

**IN SEARCH OF A CONFSSIONAL IDENTITY:
DOSITHEOS NOTARAS, THE PATRIARCH OF JERUSALEM (1669-1707),
CONFRONTS THE CHALLENGES OF MODERNITY**

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Christopher George Rene

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Adviser

Theofanis G. Stavrou

SEPTEMBER 2020

Acknowledgements

Without the steadfast support of my teachers, family and friends this dissertation would not have been possible, and I am pleased to have the opportunity to express my deep debt of gratitude and thank them all. I would like to thank the members of my dissertation committee, who together guided me through to the completion of this dissertation. My adviser Professor Theofanis G. Stavrou provided a resourceful outlet by helping me navigate through administrative channels and stay on course academically. Moreover, he fostered an inviting space for *parrhesia* with vigorous dialogue and intellectual tenacity on the ideas of identity, modernity, and the role of Patriarch Dositheos. It was in fact Professor Stavrou who many years ago at a Slavic conference broached the idea of an Orthodox Commonwealth that inspired other academics and myself to pursue the topic.

Professor Carla Phillips impressed upon me the significance of daily life among the people of Europe during the early modern period (1450-1800). As Professor Phillips' teaching assistant for a number of years, I witnessed lectures that animated the historical narrative and inspired students to question their own unique sense of historical continuity and discontinuities. Thank you, Professor Phillips, for such a pedagogical example. Dr. Eric Weitz encouraged me to view Martin Luther's Revolution within the broader context of German historiography, particularly its 'modernity' and the *Sonderweg*. His insightful comments and his own work on Weimar Germany and the Armenian genocide had a crucial role in shaping my appreciation for media's influence on the public. Dr. Gary Jahn contributed his insights on the attraction of hesychasm within Russia's spiritual and literary traditions, particularly the *Philokalia*. Dr. Christopher Isett contributed a great

deal of his time and advice to help with preparations for my doctoral exam; in addition, he graciously accepted to join my committee in the latter stages of my dissertation. I would also like to thank Soterios Stavrou. He sacrificed countless afternoons guiding me through the Greek sources and patiently helping with my translations.

Throughout my career at Minnesota, I was fortunate enough to receive a number of financial gifts. The Department of History supported four years of tuition assistance and living expenses by providing me with the *Albert and Virginia Wimmer Fellowship* and a program of *paedeia* through teaching assistant appointments. The Department also extended its generosity to me beyond those years when the need arose. Through the Modern Greek Studies Program I received a scholarship that allowed me to conduct research in Greece and participate in the truly ecumenical program *Students for Amity Among Nations*. In addition, the *Institute For Balkan Studies* scholarship, supported by Greece's Ministry of Culture, Education and Religious Affairs, twice offered me the experience of an immersive Greek language educational program in Thessaloniki. The *A. G. Leventis Foundation Fellowship in Hellenic Studies* granted me the opportunity to participate in *The American School of Classical Studies at Athens* (ASCSA) program for Medieval Greek hosted by the Gennadius Library in Athens, Greece. I would also especially like to thank the founders of the *Basil Laourdas Fellowship for Modern Greek Studies and Greek Slavic Relations* who offered financial support at critical moments during the writing of this dissertation.

At the time when I was contemplating beginning my graduate studies in history at the University of Minnesota, I discovered, much to my joy, that several graduate students had already been through the special program in Eastern Orthodox history and culture at

Minnesota, which, at the time, was under the leadership of Professor Theofanis G. Stavrou and the Center for Modern Greek Studies. Professor Stavrou had already established the James W. Cunningham Memorial Lecture in Orthodox History and Culture. Much to my good fortune, in 1998 Jaroslav Pelikan was invited to deliver that year's Cunningham lecture entitled "Eastern Orthodox Quest for Confessional Identity: Where Does Orthodoxy Confess What It Believes and Teaches" (subsequently published in the *Modern Greek Studies Yearbook*). During this particular visit at Minnesota, Professor Pelikan also announced a projected multi-volume work on "Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition", undertaken in collaboration with Valerie R. Hotchkiss. Published in 2003, this work has been a significant milestone in my research on the subject which gradually became the main theme of my dissertation. I am most grateful for the existence of this publication, as I am for the seminal work of several other scholars in this field. I can only hope that my work meets with their approval.

Finally, I want to thank my mother and sister for their support over the years and abiding faith in me. Panteleymon Anastasakis for being my friend from the very beginning, thank you. Dr. James Thompson, thank you for our conversations and the encouragement. And, especially, I would like to express my deepest appreciation to Karen Infield for her overabounding love, generosity, and grace.

Transliterating modern Greek remains challenging because of the variety of systems attempted by scholars through the years. This is particularly true of diphthongs and the letter "η". Similarly, many of the Greek names which appear in the dissertation vary slightly. This is especially the case with names which have been Latinized and which have a slightly different ending, such as Gennadios or Gennadius. Therefore,

instead of attempting to adopt a uniform system, I opted for an approach which, despite obvious anomalies, may still serve as a reasonable guide to the reader.

Abstract

I began my dissertation by asserting that the internet and modernity brought neither unity nor secularism, and I concluded by pointing to the Greek Revolution which resulted in the creation of a Greek nation-state and independent church. In between stood the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Dositheos, who produced a *Confession of Faith* in 1672 meant to identify, unify, and shield the Orthodox East from the Christian West. Dositheos identified the Orthodox East by blaming the Roman Catholic Church for breaking the first Ecumenical or Universal Creed from the fourth century, and thereby, forming a distinctively western, national church. Dositheos sought to unify the different orthodox communities within the Orthodox Commonwealth by means of educational reforms based on the Greek language and Greek printing press. As an apologist, he shielded the Orthodox East from western modernity by defending the sufficiency of hesychasm, a specifically eastern type of prayer, and the *Philokalic* literary tradition, which was a collection of writings by those hesychast practitioners. As a confessor, Dositheos' quest for an Orthodox universalism was paradoxical because he sought to unify the East by dividing it from the West. This tension between unity and particularism explains why Norman Russell stated that Dositheos' "...anti-Westernism was the product of a profound conviction in Orthodoxy's ecumenicity." In other words, Dositheos rejected union with the West in favor of his desire for a unique Eastern Orthodox universalism within the tradition established by the Ecumenical or Universal Creeds.

My analysis of Dositheos as a confessor offers a fresh historical account for this paradoxical phenomenon—that is, namely, unity through division. By convention, historians have limited the category of the confessor within a confessional box where the

priest absolves the confessed sin of the parishioner. The confessor did indeed perform the priestly role of absolving sin. The personification of the confessor, however, as a celebrated living martyr of early church state persecutions, was appropriated in the fourth century and denatured into a common trope for rhetorical and performative purposes at the first Ecumenical or Universal Council. The propagated tale of the confessor served the role in a conciliar narrative (i.e., a public council for ‘truth and reconciliation’) designed for achieving a public orthodoxy—the irenic ideology of one church. To the confessor was entrusted the call for unity—the schema. Thus, amidst the Constantinian shift to one God, one empire, one emperor stood the confessor who spoke the schema accordingly, and an audience who heard the *shema*. As a spokesperson or public representative of orthodoxy, the confessor’s schema was a call to orthodox unity, and in the confessor’s tale that call ended formal debate. For the audience the confessor’s schema was meant to be heard as a *shema*—a creed to be believed and obeyed. This theatrical or conciliar platform for shaping public opinion or *ortho-doxa* (correct opinion) not only staged the positions and determined the roles of the speaker and audience, but also framed the articulation of that intercourse between speech and silence as orthodoxy and heterodoxy, as unity and division.

In the early modern period, influenced by the impact of the print revolution on public media, the confessor’s strategy was laid bare. The frequent reproduction and dissemination of confessions of faith unfolded before the public, its readers, and translators a common pattern or habit of speech that accompanied the call for unity—the schema. Jaroslav Pelikan identified a rotating triangle pointed by the categories of believing, teaching, and confessing. In response to the question of what a group believed

were presented articles of faith; when inquired about what they taught they pointed to their catechism; and, when asked what they confessed they spoke in carefully constructed and laconic creedal language. The three volume set of *Creeds and Confessions* collected and translated by Pelikan and Hotchkiss are a testament to the documented and textual records of this confessional tradition, whereby a community confessed its unity, identified with that symbol, and universalized one creed through division. This dissertation does not delve into particular denominational theologies; rather, it proceeds through a diachronic analysis of confessionalism, it demarcates the confessor's rhetoric, collective identity, and the schematic act of believing that symbol of unity—the creed of one people.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|---------|
| Acknowledgements | i-iv |
| Abstract | v-vii |
| Introduction: Narratives and More Narratives | 1-18 |
| Chapter I: The Making of a Patriarch: A Biographical Sketch of Dositheos | 19-24 |
| Chapter II: Dealing with the Western Confessions | 25-58 |
| Chapter III: The Sixteenth Century Revolutions and Its German Confessor | 59-85 |
| Chapter IV: Confessional Geography Beyond Borders | 86-120 |
| Chapter V: Dositheos and His Universe | 121-160 |
| Chapter VI: Rethinking the Byzantine Commonwealth and its Sequels? | 161-207 |
| Chapter VII: A Perennial Addition: the <i>Filioque</i> | 208-254 |
| Conclusion | 255-275 |
| Endnotes | 276-301 |
| Bibliography | 302-321 |

Introduction

Narratives and More Narratives

The internet did not bring about unity, as some had hoped, and modernity did not lead to the triumph of secularism, as others had feared. Both sectarianism and religion remain dominant features within our current political discourse, digitized media, peripatetic youtubers, their financial patrons, devoted subscribers, and facebook followers. What we mean by the term ‘modernity’ fails to provide us with any predictive assurances. For as Leszek Kolakowski once argued in *Modernity on Endless Trial*, “Having no clear idea what *modernity* is, [scholars] have recently tried to escape forward from the issue by talking about *postmodernity*...”¹ The field of early modern European studies became an area of specialization in response to the unclear lines between modernity and pre-modernity. In the more conventional field of religious studies the sixteenth century Protestant Revolution was the preferred historical marker for an emerging modernity, but the later eighteenth century French Revolution remains at the forefront in studies on nationalism, the modern ‘enlightened’ European order of nation-states. This dissertation’s focus is the liminal or in between space of the seventeenth century. The central historical figure is the Greek patriarch of Jerusalem, Dositheos Notaras (1641-1707), a confessor who confronted the challenges of modernity as it began to manifest itself during his life and long hierarchical career.

Early modernity in the seventeenth century displayed a discourse similar to our own, when, after the invention of Gutenberg’s press in the fifteenth century, the public sphere became more crowded with book sellers, pamphleteering, wandering preachers,

publicized debates, confessional celebrities and confessional subscribers. This crowded public sphere was Dositheos' modernity. Modernity for him resembled the mythological many-headed hydra with its regenerating heterodoxies and multiplying divisions.

Dositheos sought to forge one orthodoxy and one vision of unity from the chaos caused by this mythical beast he feared was modernity. As a confessor, Dositheos recognized that his universe stood in a crisis of collective belief, identity, and unity. Dositheos provided a strategic response to a 'modern' problem that could only be resolved in the public sphere. For this purpose Dositheos published his *Confession of Faith* in 1672 on behalf of, as he wrote, "the Greeks" and "the Eastern Church."

The word confession in the Greek means 'to say the same thing' from the root *omo* (same) and *logos* (speech or word). Collective confession is a monotheistic way of speaking in the public sphere as opposed to the example of an individual confession between a priest and parishioner. The word faith in the Greek *pisti* means 'belief.' Together, a *Confession of Faith* expressed the collective act of believing something. It is to say the same thing collectively about a belief, concerning an article of faith, or regarding a matter of public opinion. The first *Confession of Faith* in recorded history comes from the book of *Deuteronomy*. When Moses descended from Mt. Sinai he declared to the freed slaves in the desert, "Hear, the Lord your God is one." The entire phrase came to be known as the *shema*, the Hebrew word for hear.

The *shema* was declared again in the *Gospel of Mark* by Jesus in reply to the question: "What is the greatest commandment?" He answered, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one." Whereas, Moses used the second-person plural possessive "...your God is one," Jesus responded with the first person, plural possessive "...our God is one." The

monotheistic *shema* of the former slaves of Egypt had become a *schema* that expressed the collective identity of one people—the Israelites.

Not unlike the Hebrew *shema*, the Greek *schema* was a monotheistic model of speaking and a call for unity. Amid sectarian strife and competing communities of believers (as depicted throughout the New Testament sources), the formation of collective identity through a *Confession of Faith* said in the first person plural pronoun: “This is what we believe.” The *schema* within a *Confession of Faith* declared: “This is who we are.” In other words, A *Confession of Faith* symbolized the proclamation of a unity that was based on and sustained by the collective and schematic act of believing in a confessed identity—the vocalized creed of one people.

In what sense then did Dositheos’ *Confession of Faith* in 1672 represent ‘the Greeks’ and ‘the Eastern Church’? What did it mean to be Greek in the seventeenth century? The latter phrase ‘the Eastern Church’ vaguely distinguished it from the Western Church; and, likewise, ‘the Greeks’ were juxtaposed with the equally broad designation ‘the Latins.’ Specifically, however, Dositheos harkened back to an inclusive notion of Greek identity that had not yet fully disappeared within the Orthodox Commonwealth until the later modern eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

After culmination of the Ottoman conquest with the capture of Constantinople in 1453, the succeeding Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople at the time, George Scholarios, presented a *Confession of Faith* to Sultan Mehmed II. In this *Confession* Scholarios used the word *Hellene* (Greek) to mean an inclusive *ecumene* or commonwealth, on par with the multiethnic designation Roman. In the post-Byzantine

era this inclusive Greek identity continued under the Ottoman millet system of governance that appointed the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople as the political representative head, the national ruler or *ethnarch*, of the Orthodox people. In the seventeenth century this religious emphasis of Greek identity remained, especially within the Danubian Principalities. There, on the frontier borders of the Orthodox Commonwealth, Greek identity was ideologically and practically synonymous with Orthodox identity. Dimitris Livanios' study on religion, nationalism, and collective identities in Greece during this period concluded, "It was this multi-ethnic and polyglot community that, together with the Orthodox Greek speakers, comprised the community of the patriarchate's flock, the *genos*." Greek identity had not yet become its later nationalized or imagined racial constructs.²

Nonetheless, this idyllic sense of Greek inclusivity must be balanced by conflicting realities that were the result of early modern pressures and a media-induced increasingly sectarian climate of the seventeenth century. For example, in the Danubian Principalities Greek was not only the *lingua franca*, but also demarcated the cultured merchant classes and higher clergy from the peasants and laity. There existed class differentials that made hellenization necessary for social mobility and cultural capital. These class distinctions became points of conflict and resistance by the 'native' or local boyars of Wallachia and Moldavia against their Ottoman appointed *hospodar* or rulers, the later eighteenth century Greek Phanariots of Constantinople. The Balkan historian Victor Roudometof insisted that in the seventeenth century "...Greeks, Albanians, Bulgarians, Serbs, and Romanians were *ethni* [nations] in the Ottoman Balkans and were clearly aware of their differences..."³ By the eighteenth century, each *ethnos* possessed

their own martyrs and confessors; by the nineteenth century, they were celebrated as national heroes.

