretation is the question of whether the indulgence of differences is to the detriment of the faith or not. At the time of his writing to Uytenbogaert, Lucaris is of the opinion that the superstitions, even those “arising from barbarism and ignorance, are to be allowed. At some point, his perspective changes to be less tolerant towards such things and reverses his opinion on the question of them being detrimental. Of course, it is unclear what exactly Cyril has in mind when he speaks of the superstitions, how much is questionable custom and how much is problematic beliefs or any sort of specifics as to what he was referring to, or if he was even referring to the same dynamics when he speaks of it
to Uytenbogaert and when it comes up later, such as in his letters to Leger. Whatever the case, it
does seem that he came to see superstition as not merely benign accretions, but as being inimical
to the faith. It also remains that such things Cyril views as being incidental accretions and not
essential to, or even derivative of, the faith. At least when he was writing to Uytenbogaert, he
attributed superstition, whatsoever he meant by that, though he seems to assume quirks of
regionality, to barbarism and ignorance. This is one of the underlying assumptions that likely
made the streamlined Christianity of the Reformed more palatable to him.

Lucaris did not seem aware that he had strayed from Orthodox thought at all. This is not
at all equivalent to Lucaris not straying, but it does speak to his state of mind. More than turning
from Orthodox belief, he thought he was uncovering it, clearing it not only of the superstition he
is concerned about, but also the Latinization that he assumes to be responsible for a great deal of
his church’s problems, not the least of which is the threat to Orthodox autonomy coming from
the Jesuits and their indoctrinated students. All of this needs to be considered when making
judgement concerning Cyril, and gives shape to one that while certainly not strictly Orthodox, is
also not strictly Calvinist.

CONCLUSION

Knowing something of the people and circumstances influencing him, the way in which
his beliefs matured, and how he understood his situation, we return to the question of how we
should understand Cyril Lucaris such that this additional information is neither overlooked nor
dismissed. Adding to the static conversation regarding Lucaris and his life, we have seen that it
would have been difficult for him to avoid Calvinist influences and that doing so would only ever
make sense in hindsight. We have seen that Reformed Christians were useful if not necessary in
Lucaris’ struggle against Latinizing forces both within and outside the Orthodox Church. We have seen the influence of these friends play out in the development of Lucaris’ beliefs, providing the books, framing the arguments, and asking the questions. We have seen Lucaris’ friendly intentions in theological dialogue, his reservations, sustained theological commitments, and attempts to find agreeable ways of expressing his faith, as well as his openness to learn from scripture-based arguments and at least partial acceptance of some Reformed theology.

While this information does not mean that Lucaris never adopted Reformed beliefs, nor does it make him into a particularly great defender of Orthodoxy, and it may be questioned if anything else needs considering if these judgements remain, but these more nuanced particulars do mean that Lucaris cannot accurately be thought of as a committed Calvinist. He was in a world with Calvinism in the air, he formed such friendships as he thought would be beneficial, he accepted that his friendships would be religiously interested and engaged in doctrinal dialogue, he worked to remedy the problems facing his church with the tools he had at hand, including those of a Reformed flavor. To categorize him as either unwaveringly Orthodox or as a crypto-Calvinist does not do him justice. Even assigning him to a more liminal status can be misleading, as it is clear that he did have serious theological and ecclesial commitments. Categorization is largely unnecessary and often unhelpful in forming a more holistic understanding. Given the considerations explored in this paper, it may be best to allow him to be undefined, humanized as a man who continually strove to do what he could for the betterment of the Church that was his charge.
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