Both Livianos' thesis of Greek inclusivity and Roudometof's *ethni* counter-thesis agree, however, that from the perspective and imagination of Balkan 'natives' and Greeks abroad "...Jerusalem was, in a sense, a much closer land than Athens."⁴ As the patriarch of Jerusalem from 1669 until his death in 1707, Dositheos was intimately aware of Jerusalem's symbolic value and its borderless, religious appeal. It was the site of holy pilgrimage by visitors throughout the Orthodox Commonwealth; but, more importantly, Jerusalem symbolized a nostalgic sense of a universal origin and the desire for a return there. The iconic status of Jerusalem helped make successful Dositheos' financial campaign abroad in the Danubian Principalities where he spent most of his ecclesiastical tenure. He had hoped that the symbolic importance of Jerusalem would also make his *Confession of Faith* (1672) an appealing call to unity and inclusive identity for those *ethni* inhabiting the frontier regions of the Orthodox Commonwealth. His schema beseeched them to subscribe to, as he expressed it himself, "...the universal religion of the orthodox Christians, the one on the basis of Constantine...one purpose...one faith, and real love, to maintain the same opinion and religion concerning God, the creator of all." What Dositheos meant by 'the Greeks' in his *Confession of Faith*, therefore, included all people within the Orthodox Commonwealth.

Dositheos' schema was the last *Confession of Faith* from the early modern period before the dawn of modern nationalism. In 1830 the Kingdom of Greece became the first nation-state of Western Europe. Greek independence from the Ottoman Empire began in 1821 with a series of revolts and rebellions, the first of which started in the Danubian

Principalities and included Greeks, Albanians, Bulgarians, Serbs, and Romanians. The embers of revolt had been stoked by centuries of heavy taxation and local grievances against the Ottoman Empire. In this new ‘enlightened’ era, however, Greek independence was inspired by the French Revolution of 1789 and enchanted by its *Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen*. In addition, a widening, media-driven, public sphere amplified the French revolutionary chant, the drumbeat of three words: liberty, equality, and fraternity. It reverberated beyond its French borders and became a slogan of exhortation. It rallied those world-wide who heard the French schema, understood its triune doctrine, and took action—united under the banner of a common creed. In 1791, the success of the great Haitian slave revolution in overthrowing its French colonialist also inspired Greek independence with a transubstantiated example of the words liberty, equality, and fraternity made real.

The call for unity and Greek independence was voiced by the poet, early martyr, and author of Greece’s “Patriotic Hymn”, Rigas Velestinlis. He envisioned a sovereign people, an inclusive citizenship of “Bulgarians, Albanians, Armenians, and Greeks, blacks and whites...,” the abolition of slavery, and equality for all—limited, however, only to those residing within Greece’s new borders.⁵ The addition of borders by Velestinlis, here, cannot be underestimated. Its historical significance to the modern schema was equal to the impact of the *filioque* on the union between Eastern and Western Christianity.

Starting in 1822, the first iterations of a Greek constitution circumscribed citizenship to those inhabitants within the territorial boundaries of the Greek nation-state and added the further requirement that they believe in Jesus Christ. The external borders

had become internal barriers that excluded Muslims, Jews, and other minorities. Assimilation or hellenization by conversion was the only path to Greek citizenship offered to them. Confining Greek identity within state borders, however, also excluded Greek Orthodox believers of the Diaspora from participation in the rights of Greek citizenship. Their exclusion energized the later irredentist campaign—The Megali Idea—to expand Greece’s borders. Later modern twentieth century alterations of the Greek constitution removed the mandate for religious conversion, but emphasized Greek ethnicity and the requirement to be of “Greek descent,” however discursively interpreted and ill-defined that was.

The identification of Greeks in the new nation-state relied heavily on borders and ethnicity—it did not reflect Dositheos’ sense of a borderless, inclusive Greek identity. Nevertheless, Dositheos’ schema did exclude Catholics, Protestants, and fellow Greeks within the Orthodox Commonwealth he judged to be too ‘westernized.’ Furthermore, in contrast to the idyllic ‘universalism’ that Jerusalem symbolized, the reality of Greek ascendancy within the Jerusalem Patriarchate reduced the native Arab Orthodox inhabitants of Palestine to an underclass. Dositheos’ tenure as the Patriarch of Jerusalem (1669-1707) marked the beginning of a second Greek ‘Peloponnesian’ dynasty, when he passed the prestigious office down to his nephew Chrysanthos. The result of this Greek xenocracy was cogently summarized by Constantin A. Panchenko as “...a few hundred Greeks at the top of the Church of Jerusalem and the tens of thousands of Arab Orthodox of Palestine.”⁶

The example of Greek rebellions in the 1820s and the establishment of a Greek nation-state set a precedent followed by other west European communities who heard of its successes. The Vienna treaty of 1815, that legitimated dynastic rule and updated the older Westphalian European order of 1648, could not prevent the European Revolutions of 1848. They were unable to censor an expanding public sphere of printers, pamphleteering, and other media outlets from publishing the *Communist Manifesto* that same year. This was the revolutionary origins of the new European order of nation-states, whose national identities were transcribed into constitutions and defined by borders and ethnicity.

Nevertheless, the great Haitian slave revolution of 1791 made headline news and galvanized an international community of mostly British and North Americans to take action, united by one purpose and creed: the abolition of slavery and the belief that all men were created free. That schema transcended the limitations of national citizenship, borders, and ethnicity. It also presaged the twentieth century modern concept of human rights. Human rights became creedal in 1948 with the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, thirty articles of faith, proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly, confessed on behalf of all people. Britain abolished the slave trade in 1807 (on the heels of the Somerset case of 1772) within its borders. Three years later William Blake penned his famous poem that he entitled "Jerusalem." Blake exhorted the "freeborn Englishman" to protest the modern system of industrial slave labor for slave wages: "Till we have built Jerusalem, in Englands green and pleasant Land."⁷

In America the Civil War between the Union North and Confederate South over the issue of slavery ended in 1865. It took another century before the former slaves were

granted the full rights of United States citizenship. Four years after the televised signing of the Civil Rights act of 1964 by President Johnson with Martin Luther King standing beside him, the civil rights leader was assassinated. The ensuing riots of 1968 that occurred in response to King's assassination were unprecedented. Audiences throughout America witnessed the destruction of property, violence, and fires that were also broadcast on live TV in black and white. Two decades later the racial divide in the United States erupted again in 1992 after the public release of a VHS taped recording that captured Rodney King's beating by Los Angeles police on 18.7 x 10.2 x 2.5 cm film. The LA riots were broadcast in color. The era from 1865 to 1968 roughly encompassed the history of the modern period in the United States. The LA riots of 1992 occurred during its transition to post-modernity.

Approximately two decades later, again, the killing of Micheal Brown by a Missouri Policeman in 2014, the court trial, the officer's acquittal, and the Ferguson riots were publicized in the age of the internet. Less than a decade after that, multiple cell phones and digital recordings shared, via packets of data traveling across almost an infinite number of IP networks, the murder of George Floyd by a Minnesota Police officer in 2020 and, once again, they helped ignit an unprecedented level of riots in Minneapolis, throughout the United States, and the world. The twitter hashtag Black Lives Matter was a proclamation movement, and the acronym BLM became an exhortative slogan. Non subscribers to BLM retorted with the schema All Lives Matter. A similar *ars dialectica* between BLM and ALM emerged when advocates for a new Black self-identity based it on the ability to trace one's lineage to Black American slavery. The American Decedents of Slavery or #ADOS wanted to distinguish themselves

from Black immigrants to America. Defendants for an inclusive sense of Black identity responded with the schema All Black Lives Matter. In addition, Pan-Africanists expressed the more traditional perspective and argued for a Black identity not limited by American borders—and intersectionalists added Black trans to complete the chiasm.

Confessionalism is not only pre-modern, but also post-modern. Without language the perennial act of confessing would not exist. Collective confession transcends borders and ethnicity by making collective identity a matter of belief—the creed of a people united by belief. In the early modern period, influenced by the impact of the print revolution on public media, the confessor’s strategy was laid bare. The frequent reproduction and dissemination of confessions of faith unfolded before the public, its readers, and translators a common pattern or habit of speech that accompanied the call for unity—the schema. Jaroslav Pelikan identified a rotating triangle pointed by the categories of believing, teaching, and confessing. In response to the question of what a group believed were presented articles of faith; when inquired about what they taught they pointed to their catechism; and, when asked what they confessed they spoke in carefully constructed and laconic creedal language. The three volume set of *Creeds and Confessions* collected and translated by Pelikan and Hotchkiss are a testament to the documented and textual records of this confessional tradition, whereby a community confessed its unity, identified with that symbol, and universalized one creed through division. This dissertation does not delve into particular denominational theologies; rather, it proceeds through a diachronic analysis of confessionalism, it demarcates the confessor’s rhetoric, collective identity, and the schematic act of believing that symbol of

unity—the creed of one people. Confessional identity and unity both divide and arise from division.

My confessional analysis is reflected in the categories of the Eucharistic miracle, mystery as *logos* (speech and words), and authority. The first category highlights the Eucharistic miracle as a central feature of unity. The Eucharistic miracle is the object of unity for a people, not unlike the heavenly manna or food that miraculously appeared and feed the freed Israelites in the desert, as told in the book of Exodus. In Aramaic, manna means ‘What is it?’ The second category, mystery as *logos*, emphasizes the words and speech in conversation with mystery and reason over the symbol of unity, the Eucharistic miracle, the manna of freed slaves. The third category, authority, affirms the importance of initiation as *praxis* and teachers as authorities on *doxa* or public opinion. Again, Dositheos’ schema—the call for unity—as he expressed it himself “...[was] the universal religion of the orthodox Christians, the one on the basis of Constantine... one purpose...one faith, and real love, to maintain the same opinion and religion concerning God, the creator of all.”

This ecumenical worldview, of course, had to contend not only with the West, but also against internal divisions. Consequently, Dositheos frequently employed a strategy of mystification in the managing or economizing of belief by appealing to the limitations of reason. In addition, Dositheos often emphasized the authority of the teaching office, calling upon his opponents to be silent, listeners, and students of the *logos*. He asserted that both his western opponents and the Orthodox East required “...learned and divine men to search out [the] true meaning...” By calling for unity to one purpose, faith, and

real love; by employing a strategy of mystification; by appealing to the teaching office; and, by all accounts—Dositheos was a confessor.

In the East, Dositheos confronted an arena already divided. The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was steeped in ‘Reformation,’ flooded with competing schools, and divided among Uniate Orthodox, Russophile Raskolniks, and Grecophiles. Dositheos attempted to reinforce the Greek Church as the teaching authority there by commissioning the Leichoudes brothers and the establishment of a Greek school and printing press. The multi-confessional territory of Transylvania was a hot bed for confessional rhetoric as demonstrated by its public debates, mass conversions, and religious reforms. The Romanian Orthodox there were under pressure to unite with Calvinism, and the Greek community in Sibiu reached out to Dositheos who in response published a *Manual against the Calvinist Madness* in 1690. In France, once again, the Eucharist took center stage when the French Catholic Jansenists and Calvinists involved not only the Orthodox East but also England in a truly international affair of diplomacy, conciliarism, and confession. Also, the scandal caused by rumors that the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, Cyril Loukaris, had converted to Protestant compelled Dositheos to gather evidence and make a public defense on behalf of Loukaris and the Greek Church’s reputation—this resulted in Dositheos publishing *The Shield of Orthodoxy* (1672).

Finally, the Jesuits, and particularly Jesuit theater, were indicative of early modernity’s advanced techniques of persuasion and their didactic intent. The Jesuit propagandist book entitled the *Targa* or the Shield was translated into vernacular Greek and staged as a dialogue between a priest and a bishop. Dositheos responded by

publishing Symeon's *Dialogue Against the Heretics* in 1682. But, more importantly, he collected the works of Greek writers and hesychasts into a three volume set:

Reconciliation (1694), *Love* (1698), and *Joy* (1705). These should be considered part of Dositheos' larger project to proclaim from Mt. Athos an inclusive identity based on an Athonite Commonwealth with Hesychasm as its confessional identity. Once again, this was Dositheos' call to unity: one purpose, one faith, and real love.

Hesychasm's roots extend back into the thirteenth century with a lineage of spiritual practitioners and teachers beginning with Gregory of Cyprus (d. 1290), Theoleptus of Philadelphia (1250-1326) and Gregory Palamas. Dositheos collected and published their works in the aforementioned three volume set, along with fourteenth century conciliar decrees on behalf of hesychasm. During the Byzantine Commonwealth hesychasm had become international since its early missionary activity spread far out into the Danubian Principalities and beyond; during the post-Byzantine period of the Orthodox Commonwealth, hesychasm's fame nonetheless had waned. Because of Dositheos' publication of hesychast works, he preserved and inspired a rebirth of interest in hesychasm, which eventually led to the famously beloved spiritual texts of the *Philokalia*.

The final chapter explains Dositheos' quest for a confessional identity based on the paradoxical process of confessional unity through division. In that process, Dositheos narrated the creation of the West against the schema of one empire, one Church, and one people. The chapter begins with Dositheos' printing activities in the Danubian Principalities where he published a series of anti-Catholic works in 1682. Dositheos' effulgent preface addressed the Danubian princes as "the rays of the sun," "radiance

[itself],” and the descendants of “Elijah.” In 1685 he also published a short devotional on the martyrs Sergius and Bacchus. In this preface, however, Dositheos evoked the schema of one people. To the prince he wrote “... [you were] born of those ancient divinely respected kings...chosen...united with Solomon and his famous race [*genos*]...” In a preface from 1690 to “orthodox readers” Dositheos complained that the West “...compare us with other nations [*ethni*] even with the Jews.” In contrasting the orthodox nation to the Jews, Dositheos made a political distinction between the orthodox nation, who once had the Byzantine state, and the Jews, who had no state. Writing a decade before the turn of the eighteenth century, Dositheos, too, was cognizant of Roudometof’s thesis of national [*ethni*] differences. More often than not, however, Dositheos favored the schematic use of an inclusive race [*genos*] and the races [*ta geni*] over the synonym nation [*ethnos*] and the nations [*ethni*].

Dositheos was nostalgic for the return of a golden era of peace and calm, when the ancient Greeks and Latins of antiquity—those aforementioned broad categories used to designate ‘the Greeks’ from ‘the Latins’—worked together as one church in perfect symphony with the seven ecumenical or universal Councils from 325 to 787. Although Dositheos’ enchanted vision of the past glossed over the actual social disarray that prompted such extravagant councils, Dositheos confidently asserted that the Latin addition to the Ecumenical Creed—the infamous *filioque*—was “an alien and foreign idea.” The eighth century coronation of Charlemagne as king of the Franks confirmed for Dositheos the West’s final break from the imperial church and the creation of a Roman national church separated from the *Ecumene* or the Universal (with a capital U). Dositheos wrote that the rupture resulted in “... the disappearance of the race [*genos*] of

orthodox Christians like a common plague within the ecumenical church.” Here, race identified one people and the symbol of unity—the Ecumenical Creed—was manna, the Eucharistic miracle.

In that same preface, Dositheos emphasized the importance of the Greek language “...which had always been to all the races [*ta geni*] a sign of great boasting...” Here, Dositheos employed a schema: All the races. For identifying the difference between the Eastern and Western Church, Dositheos used the first person plural possessive and wrote, “[Greek] will help our race [*genos*]...” This echoed the Israelite schema of Mark’s confessor as told in the New Testament Gospel. To the Orthodox Romanians, however, Dositheos employed the use of Greek as a foreign language, unknown by the Orthodox Romanians. He wrote that it was important for the protection of “...the dogmas, the mysteries, and the traditions of the Orthodox Church.” Orthodox Romanians themselves were suspicious that such a teaching served only to foster ignorance among the Romanians and deference to the Greeks. It was also like that for Palestinian Arabs studying at the Jerusalem Patriarchal schools. Dositheos had titled his *Confession* of 1672, as a statement of faith on behalf of “the Greeks” and “The Eastern Church.” This doublet artlessly reflected Dositheos’ belief in an inclusive sense of ‘Greekness’ and a ‘universal’ vision of Greek Orthodoxy, a new Jerusalem. Thus, Greeks and the Eastern Church were one body, one people. Nevertheless, it was only the Orthodox Romanians within the Athonite Commonwealth who did not acquire a representative monastery on Mt. Athos, despite their princes’ generous donations, until the middle of the modern nineteenth century.

Hesychasm or the practice of spiritual prayer by the monks of Mt. Athos had lain dormant for many decades until 1750. In 1754, Mt. Athos was the bellicose scene of protesting Kollyvades monks over the issue of the Eucharist. Two of its leaders, Makarios Notaras and Nicodemos Kallivroutes, were responsible for the collection and editing of the *Philokalia*, the literary tradition of writings by hesychast practitioners. Another leader of the Kollyvades protests, Neophytos Kafsokalyvitis, was the first director of the new Athonite academy founded in 1749 on Mt. Athos. One of its most famous students, hesychast missionaries, and charismatic preachers, was Kosmas of Aetolia. The celebrated Kosmas echoed Dositheos' refrain on the importance of the Greek language. Kosmas exhorted his audience "... [to] learn Greek because our Church uses Greek. And if you don't learn Greek, my brethren, you can't understand what our Church confesses... This is why you must establish Greek schools, so that people will be enlightened... I found that [Greek] enlightens and illuminates the mind of the student as the sun illuminates the earth."

In conclusion, Yannaras and Bouboutsis—the conservative and progressive scholars on Greek identity—although appearing to represent opposite worldviews, they both employ the confessor's rhetoric. Both scholars invoke a schema in their call for unity and one people. Both of their schemas begin with a miracle—manna (the object of unity for one people), veiled in mystery, and experienced through initiation. For Yannaras, the schema was "the real Hellenism" wherein all things are one and nothing created. Bouboutsis' schema for one peoplehood points to "the Greek miracle"—what he refers to as a transcultural and transnational *ethnogenesis*, which literally translated means birth of a nation. The presence of this meta peoplehood, Bouboutsis admits, is

difficult to locate in space and time since it is always in a state of transubstantiation or change. In fact Bouboutsis asserts that unveiling its real presence requires a missionary focus "...to translate the enigmatic voice of the East into intelligible *logos*." This missionary imperative was also catechetical and necessitated, as he wrote, "... [an] openness in learning."

In the final analysis, the politico-religious ecumenical program of both Yannaras and Bouboutsis offer a schema within the creedal tradition—that is, the call for unity found in identity. Whether through Yannaras' 'the real Hellenism' or Bouboutsis' 'transcultural and transnational *ethnogenesis*' they both called for unity and schematized a way of seeing the Eucharistic body, a people, and asking the aporetic or puzzling Eucharistic Question 'What is real?' and answering demonstrably, audibly, and intelligibly with speech and words (*logos*). Garth Fowden, the historian who brought attention to the mission of Constantine's one God, one empire, one emperor, gives an excellent example of a confessional approach to the historical identity of Hellenism. He stated that Hellenism was "...not [a] myth that explains but revelation that exhorts, speaking directly through a charismatic prophet to a human condition that is the victim of circumstance as well as history's one constant."⁸ That is the speech of a confessor calling for unity. That is a monotheistic way of speaking.

While the confessor is more than a priest, there is a central 'pastoral question' that the confessor asks us: What do we collectively believe about the origins of that incarnated body—a people, its manifestation in time, and its created or uncreated/meta reality in the present? It was and remains today the public role of the confessor to maintain a narrative of unity and collective identity on behalf of the body and its

demonstrable historical and present existence. Confession describes the formation of collective identity through speech, but the confessor for a group of believers uses the schema for an inclusive identity that unites the competing visions for unity within the group into a community of believers with one confession of faith. From the perspective of a confessional analysis, the specificities of the central question are not as important as its framing. When the art of dialectics becomes exhaustive, and the perplexity remains, there is only the aporetic or puzzling question, 'What is to be believed?' Yet, the confessional framework asks more persuasively 'What do you believe?' and even more directly 'Do you believe?' The confession of faith answers demonstrably: 'This is what we believe.' The schema declares: 'This is who we are.' The creed unified belief and identity for all its people and subscribers.

Chapter I

The Making of a Patriarch: A Biographical Sketch of Dositheos

Little is known about Dositheos' very early life, only that he was born on 31 May, 1641, and was orphaned at the age of eight. He came from the famous Byzantine merchants of the Notaras family located in the capital city of Istanbul, who originated from the region of the Peloponnese. His father, Nicholas Skarpetos, conducted a trading business from Istanbul, but in his homeland of Corinth the family's wealth and status helped establish close ties with the ecclesiastical life and institutions of the Greek Church after two centuries of Ottoman rule. In 1652 at the age of eleven Dositheos entered the monastery of the Holy Apostles in Corinth. Five years afterwards he was ordained a deacon in the Greek Orthodox Church. By 1666, Dositheos was the metropolitan bishop of Caesarea—at the non-canonical age of twenty-five—and destined to assume the patriarchal throne of Jerusalem in 1669.

The paucity of details regarding Dositheos' early life was interpreted favorably by his earliest biographer and successor to the patriarchal throne of Jerusalem, Chrysanthos: “He was raised to be a patriarch of the Holy City of Jerusalem... He was predestined and appointed by Christ to be a shepherd and teacher, according to the will and sign of the most holy and almighty Spirit of all the holy Churches, and of the godly and orthodox Christians.”⁹

From Dositheos' time among the monks of the Holy Apostles monastery, Dositheos' grandfather Germanos (a monk) and his godfather George Goulanos (a metropolitan bishop of Corinth) introduced him to the ecclesiastical circles of the

Orthodox Churches in Greece, Istanbul, the Balkans, and Jerusalem. The early educational formation of Dositheos can only be a matter of speculation based upon his residency and upbringing within the monastic life. Once ordained a young deacon, however, Dositheos' early training afforded him the opportunity to attend the ecclesiastical schools of learning in the Phanar section of Istanbul and at the Metropolitan of Athens in Greece, and first-hand experience and instruction on the state of holy pilgrimage in the Holy Places of Jerusalem.

In 1657, five years after Dositheos was ordained a deacon, the patriarch of Jerusalem at the time Paisios (1645-1660) took over Dositheos' educational training from the care of Goulanos and Germanos for further preparation of the young deacon into the ecclesiastical ministry. For three years Dositheos accompanied Patriarch Paisios on extended journeys throughout the Ottoman Empire seeking financial support on behalf of the Holy Places of Jerusalem. Under Paisios' mentorship, Dositheos was groomed for the role of traveling orthodox hierarchs and ethnarchs.

After Dositheos' mentor Patriarch Paisios passed away in 1660, Dositheos attended the election of his successor—Patriarch Nectarios (1660-1669)—in front of the Constantinopolitan synod gathered in the Phanar Quarter of Istanbul, the Greek inhabited section of the Ottoman Capital and location of the Orthodox Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople . By this time, the Greek Brotherhood of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem, a fraternity of laymen, monks, and clergy, were bound by similar interests in connections with the Phanar Metochion located in Constantinople, the ecclesiastical embassy of the Jerusalem Patriarchate and the Holy Places of pilgrimage.

In 1666 Dositheos accompanied the new Patriarch Nectarios on a visit to Jerusalem. They surveyed the needs of the Holy Sepulcher and monasteries of the Greek Brotherhood and assessed the dire financial state of the Jerusalem Patriarchate. Since the twelfth century, the Jerusalem Patriarchate had contended financially and politically with the Latins and Armenians over the Holy Places in Jerusalem. With the overthrow of the Mameluks by the Ottomans in the sixteenth century, the Greek Jerusalem Patriarchate faced a more crowded arena in contention for 'sacred real estate' with the presence of Franks, Copts, Armenians, Nestorians, Jacobites, and Maronites. The often violent conflict among the competing confessions over property and worship rights in Jerusalem proved an overwhelming expenditure in the Ottoman court system. By 1662, the enormous debts of the Jerusalem Patriarchate threatened their maintenance of and access to the Holy Places, especially their privileges regarding the Holy Sepulcher.

From Jerusalem Dositheos and Patriarch Nectarios sailed to the Danubian Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia in order to petition for funds on behalf of the Greek Brotherhood of Jerusalem. On their return voyage to Jerusalem in 1666 they passed through Constantinople where Nectarios himself ordained Dositheos, who was twenty-five years of age at the time, the Metropolitan of Caesarea. This essentially honorific title for Dositheos made sure that Nectarios' chosen successor would assume the patriarchal throne of Jerusalem, just as Patriarch Germanos (1537-1579) had done for his successor Sophronios (1579-1608).

After serving as Nectarios' legate for the collection of funds abroad (chiefly in the Danubian Principalities), Dositheos returned to Constantinople in 1668 where he met with Patriarch Nectarios privately. Dositheos himself provides the general topic of their

discussion when Nectarios confessed to him the reasons for his voluntary resignation from the patriarchal throne of Jerusalem. Among the most important reasons, Dositheos wrote, “[Nectarios] revealed to me [while] in Constantinople saying, ‘I [resign] of my own will, seeing this most blessed house [*ecos*] being always under attack in various and idolatrous ways by many enemies...for there is always scandal.’”¹⁰ Dositheos advised him that his next selection for the patriarchal seat “... [should not] be a foreign [*exothern*] man and from another region...for the brothers [would not accept it].”¹¹ Upon Nectarios’ resignation, the decision was made to send Dositheos to the Ottoman Sultan in order to obtain the necessary permission for the Greek Brotherhood to elect Dositheos the new patriarch of Jerusalem. In 1669 at the age of twenty-eight Dositheos was chosen by a synod gathered in the Phanar Quarter and overseen by the Constantinopolitan Ecumenical patriarchate. In return Dositheos appointed the frail Nectarios as church warden over the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem.

Dositheos’ ecclesiastical responsibilities—the protection of the Holy Places, the reorganization of the Brotherhood, and the maintenance of close relations with the metochia (ie. the ecclesiastical embassies of the Jerusalem Patriarchate) in Istanbul and the Danubian Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia—extended beyond the boundaries of Jerusalem. His official ecclesiastical title was: Patriarch of the Holy City of Jerusalem and all Palestine, Syria, Arabia, of the present [day] Jordan, Cana of Galilee and Holy Zion, with all the Holy Pilgrimage. Nonetheless, in Dositheos’ more personal letters, he preferred more reserved titles such as ‘Dositheos’ or ‘Patriarch of Jerusalem and Palestine.’

Certain members of the Greek Brotherhood were appointed by Dositheos himself and sent out to regions far beyond Jerusalem for the collection of charitable funds. Under Dositheos, the Jerusalem Patriarchate was largely successful in reducing its enormous debts. Most of the financial assistance came from the distant Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia and on a smaller scale from the Greek community in Transylvania. Dositheos' personal contacts with the princes and boyars afforded the Jerusalem Patriarchate a consistent source of monetary donations, monastic property (i.e., a foreign metochion), and building supplies for local church renovations in Jerusalem and, eventually, even funds for the establishment of a patriarchal library.

In the first biography of Dositheos published in 1715, as a preface to Dositheos' posthumously published *History of the Jerusalem Patriarchate*, the author Chrysanthos (who succeeded Dositheos as patriarch in 1707) delineates the chronological events of Dositheos' discipleship under Paisios and Nectarios and provides a general account of Dositheos' ecclesiastical appointments, and the occasion of his passing away. Jerusalem, in Chrysanthos' brief narrative, provided symbolic value as the holy city and home to the Holy Sepulcher and Greek Brotherhood. The themes Chrysanthos chose to emphasize about Dositheos' life were as follows: "the parapet [*promachos*] and holy fighter for truth, the one supporting the furthest parts of the Commonwealth [*Ecumene*] with his teachings [like] rhythmic drops of honey... Indeed, upon Dositheos with those Christians in a common race [*genos*], we bless thee."¹² What comes across most clearly in Chrysanthos' prologue is an icon of Dositheos as "the good Shepherd and brave Parapet" and "Shepherd and Teacher." This image of Dositheos as parapet and teacher Chrysanthos enhanced and mystified by a field of holy battle in which Dositheos fought

against the Latins. Chrysanthos described him as “the Protector of the correct dogma...the Parapet of truth and holy warrior.” The divine plan over Dositheos’ journeys, and even sufferings, were contrasted with the “vain glory [*doxa*]...of the Italians, French, Germans, Poles...and the official nations [*ethni*] of the western Church.”¹³

As patriarch of Jerusalem in the last half of the seventeenth century, Dositheos was responsible for the Holy Places during a period when the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate supported the commerce of pilgrimages by land and sea to Jerusalem. Although Dositheos spent relatively little time in Jerusalem compared to his diplomatic activities abroad in Constantinople and the Principalities, his *History of the Jerusalem Patriarchate* contributed to the construction of a ‘universal’ narrative, whose first chapter begins with the testimony and divine calling of James, ‘the Brother of God,’ into the inner discipleship of the apostles John and Simon Peter, and Jesus the Christ. Since the *History of the Jerusalem Patriarchate* consisted of twelve volumes, it is also referred to as the *Twelve Books*. Chapter one, entitled “Concerning the kin [*genos*] of James” begins Dositheos’ outline of an orthodox anatomy and historical narrative with a pagination based on the Ecumenical Councils (325-787) and the eastern confessions after the ninth century. The chronology concludes in the seventeenth century with Dositheos’ struggle against the sectarianism of his era.

Chapter II

Dealing with the Western Confessions

German historians Wolfgang Reinhard, Bodo Nischan, and Heinz Schilling introduced the concept of confessionalization, the break up of Roman catholicity into sectarian communities of Protestant believers based on doctrinal denominations, to English speaking readers in the early 1980s to early 1990s. With the establishment of confessional studies, this relatively minor field examined the dynamics of institutional religion as a significant contribution to the processes of early modern state-building and the formation of secular politics, while most historians were exploring other avenues of the seventeenth century general crisis and the emergence of modernity.

Wolfgang Reinhard focused on the social dynamics of confessionalization within German Catholic communities and located its actualization in the early sixteenth century Evangelical and Reformed Reformations (1517-1530). Heinz Schilling, however, located confessionalization's greater significance for nation-state studies in Charles V's establishment of religious parity among German confessional prince-states under the Peace of Augsburg (1555). Both historians mark the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 as the close of confessionalization, ending a long period of intra confessional warfare among most European states. Coined 'the long sixteenth century' or 'the Age of Confessions' by German historians, this novel periodization attempted to characterize the political and social elements of Christian sectarianism that embodied the German prince-states and Europe's multi-confessional wars.

Bodo Nischan provided a strong case study for confessionalization in seventeenth century Brandenburg's 'Second Reformation,' when Johann Sigismund (1608-1619) attempted to impose Calvinism on his subjects. Nischan argued that Elector Sigismund's personal conversion to the Reformed confession was governed mostly by religious conviction. In addition, while introducing more political complexities to Sigismund's anti-Catholic foreign policies, Nischan emphasized the importance of religious ritualism, symbolism, and ecclesiasticism as the public space for political relations that often rose to the level of riots between confessional Lutheranism in Brandenburg and their Calvinist Elector. Nischan further demonstrated that confessionalization was not limited to tensions between Noble Estates and the Crown; rather, state politics, doctrine, and theological nuances were encountered in the daily folk experience and exchange of Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed practices of worship in local churches. This confessional pattern during 'the long sixteenth century' was witnessed across Western Europe in such places as France, the Netherlands, and Britain.¹⁴

Heinz Schilling expanded the interpretative scope of confessionalization by drawing comparisons of the first half of the seventeenth century to modern debates on globalization, multiculturalism, transnational self-understanding, and political identity. Schilling asserts that by the close of that period (1650) a new version of 'Roman' European state structure emerged from the international peace accords and internal compromises between church and state. Western civilization, in Schilling's estimation, gave rise to a secularized European Order or 'the autonomy of politics' from confessional religious fundamentalism. Schilling describes the pursuit of international peace as the elevation of rationalization and 'reasons-of-state' over competing religious communities.

In light of this, the second half of the seventeenth century, Schilling argues, should be viewed as the *Sattelzeit der Moderne* (literally, the saddling up for modernity) to late eighteenth century modern nation-state politics.¹⁵

At present, the trend in confessionalization studies remains within a secular analysis of religion and state; in other words, ‘the long sixteenth century’ is mined for the political foundations of autonomous nation-states extracted from theology’s age-old hegemony over Europe’s Christian civilizations up to 1650.¹⁶ Consequently, in the final analysis, the descriptions of the emerging sovereign-states in confessionalization studies parallel more conventional political histories of the continental Wars of Religion (1562-1648) and histories of state government where rationalization and centralization take center stage.¹⁷ This typically top-down approach to understanding early modern state formation emphasizes aspects of Roman law and the interests-of-crown to either expand their reach or maintain a politically unified state. Meanwhile, the secular conclusions of confessional studies (i.e., the separation of Church and State) have led to its unabated mitigation in nation-state studies so far.¹⁸ By conceding the space of state formation to secular political-sovereignty, the religious focus of confessionalization becomes irrelevant.

At the dawn of the early modern state with the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, where confessionalization studies become overshadowed by issues of national identity *sans* religious identity, the last half of the seventeenth century set in motion a new era of international relations among sovereign states.¹⁹ While the ossification of confessionalization led to greater localized and provincial government regulated order and reasons-of-state, Schilling also argued that confessionalization had an extensive

impact on the processes and the outcomes of early modern state-building: that is, namely, the external and equally regulated international politics of a new multi-confessional European or Westphalian Order.²⁰ Confessionalization was local and global. Schilling's hope, however, to draw confessionalization studies into contemporary debates on globalization and international relations faces the same problem noted above—the annexation of the post-1650 period by secular analysis. Eighteenth century internationalism becomes simply the “secular variant of Early Modern confessionalism,” as Schilling admits.²¹ The multi-confessional landscape of Europe, which confessionalization studies brought to light ever so clearly, was resolved by the legitimization of state power; and therefore, the historical analysis of international relations focuses mainly on the state-agents and state-institutions which emerged from the seventeenth century. The processes of confessionalization during ‘the long sixteenth century’ clearly had a formative role in the establishment of the Westphalian Order in 1648, but the extent of the religious influence has been masked by the intensity of the interest accorded to state-regulated society and national identity.²² And, Schilling's hope to include the theory of confessionalization into broader conversations about international relations and post-1650 modernity remains a distant leap.²³

Finally, Wolfgang Reinhard demonstrated many of the techniques of confessionalization that brought about a ‘confessional consciousness’ through religious rituals and other means of social disciplining.²⁴ But, even at this socially integrated level of confessionalization, there remain skeptics.²⁵ For example, Mack P. Holt's account of the *French Wars of Religion (1562-1629)* refutes the segregating influences of confessional ideology on popular French society by stating that, “...religious and

confessional differences quickly became submerged in general peasant revolts. A variety of factors...explain how confessional differences could get buried beneath a myriad of socio-economic complaints among the popular classes.”²⁶ Holt argued that the larger political tensions among crown, estates, and rural counties did not reflect a confessional restraint over more significant material forces such as billeting troops at the grassroots level. The gap between top-down confessionalization verses bottom-up remains an obstacle within confessionalization studies. Nevertheless, new directions in the historiography of confessionalization have great potential for bridging this divide.²⁷

Bernd Moeller’s early influence on reformation studies has continued with historians focused on the impact of confessional social disciplinary processes in early modern urban centers or cities,²⁸ such as Allan A. Tulchin’s examination of sixteenth century Nimes and its conversion into a Reformed city;²⁹ Joachim Whaley’s classic *Religious Toleration and Social Change in Hamburg 1529-1819*;³⁰ and the response of Gregory Hanlon in *Confession and Community in Seventeenth-Century France*, which argued that peaceful co-existence was the normal experience of daily life in a multi-confessional city.³¹ Others have provided careful studies of the religious and political techniques of confessionalization, such as Wietse De Boer’s *The Conquest of the Soul* which cautioned historians to analyze social disciplining as a hypothesis still in need of further confirmation.³² There have also been studies of the influence of confessionalization on early modern intellectual thought, although most focus on the lineage of ‘Free Thinkers.’³³

The current direction in globalization and modernization studies, however, toward an understanding of transnational identities hold promising avenues for a confessional

analysis of collective identity and unity in the seventeenth century, especially in light of the diminishing hold of teleological secularization theories on the state.³⁴ The persistence of religion within contemporary international relations, most pronounced in the Christian West's encounter with Islam, has reframed nation-state studies within a definitional space that limits an understanding of multicultural interaction across increasingly invisible national borders. As the European Union expands and contracts (i.e., Brexit), and consequently, questions of nation-state identity become more crucial, the established international order created by the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 appears once again a crucial marker for understanding religious identities. Non-state agents, such as religious leaders, educational institutions, and social confraternities complicate the linear narrative of international law and state-relations based upon national identities.³⁵ Since Paul Kennedy and Catherine Danks posed the question of a "Crisis or Opportunity" over concerns about the demise of nation-states,³⁶ religious identity as a transnational factor within international relations has given confessionalization studies a new opportunity for contributing to the debate on modernity.³⁷

Somewhat ironically, confessionalization studies have developed levels of political significance around these markers of early modernity, but have generally disregarded any textual analysis of the confessional documents themselves. The theological language and doctrinal positions contained within them are confined to history as internal conversations amongst religious Reformation and Counter-Reformation movements but having no bearing on 'modernity' nor clarifying the meaning of it. Burrowing through textual analysis of these confessions, it is assumed, invites crossing over the chasm between religion and state and leaping into historical

theologies that not only predate the paradigm of nation-state building, but contributed little to the external phenomenon of the ‘secular’ other than separating it from the church. In this regard, confessionalization studies circumspectly view doctrine and theology from askew and prefer to contextualize confessions within a given polity and not delve into the exegetics of the confessional text and the exploration of authorial designs.

Philip Benedict, in his historiographic review on *Propaganda, Print, and Persuasion in the French Reformation*, voiced concerns about going backwards “...down the furrows that the past fifty years of research has marked out.”³⁸ Yet, as Benedict praised the current direction of scholarship led by Andrew Pettegree’s *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion*, he emphasized the need to analyze individual texts “...to reveal the arguments and rhetorical strategies that might have made them particularly convincing or moving.” Benedict asserted that within the movement’s doctrines there was a persuasive message that not only attracted ordinary people, but more importantly, reinforced “...a general conviction of the rightness of the cause to direct action against the old ecclesiastical order—to move in Pettegree’s terms from understanding to activism.”³⁹ Benedict located the space for investigating ‘the Protestant Message’ in the gap between early modern academic debates on predestination or justification and “...the hawkers who spread Protestant pamphlets...and converts...”⁴⁰ He extols Pettegree’s work for deemphasizing a traditional bias in the historiography towards books and images in the conversion process and concomitantly demonstrating that these “were only a drop in the bucket” compared to “sermons, group conversations, and the reinforcement provided by group singing.”⁴¹ Moreover, even within this cacophony of media Benedict pointed to formulations of a message between “the most educated individuals [and] those

with less formal education.”⁴² ‘The Protestant message,’ Benedict concluded, appealed to three co-relational issues: the liturgy, idolatry, and the clergy.⁴³

Andrew Pettegree asserted that “...drama [at this time] pursued an overtly didactic purpose” and transformed Augustine’s ‘City of God’ centered on a miracle and the Eucharist into a theatrical city focused on persuasion and conversion. Both Pettegree’s theatrical audience and Jaroslav Pelikan’s ‘community of believers’ took religiously or piously words and ‘naming,’ as Pettegree referred to its literary and dialogical significance.⁴⁴ Pettegree points to the transition of dramatic performance from “mystery and miracle plays” to didactic performances written by clerics and schoolmasters which lasted into the seventeenth century, especially among Lutheran Germans and Dutch Calvinists. While in England commercialization, professionalization, and secularization (i.e., profane themes of entertainment) caused retaliations against it there, elsewhere the ‘power of the crowd’ continued to echo the sentiments quoted by Pettegree from the playwright *The Second and Third Blast*, which itself equated the theatrical with liturgical participation and piety:

When I see the word of truth proceeding the hart, and uttered by the mouth of the reverend preachers, to be received of the most part into the ear, and but of a few rooted in the hart: I cannot by anie means believe [...] the wordes proceeding from a prophane plaier...⁴⁵

Perhaps one of Pettegree’s most keen insights on persuasion during the early modern period is stated in his conclusion which summarized the culture of belonging. He connects ‘the power of the crowd’ with its desire for both orthodoxy performed in

liturgical ceremonies of affirmation and unity with the “...often very solemn expulsion from the community”—excommunication—and the concomitant fear of disorder among the clergy and magistrates that heterodox communities of believers caused. In the resolution to this problem of disorder and unity Pettegree states without equivocation, “This was the power of the evangelical sermon, a powerful demonstration of a new, evolving community.” At the same time, as Pettegree asserted, ministers became more “...adept at manipulating symbols by which supporters expressed their loyalty to new communities of protest or belief” despite the increase of sectarianism and anti-clergy suspicions among the laity.⁴⁶ Thus, early modern culture placed great importance on belonging, and this manifested itself in the people’s desire for liturgical orthodoxy and performative excommunication—standing in the midst of this dialectic between division and unity was the evangelical sermon.

Benedict had rightly asserted that rhetorical persuasions and arguments could be found in the movement’s doctrines, but the framing of those articles and formulas as divine teachings might be more fundamentally significant. The schema was ‘the message’ Benedict had sought that could explain mass conversions. Also, Pettegree’s overlapping of religious fervor for the Eucharist with theatrical joy and the desire for excommunication ingeniously situates the audacious power of the sermonic word within the anticipations of the crowd; however, the participation of the confessor uniquely mediates the role of teacher and orthodoxy before aporetic or wide-eyed audiences of believers.

For communities of self-confessed orthodox believers, Pelikan asserted, “...it was the primary identification of each of these doctrines with one specific denomination that was to shape much of its future history.” From their perspective inter-doctrinal arguments

of the sixteenth century were just as complex as the fourth century, but one thing was clear: some groups believed one thing, others another. Yet, what Pelikan acutely distinguished is so-to-speak metaphysically *homoousios* or similar with the rhetorical effect and concept of orthodoxy. “In principle,” he explained, “...no one would admit to a ‘development of doctrine.’” None of the articles or teachings had changed; they descended from revelations; they were distinct from wavering radicals, ephemeral philosophies, and historical contingencies by a miracle of historical preservation. There was always orthodoxy. There will always be divine teachings.

Pelikan (who in his later life had experienced a conversion from Lutheranism to Eastern Orthodoxy) described this public secret suspended over the seventeenth century among ‘the dueling reverend rhetoricians,’⁴⁷ by himself admitting to a “...constant doctrinal development, alongside the continuing insistence on a uniform and orthodox doctrine.”⁴⁸ Protestant ministers had experienced this when they became aware of what Pelikan called ‘an argument in a circle’ after they had debated endlessly with Catholics. The Catholic appeals to tradition’s ‘self-verification’ and ‘inner testament’ only seemed to Protestants a clever maneuver to cover up for accumulated or evolving errors that were clearly testified to by the historical record of the visible Church.⁴⁹ Yet, Protestants too followed suit with divine teachings and ‘an argument in a circle’ of their own.

It was a conflicting reality about orthodoxy and change that the people increasingly suspected, especially within multi-confessional cities. They had the ability to ask rhetorically, “What does ‘the Good Book’ say?” They could echo an argument ‘Our God is One in Three’ among other slogans. And after the sixteenth century revolutions, they knew that certain creeds once believed could become idolatry. Likewise, it was an

axiom that truth was single and not duplicitous...unless, of course, the minister could present the dialectical mystery as a paradox.⁵⁰ The minister could skillfully juggle propositions and parry counter-arguments, but the introduction of a paradox could outplay most difficult questions and formulas—at least put an end to debate. Mystery, however, offered a singular resolution to dialectical opposites—like Luther’s *Simul Justus et Peccator* or the ancient Hellenic tension between the Fates (*Moirai*) and the physiologists (*physiologoi*). The role of the confessor was not to persuade the believer to accept a paradoxical proposition, but how to believe in a mystery. Framing guided the listener through the contradictory reality of truth—to the end of doubts, the beginning of conviction, and the beliefs which quickly followed.

* * *

In his 2001 essay entitled *Varieties of Religious Community*, historian Garth Fowden, author of *Empire to Commonwealth: Consequences of Monotheism in Late Antiquity*, provides the interpretation that guided his pioneering narrative in early church studies. Fowden depicted the fourth century as a period of transition from correct-practice (*ortho-praxis*) to “... [an] empire of communities [and] commonwealths, built in part on political but primarily on cultural—that is, religious—foundations.”⁵¹ From the cultural industry of fourth century cities, Fowden argues, scriptural communities inaugurated an unprecedented period of self-identification, self-explanation, and self-defense. This ‘scriptural turn’ during the early period of the Christian church, the transition from *ortho-praxis* (which constituted the religious identification of polytheist

sects) to self-identifying communities and monotheistic sectarianism. led to competitions over what could be best described as correct-opinion (*ortho-doxa*) Christian communities. In the cities of Nicaea, Constantinople, and Chalcedon there emerged group biographies, Christian chronologies, and lists of apostolic successors and catalogues of heretics. It was a marvel of urban activity that the Byzantine Emperor Constantine eventually found "...an oppressive everyday reality," as Fowden succinctly put it. But, the Byzantine Empire had one imperial capital and the 'City upon a Hill' required a singular Orthodoxy.

Although the ecumenical creeds themselves received little attention in Fowden's narrative, the creeds' compositional changes through time reflect the 'scriptural turn' described by Fowden, namely, "...an acquired consciousness of distinct identity." The period of the *Ecumenical Creeds* (325-787) recorded the cadence of beliefs with historical events as produced and transcribed by orthodox communities of believers. Even so-called heretics were *ortho-doxa* thinking in their belief. In Fowden's chapter on "Constantine's Strategy," he cautioned against depicting Constantine's unification of the Roman Empire and adoption of Christianity in 324 as a sudden revolution, which he considered not fully complete until Theodosius I's codification of law. Nonetheless, Fowden agreed that Constantine's introduction of monotheism instituted a new era of imperial missions to unify those communities on the periphery of the empire and make Constantinople its capital. While this mission was not absent in the goals of Constantine's predecessors, Fowden argues that Constantine's christianization of the empire instituted a radical break from Rome's traditional polytheism with a new strategy, a 'universalist'

program, and public doctrine of “one god—one empire—one emperor *schema*.”⁵² It was a divine ideal.

When Constantine invited over three hundred bishops from all over the empire to gather in Nicaea, it was for the purpose of quelling Christian sectarianism by adopting the first ecumenical or universal creed along with his concomitant plan for a one empire and one church. Constantine was greatly assisted in this mission by a professional priesthood and a secular extension of priestly authority; on the peripheries of the empire, however, this same sacerdotal class—especially the bishops—consequently exercised greater local control. By the fifth century, particularly after the fourth Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon (451), Constantine’s empire had become a Byzantine Commonwealth with a variety of ‘orthodoxies’ on the periphery. These para-orthodoxies “defined itself against a strong center,” as Fowden noted, and nonetheless always had Constantinople as its historical and symbolic focal point.⁵³ The first Byzantine Commonwealth according to Fowden’s estimation was “...an unintended result of Constantine’s adoption of monotheism as a suitable creed for empire...”⁵⁴

Eusebius’ *Ecclesiastical History* and the *Life of Constantine* provided the Christian language or historical framing for a popular belief in Constantine’s schema, which cemented “... [a] virtual redefinition of the empire itself as a ‘school’ gathered around a charismatic royal teacher.”⁵⁵ Creedal historian Frances Young had described this early transition before the fourth century as the move from *religio* and *pietas*, that centered on the worship of God through ritual practice, to a dominant focus on belief and correct teachings. Young provides one of the more illustrative examples by pointing to the transformation of public temples into basilicas for mostly educational purposes—a

place where believers “...listened and learned, where speeches were delivered.” This change in focus meant that basilicas were centers for public education on orthodoxy and no longer the location for cultic ritual—although these new community centers remained just as sacred and revered by the people.⁵⁶ Instead of the fulfillment of initiation by water baptism, however, Young asserted that “...initiation was a teaching and learning process.”⁵⁷ Initiation was *praxis*, but the authority to teach—to occupy the office of teacher—belonged now to an episcopate guardianship often times antagonistic to the remnant philosopher scholars of a not too distant Hellenic past. After the enforcement of an official public orthodoxy in the fourth century that ‘secular’ past became antiquity.⁵⁸

Eusebius was the first public historian to combine the doctrine of Constantine’s new empire with an ordained providence of God—both of which, he claimed, converged at the first Ecumenical Council of Nicaea “under celestial influence and cooperation” in the same manner that Old Testament Kings and Judges were divinely appointed and likewise in the New Testament at the first council of Jerusalem.⁵⁹ Yet, the genius of Eusebius’ *Ecclesiastical History* was the schema, which he employed throughout his narrative in order to express this *symphonia* between empire and church, as well as, its inclusive mission “to all nations, both Greeks and barbarians.”⁶⁰

When communities of believers in the sixteenth century revolted against their temporal leaders—for example, Charles V of the Holy Roman Empire (1519-1556), Ferdinand I of Germany (1531-1564), and Francis I of France (1494-1547)—they also appealed to the schema, compelled its subjects to subscribe to a single creed, and wrote their own narrative histories. All over Europe, since the Peace of Augsburg (1555) to the Peace of Westphalia (1648), these communities constructed confessional identities and

created a historical sense of belonging to a ‘universal’ narrative that originated in Jerusalem and traveled through Constantinople. In particular, Germany demonstrated a clear development from Luther’s revolution to the more academic ‘Wittenberg Reformation,’ which resulted in a confessional identity: the *Augsburg Confession of 1530*.

In her study *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation*, Irena Backus provides a new direction from conventional approaches to Protestant historiography and the production of sixteenth and seventeenth century confessional narratives. In contrast to the views of Pontien Polman, Donald Kelley, and Enrico Norelli, all of whom emphasized the polemical role of these narratives, Backus asserts, “Their quest and struggle for religious identity was real and profound and, like all struggle for religious identity, it had history as its main court of appeal...for reformers and for their adversaries history became a means of constructing and expressing their confessional identity.”⁶¹ Protestants, as well as Catholics, published a number of confessional histories in the last half of the sixteenth century which increased dramatically, and more autonomously, into the seventeenth century. In 1558, when evangelicalism had since fully embraced its Lutheran appellation,⁶² Melanchthon’s *Chronicon Carionis* was published; in 1565 David Chytraeus, who viewed Melanchthon’s history as exemplary, followed suit with *How to set about reading history in the correct way*; that same year, the Calvinist Flacius Illyricus’ *Catalogus Testium Veritatis* was also published. Constantine, in Melanchthon’s estimation, presided over a paradigmatic community of Christian believers. By connecting the evangelical

movement to a glorified period of the early church Melancthon delineated a vestigial narrative of their confessional identity.

Eusebius' schematic narrative allowed sixteenth century Protestants to separate themselves from Roman Catholic Church and still argue that they remained within a historical and uninterrupted succession of orthodox believers. Nonetheless, each community championed its local class of professional priesthood and magisterium for the propagation of their *ortho-doxa* or correct-opinion and particular teachings. This paradoxical splintering and unifying Protestant movement led to a European Commonwealth, concomitant with the onslaught of sectarian competition, grave violence—and falling far short of Constantine's vision for 'one god—one empire—one emperor.' Although Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* was intended to be read as an ecumenical or universal history of the early church, it was successful only in so far as it provided a historical source for proprietary interpretations among those communities on the periphery. Equally important, it was also responsible for dramatizing martyrs and confessors.

In *The Myth of Persecution: How Early Christians Invented a Story of Martyrdom*, Candida Moss refers to Eusebius as an apologist for "...redefining the church as a persecuted church" and the ecclesiastical historian responsible for its initiation into an ecumenical narrative.⁶³ Her research demonstrates that the roots of Christian martyrdom lie in the confessions and testimonies of defendants in Roman courts and the honors bestowed by the Church on the highest rank of confessors, namely, martyrs.⁶⁴ She describes its development as follows:

This formal distinction between confessors (those who are in prison awaiting execution) and martyrs (those who are dead and no longer have opinions) emerged in the mid-third century. During a period of prosecution under the emperor Decius confessors had taken *to absolving* other Christians of the sin of apostasy.⁶⁵

Moss contextualized the confessors versus the lapsed (i.e., those who denied ‘the faith’ from fear of persecution) during the pre-Nicene period as an internal battle among the clergy, who navigated through the difficult space of the confessors’ popular idealization and public glorification by the laity. The confessors gave absolution outside the established rites and clerical procedures. Prisoners were celebrated for their sacrifice as confessors, while many clergy abandoned their office in the face of persecution and later meekly sought public forgiveness through the performance of a solemn *apologia*.

The role of confessors in absolution and their fame within early Christian communities had compelling and long-lasting influences on the historiography of ecclesiastical chroniclers. In this sense, ecclesiastical history is very much confessional and not just partisan. At the same time that confessors rose to prominence in the mid-third century, the scriptural community of *ortho-doxa* believers turned to the past for refuge against the rise of competing Christian sects, like the Montanist. On the tail end of a period of wild prophetic evangelicalism, eschatological visions among the established ministry dimmed in light of the need to validate their group’s orthodoxy through some kind of unchanging historical providence. Confessors and an orthodoxy converged in narrative form through the production of ecclesiastical histories.⁶⁶

Despite some critics of Candida Moss' thesis that the early church did not experience three hundred years of persecution, it is far more difficult to disagree with her evaluation that Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* was responsible for encoding the martyrdom tradition into an official narrative of Nicaean orthodoxy and into his historical narrative of an ecumenical Church.⁶⁷ Eusebius' strategy, Moss argued, "... [made] martyrs into the champions of orthodoxy and the natural opponents of heresy. For readers, who see martyrs as the champions of the [ecumenical] church, the martyrs model how to interact with heretics."⁶⁸ Moss concluded by noting two significant consequences from the popular appreciation for martyrdom, which even their public opponents considered a heroic act, and Eusebius' employment of this effective rhetorical device. First of all, because of Eusebius' sharp binary between orthodox martyrs and heretics—often times contrasted and dramatized as earthly saints verses demonic forces—he institutionalized the galvanizing script of the persecuted us story against the *hetero-doxa* or deviant-opinion many headed hydra. It was more than an idea or concept because the narrative had the feel of reality (there certainly were cases of Christian martyrdom) behind the painted iconostasis that Eusebius framed their victimhood.⁶⁹ Eusebius' reliance on martyrs and confessors to prove his agenda (i.e., Nicaean orthodoxy) established for posterity the perennial myth of Christian persecutions.

Second, Moss used the example of the Montanus or 'The New Prophecy' to further demonstrate Eusebius' exaggeration of the binary between the orthodox and heretics. Eusebius edited and retold the trial of a certain Quintus associated with Montanism by, not just referring to its geographical location with the common designation of the Phrygian heresy, but juxtaposed the 'race of Christians' with a new

emphasis—the race of Phrygians. Moss explained: “...it becomes, in Eusebius’s version, a question of race and ethnicity. One is now either a follower of the martyrs and member of the race of Christians, or one is not...if you are not with us doctrinally, you are not even of the same race.”⁷⁰ Beneath every article of faith in the Nicæan Creed Eusebius entombed a martyr’s body, spilled a confessor’s blood, and covered the sacrifice of many with dirt—that was the orthodox anatomy. That was how doctrine transubstantiated race realism; it had the power by epiclesis to change how others perceived people and race, body and blood, the material and immaterial. Doctrine, not just schools of thought coming from discursive geographic locations, united bodies of believers with convictions about the past, judgments on the present, and fixed premonitions of the future.

Research by historian Paul Valliere illuminated the transition from *pietas* to *ortho-doxa* or religious practice or correct-opinion from the angle of conciliarism and the historical role of the teacher in what he called “the decision-making process.” Valliere keenly assessed Constantine and his successors as policy brokers and political managers of an independent episcopate, and the imperial council as a mediating, peace-maker. Imperial violence arose when conciliarism broke down, as happened in late fifth century Chalcedon and the European Wars of Religion (1542-1648). Against the chronological snobbery that castigates Nicene orthodoxy as a historical product of religious fundamentalism, the conciliar perspective interpreted the empire and ministry as co-managers of popular orthodoxy, perhaps even moderates, and conciliarism as a ‘decision-making process’ among communities of believers already in conflict with each other. For example, bishop Hilary of Poitiers’ admonishments in the fourth century about “the dangers of human speech” revealed a certain reticence, writing:

Questions of this nature, which no law compels us to discuss, but which are suggested by a fondness for disputation in an hour of unprofitable leisure, may indeed be permitted as an exercise of the intellectual faculties. We ought however, to confine them within our own bosoms, not readily bringing them forward at public meetings, nor rashly confiding them to the ears of every one.⁷¹

Valliere came closest to articulating Eusebius's sense of a unifying ecumenicity by referring to it as "the conciliar mystique" and "the singularity of Nicaea"⁷² H. J. Sieben agreed, stating, "...in these early doctrinal synods a distinctive type of council in which 'the dominant role at councils is played not by the episcopate, not even by an individual bishop, e.g. the president of an ecclesiastical province, but by the *didaskalos*, the leading 'Teacher' in the church."⁷³ And, Pelikan emphasized the significant weight given for doctrines corroborated by an "... [official] transmission by an unbroken succession of teachers."⁷⁴ For Valliere's study on the conciliar tradition, as well as Pelikan's creedal tradition, orthodoxy achieves ecumenicity or 'the unity of belief' by a conciliar decree—a creedal proclamation that may have begun with a public confession. Nonetheless, this singular ecumenicity and unifying creed conversely declared judgment and blame on the other—someone or group was responsible for 'the war.'

Eusebius provided an extract of a letter from Emperor Constantine regarding the Arian scandal at the first Ecumenical Council of Nicaea in 325. Constantine presented the problem, writing that "...communion has been refused, and the most holy people, rent into two factions, have departed from the harmonious union of the common body." What Constantine called "the subtle management of such questions" required careful attention, he warned:

We ought however, to confine them within our own bosoms, not readily bringing them forward at public meetings, nor rashly confiding them to the ears of everyone. For how eminently gifted must be the man, who can accurately understand the true nature of such great and difficult matters, or explain them in a manner worthy of their importance? But if anyone should be supposed capable of performing this with ease, what portion of the common people would he be likely to convince?⁷⁵

The entire ecumenical period that began in the fourth century and stretched into the eighth century suffered from synodmania.⁷⁶ A year before the second Ecumenical Council of Constantinople in 381, the Council of Saragossa expressly forbade by decree “...to take for oneself the name of teacher, except those persons to whom it has been granted, according to what has been written.”⁷⁷ A half-century after the first imperial and ecumenical council the transition from *ortho-praxis* to *ortho-doxa* had only hastened unabated by Nicaea’s schema, and the technologies for orthodoxy advanced too.

The scholarly contributions from Frances Young and Richard Norris on early Christianity reinvigorated modern studies on the appropriation of rhetorical techniques by Christian educators during the Nicæan period. Most recently, historian Caroline Humfress broke new ground with her book *Orthodoxy and the Courts in Late Antiquity* by examining the professionalization of forensic practitioners of rhetoric within an ecclesiastical structure for defending against heresy prosecutions in the imperial courts. Second and third generation Nicene-Constantinopolitan judges were secular and ecclesiastical, and the magisterial trials were public and theatrical. Both litigants sought to protect their reputations, but defendants in particular employed a new class of

professional advocates—the ecclesiastical preacher turned forensic orator or *defensor ecclesiae*.⁷⁸

Both litigants—those accused of heresy and their orthodox prosecutors—emphasized the importance of and honed their skills in forensic techniques of argumentation. The new ecumenical *symphonia* between church and state also involved the institutional interdependence of ecclesiastical schools and pagan rhetorical education, what was known as Greek *paideia*, and ultimately changed the manner of public debates and *ortho-doxa* polemics—classically referred to as Christian apologetics. By concentrating on the reality of rhetorical ‘practices of labeling and categorization’ in the post-Constantinian imperial courts and the bishop’s courts or *episcopalism audientia*, Humfress pierces through the theological debates among competing Christian sects and concludes that the entire Byzantine “...legal process aimed at ‘conversion’” which by the late fourth century permeated both an ecclesiastical and secular “culture of forensic argumentation.”⁷⁹

Her evidence pointed to a common phraseology that one would expect to see within a courtroom trial: the importance of testimonies, the need for eyewitnesses, the concern for public reputations, and the impotency of pleading the fifth (i.e., silence). More importantly, it brought to light a specifically new defensive strategy used by heretics in direct response to the legislative application of *ortho-doxa* in the courts and the prosecution of heresy. In order to avoid the accusation of heresy Manicheans had begun to self-identify themselves by using state-approved names. This practice became such a quagmire for the courts that Emperor Theodosius I addressed the issue in a constitution from 381, stating:

Nor shall they defend themselves with dishonest fraud under the pretence of those deceptive names by which many, as We have learned, wish to be called and signified as of approved faith...and by a variety of diverse names falsify, as it were, the ceremonies of their religious professions. For none of the aforesaid persons shall be protected by a profession of names...⁸⁰

The emperor's decree did not resolve the issue, of course, since the followers of Mani then utilized a strategy of self-defense by further distinguishing themselves and their identity as separate from the various other sects under the name Manichean and pled orthodoxy by accusing the others of heresy. The Donatists employed the same strategy.⁸¹

Shortly before the third Ecumenical Council of Ephesus in 431, while the once 'orthodox' Nestorius still sat on the patriarchal throne of Constantinople, come twenty-one documented confessions from repentant heretics.⁸² Take for example the Philadphian and remnant Quartodeciman (*Tessareskaidekatites*) who protested against the official Julian calendar date of Easter in favor of the Hebrew calendar, repented of his crime, and converted to ecumenical Orthodoxy:

I, Boudios son of Iounikos, Philadphian, a *Tessareskaidekatites*, having acknowledged the true belief of orthodoxy...assent to the afore-written exposition of the orthodox faith...swearing by the holy and consubstantial Trinity and by the piety and victory of the masters of the oikoumene...After the exposition has been read aloud to me, I have subscribed through Hesychios, Philadphian, city-councillor, because I am illiterate.⁸³

The converted and illiterate Philadphian confessed to ‘wandering in error’ as a Quartodeciman, subscribed to a creedal document, and swore an oath to ‘the masters of *Ecumene*.’ Yet, Humfress concluded by emphasizing that in each case the verdict was not simply a matter of applying a “cannon of orthodox belief” systematically and making the necessary calculations, but rather the importance of forensic rhetoric laid in its ability to influence the courts through “the technical skills of persuasive eloquence already learnt in the ‘secular’ sphere.”⁸⁴ Added to the culture of argumentation was the bourgeois appreciation for rhetorical delivery, a convincing orator, and celebrated speaker.

As Humfress demonstrated, forensic rhetoric in the “dialectic of the courtroom” and the professionalization of the *defensor ecclesiae* were certainly new avenues within the conciliar and creedal tradition. In addition to Norris’ “deliberative rhetoric” and Humfress’ “forensic rhetoric”—both of which relied on a synodical foundation ingrained with verbal contests—historian Richard Lim has provided a thorough analysis of the *ars dialectica* outside the court rooms and inside the market square where it peaked in the fourth century.

Lim argued that the original evangelical mission field of early Christianity came to fruition in the arena of rival speeches (*logoi*) against pagans.⁸⁵ Christian contenders, mirroring the Hellenic philosophers of late antiquity, attempted to persuade their opponents and convince the audience with rational (*logos*) demonstrations and dialectical interrogation. Against the ‘irrationality’ of the pagan pluralist these Christian apologists considered themselves supra-rational and contended that “...since the truth is one, the consensus of Christians proves beyond doubt that they alone possess it.”⁸⁶ Lim guardedly accepts the conventional view of the historian Edward Gibbon who proposed that these

Christian orators made reified questions and speculations a commodity for the masses; however, Lim rightly notes that it was not the strength of their arguments, but “...their supreme conviction, which they displayed before the world by becoming martyrs in Roman arenas” which won converts.⁸⁷ Indeed, the Christian emphasis on persuasion through *logoi* and sharpened dialectics—also a component of preaching (*kerygma*)—caused internal problems and divisions among Christian communities when these same techniques were used by competing heterodox sects (with their own martyrology) to persuade orthodox believers.⁸⁸

In particular, the Manicheans presented a daunting challenge to orthodox communities because of their dialectical acumen in public debates. Even more effective was a Manichean evangelism centered on engaging small groups and individuals by broaching a dialogue with a puzzling question intended to startle their audience’s seated convictions and put them in a disposition of bewilderment.⁸⁹ The well-known Manichean emphasis on a hermeneutical dialectic between light and darkness, good and evil, and the Hebraic Old Testament and the New Testament Gospel often titillated the curiosity of their hearers. In a fashion similar to the first century heretic Marcion, who espoused a duality that strongly challenged monotheism (yet still had its own schema), the Manichean evangelists would begin an oration or conversation by proclaiming “I do not believe [*Non credo*] the Hebrew prophets.”⁹⁰

Their most clever style of rhetoric started with an aporetic or puzzling question—often the perennial quandary ‘from whence comes evil?’—in order to engage a dialogue with wide-eyed listeners more open to new ideas, teachings, and beliefs. They were thoroughly prepared, even scripted, to dialectally lead their listeners from mental or

theological apoplexy to an answer only resolved by the teachings of Mani. In this latter sense their opening question was rhetorical since, as Lim stated, “Their purpose was not to draw listeners into debate...but to allow them to appreciate the Manichaean kerygma [the act of preaching] as the solution to real theological problems.”⁹¹ The setup of an aporetic dialogue by the Manichean missionary-teachers allowed them to present the whole of Mani’s teachings as the synthesis to a stark dialectic. The rationalizations which they then proceeded to give compelled the former Manichean and orthodox convert Bishop Augustine to designate them the sect of the super-rational.

Even according to the highly biased reports of court stenographers, the orthodox admitted losing verbal contests against Manichean missionaries; yet, they resolved the narrative by defeating the heterodox by demonstrations of divine power and miracles, such as walking through fire and cursing the opponent with *aphonia* (i.e., deaf and dumb; silence).

Alongside the solidification of ecclesiastical credentialism within ecumenical councils was the necessity for what Lim termed “a strategy of mystification” to accompany the orthodox schema. A strategy of mystification began in the fourth century with the Cappadocian Theologians (Basil the Great 330-379, Gregory of Nyssa 332-395, and Gregory of Nazianuz 329-389), John Chrysostom (347-407), and culminated with its fullest expression found in the sixth century with pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. It was also a strategy approved of by Augustine against “undue curiosity.”⁹² A mystification of the schema, simply put, expressed the ultimate incomprehensibility of faith, the Eucharist, creedal articles, the universal Church, doctrine, and God by means of rationalization. Lim defined it within the fourth century specifically: “Competitive forms

of knowledge such as Aristotelian dialectic were subordinated to an apophatic, mystical *theoria* that stressed the importance of a hierarchical status quo and the mediation of priests in the spiritual anagogy.”⁹³ The hierarchical priestly structure meant that initiation was still *praxis*, but the confessor now had a mystical *theoria*.

Lim also called this strategy an apophatic obfuscation, which was a handy tool when theologians were pressed for more exacting definitions from catechumens or challenged by public debate. An apophatic obfuscation would definitively express what for example God or the Eucharist is not, but appeal to the limitations of reason when asked to cataphatically express what it is. Western theologians also had a similar concept called the *via negativa*, but this became less prominent with the renaissance of apoditic Aristotelianism in the fourteenth century.

Eusebius’ narration of orthodox martyrs and confessors ended one year before the Nicaea Council of 325 commenced. The next generation of ecclesiastical historians—the Latin Historian Rufinus of Aquileia, and the Byzantine Historians Socrates Scholasticus, Sozomen, and Gelasius of Cyzicus—continued Eusebius’ legacy up to the second Ecumenical Council of 381. Among these historians, Lim noted that a spurious but climatic event at the Council of Nicaea 325 was retold with minor variations. The tale or legend illustrated the defeat of the *ars dialectica*, polytheism, and Christian sectarianism by a confessor armed only with the *simplicitas* of the schema and an unwavering conviction. Lim summarized the story as follows:

After a long series of exchanges [between a polytheistic philosopher and the assembled bishops at Nicaea], the precise nature or content of which is not given in

any of the sources, the stalemate was finally ended when an unlearned and elderly confessor stepped forward to confront the philosopher with a terse creedal formula, and simply asked his stunned opponent whether he believed the statement or not.⁹⁴

Lim accepts the conventional thesis of Françoise Thelamon, who categorized the vague story as a typological drama, where the roles the actors play (i.e., the confessor, the pagan philosopher, the bishop-dialectician) are more significant than the characters' particular identities. Lim also added that the repeated tale served the historians' purpose to present a conciliar narrative toward orthodoxy and "the irenic ideology of the *mia ekklesia* [one church]."⁹⁵ Thus, the storied confessor personified the singularity mystique of Nicaea and its public schema.

The small variations of the story are insignificant, but their commonalities were purposeful. The event always took place before a large audience, either before or during the official debates; the confessor's opponent was converted, turned to his own party and began proclaiming the truth or teaching them; each story ends with the confessor's victory by silencing the opponent. An even closer look at the dialogue used within these tales reveals a common manner of speaking or rhetorical device within the conciliar tradition.

According to Rufinus: "[The Confessor] said, 'In the name of Jesus Christ, O philosopher, listen to what is true. [He then recited a creedal formula.] Do you believe that this is the case, philosopher?'... [In response the Philosopher said,] 'Yes, it so appears, truth is none other than what you said.' Then [the Confessor] said, 'If you

believe that these words are true, stand and follow me to the Lord, and receive the seal of his faith.””

According to Socrates: “...one of the confessors, who was a man of unsophisticated understanding, reproved these dialecticians, and said to them: ‘Christ and the Apostles did not hand down to us dialectic art, nor empty tricks, but simplemindedness [naked opinion, *gumen gnomen*] preserved by faith and good works.’... As he said this, all present were amazed [*ethaumasas*] and accepted it.⁹⁶ The dialecticians were made more silent [*hesychasas*], having heard the simple word [*logos*] of truth.”⁹⁷

According to Sozomen: “...a simple old man, highly esteemed as a confessor, who, although unskilled in logical refinements and wordiness, undertook to oppose [the philosopher]. [He said,] ‘In the name of Jesus Christ, O philosopher, listen to me. There is one God... We believe these things to be true with all simplicity. Do not, therefore, expend your labor in vain by striving to disprove facts which can only be understood by faith... Answer me, do you believe?’ The philosopher...replied, ‘I believe.’ ... [The philosopher] began to teach the same doctrines to others...assuring them on oath, that he had been impelled to embrace Christianity by a certain inexplicable impulse.”

According to Gelasius: “...a certain man from the holy confessors [*homologiton*] who were present at the synod...said to [the Arian philosopher]: ‘In the name of Jesus Christ, the word [*logos*] of God eternally with the Father, hear, O philosopher, the true doctrines.’ And he said, ‘One is God’s nature... [He then recited a creedal formula]... Do you believe these things, O philosopher?’ [The philosopher was struck dumb and silent.]

The confessor said to him, ‘If these you have believed, O philosopher, stand and follow me; to the church we shall make haste, where you shall receive the sign of this faith.’ The philosopher turned to his disciples and all those with him and said: ‘Listen, O learned men...if any among you are able to continue as I had thought—believe in Christ, and follow this [confessor] through whom God has spoken.’ In this manner, the philosopher, having received enlightenment [*photistheis*] and becoming a Christian, he was withdrawn from heresy because of the [confessor]. Afterwards the philosopher was also baptized in the Church of God...’’⁹⁸

According to Dositheos, “There was at the Council a lay confessor, who said: ‘Christ and the Apostles did not hand down to us dialectic art, nor empty tricks, but simplemindedness preserved by faith and good works.’”⁹⁹

Here, Dositheos had cited and copied (a common method he used throughout his *History of the Jerusalem Patriarchate*) Socrates’ version of the story, although he also had at his disposal the other three versions. He continued, not with the conversion of the philosopher-dialectician, but with a quote from Epiphanius of Salamis’ three volume series the *Panarion* (Chest of Remedies), a late fourth century heresiology consisting of eighty heterodox sects.¹⁰⁰ Following Socrates’ story, Dositheos added: “...agreeing with Epiphanius who said:

‘Anciently, expositions were always brief, and were given by persons who were at pains, not to please, but to benefit the audiences of their day. But latterly, ever since, from carelessness, anyone has been permitted to interpret the scriptures, they have all been filled with conceit and lost their keenness for doing good, but

they have prided themselves on their progress in debating as though they were clever enough to know everything—ashamed to admit [*homologeîn*] that they needed teaching, but to contend, like their teachers.’¹⁰¹

Dositheos also expressed this same negative sentiment towards individual expositions or examinations of the scriptures in the short catechism attached to his *Confession* (1672).

Dositheos certainly intended to emphasize the miraculous events that he believed to have had occurred during the Nicene Council. In his *History of the Jerusalem Patriarchate* Dositheos placed Socrates’ excerpt of the ‘tale’ in book two under the title “Concerning the first Ecumenical holy Synod, its beginning and end, and of the things having been passed and the miracles worked within it.” Dositheos used the church historian Theodoret of Cyrrihus (393-458) for introducing the confessor tale. Dositheos’ prolegomena to the first Ecumenical Council (325) began with the men in attendance and “...the Council [which] looked like an assembled army of martyrs,” turned to the miracles of James of Antioch who “...raised the dead, restored them to life, and performed many other wonders which it would be superfluous to mention again in detail in this history...,” to the Arian heresy, and Emperor Constantine’s speech for “unanimity and concord.”¹⁰²

For the historical information on Arius prior to the Ecumenical Council Dositheos primarily relied on Epiphanius’ well-known heresiology, while the church historians Theodoret and Socrates provided Dositheos with the correspondence letters written by Alexander of Alexandria, Emperor Constantine, the Nicaea Council, the church historian Eusebius, and Arius. Overall, however, Dositheos’ narrative follows the emphasis placed

on the verbal exchange (*logoi*) between philosophers and confessors from the Church historian Gelasius' *Collection of Acts during the Holy Synod in Nicaea*. “[It began...], Dositheos stated, “...with the most wise men of the fathers, who were debating [*dielegonto*] with the Philosopher.”¹⁰³ He listed eight bishops who were engaged in this verbal contest, which included Patriarch Alexander of Alexandria and his deacon Athanasius (who soon gained fame at the second Ecumenical Council of 381). Quite conspicuously, Dositheos did not list Patriarch Makarios of Jerusalem as one of the dialecticians, even though Galasius recorded him among this select group. Instead, Dositheos had Patriarch Makarios give the final judgment along with Alexander and “many others.”

In one sentence Dositheos summarized their public address to the emperor. The verdict was read out loud by their spokesman, Alexander: “Concerning the mysteries of God, no one is to seek it in such a manner, for it is forbidden and beyond reason [*anepilogista*].”¹⁰⁴ What followed this was Socrates' version of the confessor story and Epiphanius' quote against individual examination. Subsequent to Epiphanius' quotation Dositheos informs us that “...many other confessors (who had on behalf of the Christ, stigmata on their hands from the persecutions) and miracle-workers who were there.”¹⁰⁵ Dositheos continued his narrative of the Arian scandal and its conclusion with a confession of faith.

Dositheos reminded the reader of the verbal contest and wrote, “Arius also had philosophers who debated [*dialegontai*] for him, among whom one was made to become voiceless by Alexander [the Patriarch] of Constantinople.” Dositheos next emphasized Socrates' censure of the *arts dialectic* (based on his version of the confessor tale) by

retaining one particular aspect throughout all its versions—namely, that if not for the intervention of the confessor, the philosophers would have triumphed. Dositheos continued, “...but having overthrown the remaining [philosophers] through demonstrations and wonders [*apodeixeon kai thaumaton*], the Fathers gave the holy Creed [*Symbolon*], which is...a faithful and correct confession [*ortho homologia*] or...a wall against the weapons of the Devil.”¹⁰⁶

As we have seen in this chapter, the development of confessionalization studies has hit a road block, but the current trend toward studies of transnational identity and unity hold promise for that type of analysis. Particularly, Benedict and Pettegree put the focus on persuasion and propaganda in the form of sermons, conversations, and didactic theater to look for patterns of conversion across geographic boundaries. For example, one tactic used by clergy denied that orthodoxy was unchanging and its teachings divine. Fowden highlights Constantine’s monotheistic schema—one emperor, one empire, one God—as the result of communities of believers turning from *ortho-praixs* to *ortho-doxa*. Eusebius was the first historian to glorify Constantine’s schema with martyrs and confessors. Post-Reformation Protestants and Catholics constructed confessional identities based on the themes in Eusebius’ ecumenical narrative and history.

Through the studies of Valliere, Humfress, and Lim we gained a greater appreciation for the historical development of conciliarism, orthodoxy, and rhetoric after the era of Constantine. Valliere argued that the empire and its ministers were co-managers of popular orthodoxy, and conciliarism was the bi-directional vehicle for achieving the ‘unity of belief’ in creedal form. Humfress demonstrated the unfolding of orthodoxy and its professionalization in court trials, where prosecutors and defendants

honed their rhetorical skills in forensic techniques of argumentation. Lim identified this period's fascination with speeches (*logoi*) as the center of political and religious *praxis* and *doxa*. In this polemical environment orthodox clergy increasingly resorted to a strategy of mystification and apophatic obfuscation in order to defeat their 'secular' opponents. The chapter closed by describing Eusebius' confessor story at the first Ecumenical Council of Nicea in 325 as a dramatized trope carried on by succeeding ecclesiastical historians, including Dositheos.

Chapter III

The Sixteenth Century Revolutions and Its German Confessor

In the preface to Pelikan and Hotchkiss' three volume collection, entitled *Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition*, the authors expressed their apprehensiveness in deciphering the *cur alii prae aliis*, why some creeds and confessions were chosen and not others, and in establishing criteria for their inclusion or exclusion.¹⁰⁷ It was not a simple question of historical fact and etymology; rather, the project to colligate these records also required an *apologia* or self-defense and rationalization.¹⁰⁸ In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries a unique phenomenon occurred when an unprecedented proliferation of creeds and confessions followed the printing and protestant revolutions.¹⁰⁹ Although Pelikan rightly admitted "...we all know what a creed is—as long as no one asks us to define it..." there was no doubt to the editors that "[t]he Augsburg Confession therefore helped to define, not only for its followers but for many other groups, including its severest critics, what a 'confession of faith' means."¹¹⁰ The historical documents deemed 'confessional' vary from articles of faith to catechisms and individual testimonies to collective *apologia* or self-defense. By 1530 the new form of media—the printed word (*logos*)—did more than facilitate Luther's personal protestation to a larger German audience; it provided for the re-formation of a confessional identity and the repurposing of Eusebius' ecumenical narrative and history. By public confession this *credo* community's proprietary interpretation of the past united them in an ideologically grand narrative of a common past, a 'universal' history originating from Jerusalem. Politically, they distinguished and separated themselves from the Catholic Roman Empire by confessing. The publication of the *Augsburg Confession*

of 1530 established a paradigm for formulating a confessional identity during that period. Theoretically, they were only making a distinction that the German audience had already felt as Rome's 'cash cow.'

Although A. G. Dickens proved in his groundbreaking publication *The German Nation and Martin Luther* that "...the German masses had their faces averted from Rome and were ready to march..."¹¹¹ and any 'Luther' would do, the populism and peripatetic propagation of Martin Luther's preaching in 1517 was unprecedented in the history of creeds and confessions. Nevertheless, between 1530 and 1580 Luther's preaching was reinscribed with a more academic version of Luther's message provided by Wittenberg's professors and the secondary authority of confessional texts.¹¹² In 1525 Germany's hero condemned the peasant revolts. By 1529 at the Marburg Colloquy he had disassociated himself from other Protestant spokespersons ostensibly over one article of disagreement on the Eucharist. This paradoxical division towards union resulted in the formation of a confessional identity.¹¹³ This transition to a confessional form of unity was expressed affectionately by historian Robert Kolb, writing, "Not since the Council of Nicaea [381] had a confession created in such a forum become a standard of dogma, a secondary authority for teaching the faith...Not since Nicaea had such a confession become a fundamental definition of what Christians believe and teach."¹¹⁴ The *Augsburg Confession* of 1530 was authored by Wittenberg's professor of Greek and history, Philip Melancthon, who also shared a similar nostalgic adoration of an idyllic Nicaea past. The *Augsburg Confession* was officially presented by German nobility on June 25th at the Diet of Augsburg in protest to Emperor Charles V (1500-1558) and in response to their fellow critics and excommunicated detractors. In the imperial courts these German 'Lutherans'

faced the same accusations recorded by Eusebius in his ecclesiastical history of the fourth century, namely that they were a new Christian nation introducing novel doctrines.

In *Images of the Martin Luther: as Prophet, Teacher, Hero Reformer 1520-1620*, Kolb summarized Martin Luther's (1483-1546) impact on the German audience by emphatically stating that "Luther's Reformation had begun with an air of the supernatural about it. In a world which had no experience of the potential power of the printing press, his sudden and profound impact on German ecclesiastical and political life seemed miraculous."¹¹⁵ Indeed, there was an apocalyptic hope among the peasants. Luther was perceived by many admirers as fulfilling legendary prophecies about a forthcoming *reformer* and new Elijah. The tale of Luther was heard by a wide-eyed audience and imagined as a mythical battle and Luther its German Hercules.¹¹⁶ He assumed other popular tropes when the Edict of Worms was proclaimed against him in 1521 by the Roman Empire. This imperial act consequently made Luther the heroic outlaw, the sacrificial lamb, and the long-suffering protagonist of a developing passion story. These early visions of him were nostalgically recycled at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530.¹¹⁷

Luther's popularity was media driven. Through journalistic biographies and popular print artists such as Lucas Cranach, Luther's image makers gave him a touch of the supernatural within the popular imagination.¹¹⁸ The period from 1521 to 1524 was a crucial moment of mass print and communications *Wildwuchs* (literally, wild evangelical growth) in conjunction with an abundance of itinerant preachers—all intersecting and centrifugal. In addition, Luther's political notoriety was given a public platform via the unprecedented phenomenon of polemical pamphleteering (*Flugschriften*) in the German public square.¹¹⁹ Luther's celebrity was a public event. Fully aware of this fame, as early

as 1519, Luther inscribed some of his letters with the appellation ‘The Liberator’ (*Eleutherius*).¹²⁰

Furthermore, concomitant with innovations in print and media technologies the traditional effect of the spoken or preached word remained an influential source of and intoxicating brew for excited crowds and attentive audiences.¹²¹ Pettegree’s early research on the impact of preaching ministers, in compliment to Bernd Moeller’s emphasis on vibrant German cities, led him to conclude that “...many in the German cities knew of Luther even before they read his writings.”¹²² Many former students of Wittenberg contributed to his popularity and provided much of the groundwork by visiting and preaching in small and large villages and towns particularly in and around the area of Wittenberg. Almost all of the preachers originated from urban upper classes with a cosmopolitan background; nonetheless, state-endowed preacherships in many German cities also became available during this period and offered an aspirational middling group opportunity for advancement.¹²³ The success of Luther’s message was not primarily driven by its theological content but by the preached word and what the audiences’ heard. Rhetoric was more influential than the doctrinal arguments being sermonized—the line of delivery and presentation, the still and thunder of performance, and the light melodic reasoning from charisma over the dim effect of plodding logic. It was the crowded and potent space between the podium and the laity, where the mention of local news helped traveling preachers engage their audience and garner the attention that established celebrities took for granted.¹²⁴

Pettegree stated, “These were, not least, a sense of the sermon as performance; a belief that preaching could transform the lives of those who stood before them; and a

belief that the spirit of God was embodied in the preacher, and that the preacher's rhetorical skill worked with divine grace."¹²⁵ Luther and his message—the gospel announcement and advertized ‘good news’—were one celebrity preacher.¹²⁶ The message was an urban spectacle whose theatrical effects often persuaded and converted its audiences.¹²⁷ Its overture rang loudly throughout an orally inclined culture, and cracked thunder within an atmosphere of believers with eschatological anticipations, and miraculously appeared to the surprised shock of its spectators.

Luther's Wittenberg cohorts capitalized on his episodic fame to promote their long term institutional goal to replace old-style saints with new “...confessors and confessions, of martyrs and messages, of teachers and teachings, doctors and doctrines,” as Kolb described this period of transition.¹²⁸ Kolb, however, was reticent to declare the Wittenberg reformation a form of German nationalism like that of Protestant England, but as he admitted a peculiar “...flavor of specific national...” sentiment was clearly present.¹²⁹ During the Augsburg Interim of 1552, the first Lutheran martyrology was published in Strasbourg, authored by Ludwig Rabus, and entitled *Accounts of God's Chosen Witnesses, Confessors, and Martyrs*. In it Rabus referred to Luther as “the prophet of the German nation.” Rabus' contributions helped Wittenberg form a collective identity and message based on popular confessors and publicized martyrs.

Ludwig Rabus' martyrology comprised eight volumes divided into periods of persecution throughout the Church's history—his own time being the “third and last persecution” of the Antichrist—and comprised various biographical collections of martyrs, their confessions, and public testimonies. Rabus had also been a former student at Wittenberg and most probably acquired his discipline under the tutelage of Philip

Melanchthon; nonetheless, the ‘Homeric’ Eusebius provided Rabus with a historical framework, a model for making a clear distinction between martyrs and confessors, and a template for the glorification of confessors. Volumes two and three, both published in 1554, added to the chronological arrangement of martyrs and confessors and concluded with the burning of Jan Hus in the fifteenth century. Volume four began with Luther, whose early confrontation with Emperor Charles in the sixteenth century was compared by Rabus to the fourth century contest between the orthodox Athanasius against the heterodox Arius at the Diet overseen by Emperor Constantine I in the town of Nicaea. Luther held a special place in Rabus’ chronology as “the third Elijah.” One year after the Peace of Augsburg was proclaimed in 1555, volume five was published. Volume one began with a recounting of events centered on the presentation of the *Augsburg Confession* (1530). The three remaining volumes represented Rabus’ evangelical aims by colligating martyrs and confessors mostly outside the boundaries of Germany. Overall, Rabus’s Lutheran martyrology sought to impress the view that this persecuted sect belonged in the historical lineage and orthodox anatomy of martyrs and confessors.

Regarding German martyrdom in the early sixteenth century, however, there is great doubt and suspicion among scholars as to the historical reality on the blood soaked ground and the claims of it being widespread and severe for Lutherans. Beneath the emphatic rhetoric, Lutheran martyrdom was not commensurate with the violence suffered by Anabaptists and others outside of Germany. In southern Germany, where Lutherans experienced the most direct persecution by Charles V and foreign mercenaries, there were no martyrs and the pastors there chose exile over conversion. For much of the sixteenth century most suffered exile and sporadic deposition. Few had been subject to

direct police action due mostly to distance and the protection offered by German princes. Even the persecution Rabus personally faced as a pastor in Strasbourg during the Augsburg Interim merely resulted in the loss of his ecclesiastical position. After Lutheranism gained official legalization as a result of the Peace of Augsburg (1555), Rabus refocused his attention from the now less inspiring persecution by sword to the more clerical threat of false doctrine—although sales of his martyrology continued to lag behind John Fox’s English martyrology.¹³⁰

The preached word fell not surprisingly short of imparting on German audiences a refined indoctrination or a more complex theological articulation during this early period.¹³¹ Nevertheless, Pettegree emphasized that “...the evangelical movement unwittingly provided the common man with a new vocabulary and basis of action...” upon deep-seated clerical resentments and latent desires for social justice.¹³² The opening *apologia* or self-defense to the *Twelve Articles* (1525), published during a protracted uprising known as the Peasant Rebellion (1524-26), attested to this conservative fear. It confirmed reports that some peasant assemblies were preaching: “...to be obedient to no one, to rebel and rise in revolt everywhere, to rally and band together with great force, to reform and overthrow ecclesiastical and secular authorities, indeed, perhaps even to slay them.”¹³³ The constituents represented by the *Twelve Articles* were accused by their Roman Catholic opponents and German critics of fomenting among the peasants a ‘new Gospel.’

It was difficult, of course, for the motley crew of Swabian peasants to assert their orthodox lineage and articulate the finer doctrines of their gospel by means of the printed word; nonetheless, as a *credo* community they had little doubts about their place as true

believers versus, as the authors confessed, "...the most harmful enemy of the Gospel." In the first article of the peasant Twelve Articles, they immediately addressed "...the power and authority for the whole community to choose and elect its own pastor"; distinguished their desire for "...the holy Gospel to [be preached] to us purely and clearly"; and, necessitated a mandate for "...constant preaching." Their first priorities reflected their 'oral' culture: they desired their own clergy, to control what was preached, and to preach unceasingly. Some other points of the *Twelve Articles* pertained to more worldly concerns and affairs such as rents and tithes, hunting rights, the commons, and liberty from serfdom.¹³⁴

The final article declared a very 'Lutheran' schema: the priesthood of all believers. They proclaimed, "We will exercise [the right] and apply Christian doctrine in all its aspects." This rather bold expression and usurpation of clerical authority could only have come to those convinced by a nagging suspicion between "...the arguments of Scripture" and the duplicity of "...any human addition, doctrine, or commandment," as they expressed it.¹³⁵ Preaching and teaching framed their more worldly concerns. Further hints of this new vocabulary are located two years later in the first Anabaptist confession, the *Schleitheim Confession* of 1527, although it served more didactic purposes than the peasants' appeal for social justice. Its author was a martyr of the first rank having been tortured and burned at the stake.¹³⁶ Throughout Germany both radical groups, the Swabian peasants and the Anabaptists, shared equally in the loss of lives at the hands German Lutherans and even Swiss Zwinglians.¹³⁷

Martin Luther's well-known response to the peasant rebellions and the publication of his *Against the Murderous, Thieving Hordes of Peasants* in 1525 augured a growing

shift in the direction of evangelical preaching. By then peasant movements came under clerical leadership and the power of the crowd was subdued by ministerial politics.¹³⁸ In Germany the Zwickau prophets, Thomas Munzter's revolt, Andreas Karlstadt's iconoclasm, and Zwingli's teachings about 'Christ's presence' in the Eucharist had alarmed Martin Luther to the wild implications of 'the priesthood of all believers' which he had earlier emphasized and preached.¹³⁹ The once broader sense of his gospel required a narrower, more proprietary and doctrinal interpretation. For Martin Luther had to confront the frequent charge by Catholic scholars that he preached mere belief.¹⁴⁰

By 1526 the remaining pockets of peasant revolts in southern Germany ended in bloodshed and massacre at the hands of zealous soldiers encouraged by Luther's *Against the Murderous, Thieving Hordes of Peasants*. Luther concluded his book with the now infamous command for everyone to "[s]tab, smite, slay" the peasants and put an end to the rebellion by any means necessary. This short piece by Luther outlined three of his reasons for justifying the use of unyielding violence against the peasants, but the last one was confessional: "... [they] call themselves 'Christian brethren,' receive oaths and homage, and compel people to hold with them to these abominations."¹⁴¹

It can be imagined how shocked the larger German audiences were to see the words of Martin Luther which read: "Thus it may be that one who is killed fighting on the ruler's side may be a true martyr in the eyes of God...one who perished on the peasants' side is an eternal brand of hell...a member of the devil." The violent consequences of Luther's rhetoric *in extremis* were a ghastly sight even in the eyes of many urban artisans, merchant townspeople, and some of Luther's closest friends and professional colleagues. In the aftermath of bloodshed the loud outcry of Luther's critics

forced him to publicly respond via an *apologia*.¹⁴² Luther began *An Open Letter Concerning the Book Against the Peasants* (1525) with a scripture passage that reflected a confessor's rhetoric: "If ye believe not when I speak of earthly things, how shall ye believe when I speak of heavenly things."¹⁴³ After warning his critics, labeling them rebel sympathizers, and calling for their arrest, Luther stood by his previous writings with a confidence palpably conveyed when he wrote, "What care I that you do not like it, if God likes it?"¹⁴⁴

What Luther expected of the peasants was already reflected upon and articulated by him in a letter diplomatically entitled *An Admonition to Peace* (1525). In short, to the German princes he asked them "...to give up a little of your tyranny and oppression." His verdict on the peasants echoed a timeless confessor's refrain "...to let themselves be instructed..." To each of the peasants' *Twelve Articles* Luther appealed to the benefit of suffering and bearing the cross of martyrdom for the sake of order, law, and obedience. Luther called the second peasants' article "theft and highway robbery" for seeking the redistribution of church tithes in a more equitable manner.

Luther responded to the third article—"There shall be no serfs, for Christ has made all men free"—with examples of slavery from the Old Testament and its more abstract defense (*apologia*) in the New Testament.¹⁴⁵ According to Luther, history and sacred scripture proved the economy of master and slave an acceptable and natural inequality, stating: "For a slave can be a Christian and have Christian liberty... [For] a worldly kingdom cannot stand unless there is in it an inequality of persons, so that some are free, some imprisoned, some lords, some subjects, etc." "Therefore," Luther asserted, "...this article is dead against the Gospel." He concluded with a confessor's maxim,

namely, for his opponents to remain silent, keep still and suffer. Furthermore, he retooled his concept of *sola fide* or faith alone or monoideism and told the peasants "... [to] make their complaints to God alone."¹⁴⁶

The peasant revolts of 1525 and their pursuit for social justice as demonstrated in the *Twelve Articles* had been silenced within the city walls, just as Luther admittedly intended.¹⁴⁷ They never held a city long enough to maintain a public orthodoxy and teaching based on their understanding of "[T]he Word of God, which teaches love, peace, and unity..." Nevertheless, the memory of the peasant revolt and their *Twelve Articles* remained a potent spark of inspiration for radicals and a recurring dream of peasant freedom for other *credo* communities.¹⁴⁸

Articles operating as an avenue for confessional identity were consequential. In 1529 German Lutherans and Swiss Zwinglians sought concord based on the *Schwabach Articles* (summer) and the *Marburg Articles* (October) but failed. In 1531 the militant Schmalkaldic League of Lutherans united to defend the *Augsburg Confession* (1530), and in 1535 they required all its members to subscribe by oath to it.¹⁴⁹ Pettegree defined the period after the Peasant Rebellion (1524-1526) as a cultural of persuasion, when "a new dialectic of belonging and rejection" competed for confessional allegiance.¹⁵⁰ Along with the evolution of early sixteenth century print media were tertiary markets around popular hymns, plays, woodcuts, trinkets and icons and these served as objects and symbols for identifying who belonged in the community and concomitantly those excluded from fellowship. The public tension between orthodoxy and heresy demarcated art, devotions, and entertainment with signs of commitment and an early form of 'cancel culture'.¹⁵¹ They functioned, Pettegree emphasized, as "... a badge of identity, a tangible symbol of

allegiance for those who wished to affirm the general programme of the Gospel preachers... [and the preachers] grew adept at manipulating symbols by which supporters expressed their loyalty to new communities of protest or belief.”¹⁵²

Germany’s ‘second Luther’ and Wittenberg professor Philip Melancthon (1497-1560) had expressed his own frustrations with the situation, stating, “The common people who have become used to freedom, having once shaken off the yoke of the bishops, takes it badly to have those old burdens laid on them again... They are nothing bothered about the teachings of religion: they are only concerned with power and freedom.”¹⁵³ Indeed, the task ahead of Luther and his Wittenberg protégé sought to move from a defensive stance (i.e., *apologia*) to an explanation (i.e., *assertio*) with the intent on establishing the object of belief (i.e., *doctrina*)—that is, namely, the Lutheran articles of faith. By 1533 Luther was emphatic that the critique of doctrine be the central article of their cause. In a ‘table talk’ with his students Luther stated, “...I fight over the Word and whether our adversaries teach it in its purity. That doctrine should be attacked—this had never before happened. This is my calling... With this I have won, and I have won nothing else than that I teach aright... It’s the teaching that breaks the pope’s neck.”¹⁵⁴

The wild period of debating, questioning, and uncertainty gave way to the final assertion on what had to be believed. “Articles of faith”, Luther argued, “...like the Trinity and the incarnation of Christ—these don’t tally with reason... Ah, this [the incarnation] is a high doctrine, but few care very much about it.” In general Luther circumscribed the boundaries of reason, and sometimes even equated reason with unbridled inquiry, for the question “...‘why’ destroys many souls when they search after that which is too high for us.”¹⁵⁵ In another ‘table talk’ entitled “The Hatred between

Laymen and Clergymen,” Luther emphasized the importance of schools, stating, “In a city as much depends on a schoolmaster as on a minister. We can get along without burgonmasters, princes, and noblemen, but we can’t do without schools, for they must rule the world.”¹⁵⁶ He pointed to Wittenberg, proclaiming, “For it was in this school that God first revealed and purified his Word”; and, he opined that “[n]o better book has been written after the Holy Scriptures than Philip’s [*Loci Communes* (1521)]”—Wittenberg’s curriculum for the theological training of its clergy.¹⁵⁷ By 1545 at the Council of Trent even Luther’s *Smalcald Articles* (1537) were rejected as a basis of concord in favor of the *Augsburg Confession* (1530) and Melancthon’s *Apology to the Augsburg Confession* (1531).

* * *

Shortly after the failure of the German princes and the *Schwabach Articles* to secure an alliance with the Swiss and Free Cities in the summer of 1529, that October they tried again in the town of Marburg. The famous Ulrich Zwingli of Zurich, along with his close friend Johannes Oecolampadius of Basel, were the theological representatives for the Swiss Confederation; theologians, Caspar Hedio and Martin Bucer, both from Strasbourg represented the side of Jacob Sturm and the Free Cities; and a reluctant Martin Luther (he needed some amount of coaxing by John of Saxony) represented the German princes. Philip of Hesse chaired the colloquy and made known his wishes: “...that no one display his own particular feelings, rather that everyone seek

the glory of God, the common Christian welfare, and brotherly concord.”¹⁵⁸ The topic under dispute was the ‘the Lord’s Supper,’ that table of communion—the Eucharist.

The matter of disagreement concerned the physical presence of Christ in the Eucharistic elements of the bread and wine. Zwingli conceded the spiritual presence but not the physical. The dual—the physical and the spiritual—played a central role in the debate: conventional Roman Catholic theology had mostly assumed that the transubstantiation (i.e., change in some indescribable manner) of the Eucharistic elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ had accompanied the actual presence of Christ both spiritually and physically. As historian Steven Ozment observed, Luther was well-versed in Ockham’s theory of epistemology (i.e., scholastic nominalism).¹⁵⁹ Whenever the scholastic debate touched on the issue of reason Luther unsheathed Ockham’s razor to make a thin incision between belief and unbelief and made problematic the late medieval synthesis between reason and articles of faith.¹⁶⁰

To begin, Martin Luther accused the others of holding to Arian views of the Trinity against the teachings of Augustine and other orthodox predecessors. He compared their view of the Eucharist with baptism by stating, “Several teach that baptism is not a sign of faith, but merely an outward symbol of belonging.” He followed up by claiming his opponents’ party did not hold to justification by “...faith in Christ alone...”¹⁶¹ Luther concluded, “And so, without unanimity in these matters, it would be pointless to discuss the real significance of the Lord’s Supper.” Luther had already denounced Zwingli and his followers as early as 1522 and wanted nothing to do with the radicals—he would stand firm on one article of faith. And, his opponents insisted that they in turn could “...neither comprehend nor believe that Christ’s body is there.”¹⁶²

Luther did not quarrel with his opponents via *sola scriptura*—in the sense of gathering meaning by comparing passages—as Zwingli’s circle wished for and repeatedly insisted on as a basis of engagement and interpretation. Luther had other plans. He wrote on a table the following words: “This is my body.”¹⁶³ And, he covered this declarative sentence with a velvet cloth. The meaning of Luther’s performance he made clear to all:

...you produce arguments about the unlimited body which are based on natural reason. I do not question how Christ can be God and man and how the two natures can be joined. For God is more powerful than all our ideas, and we must submit to his word. Prove that Christ’s body is not there where the Scripture says, ‘This is my body’! Rational proofs I will not listen to.

Zwingli’s group objected with arguments from Scripture, in particular the sixth chapter of John’s Gospel, which pointed to the often figurative language and metaphors used by Jesus. The Eucharist in these contexts, they asserted, symbolize an inner meaning and not the literal interpretation of ‘Christ’s presence.’ Oecolampadius and Luther conversed about the grammatical functions of demonstratives, inclusive versus exclusive language usages, and the efficaciousness of the flesh versus the spirit. In the end, however, Luther weighed the authority and quality of one text—This is my body—over his opponents appeals to hermeneutics and reason. Luther also directed his criticism toward his academic colleagues whose theological speculations, he asserted, had attempted to harmonize Aristotelian philosophy with the scholastic pursuit of an ethereal logic of faith. Historians Ozment, William Bouwsma and Lewis Spitz all accepted the possibility that the art of rhetoric, the art of persuasion, and the Renaissance ideal of the

orator was more appealing to Luther—perhaps even “...the [very] ideal behind Reformation preaching and stress on the Word of God.”¹⁶⁴ During the Marburg debate Zwingli voiced similar suspicions. “Luther is employing the rhetorical device of exaggeration...It is a game of words that we are playing,” Zwingli expressed with exhaustion.

Luther was correct when he stated at the beginning of the colloquy that a hundred years of debating would not unite their views on the Eucharist. “No text, no interpretation, no employment of human reasoning...” Luther claimed, had the authority over the power of God’s efficacious word which declared literally—This is my body. Zwingli’s party also made appeals to Holy Scripture, Augustine, and orthodox predecessors. Luther’s acumen, however, had been well sharpened by 1529 in ecclesiastical synods and political arenas; thus, he dismissed historical appeals with sobering candor: “As regards the ancient fathers, we shall no doubt find that you speak about those on your side, we about those on ours.” Only a “decree from God himself” could shake Luther’s stance.¹⁶⁵ Even Zwingli’s last resort—interpreting from the original Greek text of the New Testament—was chided by Luther as unnecessary and kindly asked him to read in “German or Latin.”

Luther said as few words as possible and instead performed a demonstration about the limits of reason by proclaiming: “But [what] the word says...I believe...I believe... I believe...On these words I take my stand until Christ himself speaks otherwise.” Frustrated Zwingli exclaimed, “It would be outrageous if we affirmed, taught, and defended such an important article and yet were neither able nor willing to point to a singular passage of Scripture!” As the transcript reads, Luther lifted the table cloth with

the words ‘This is my body’ written on it and retorted, “My esteemed lords, as long as the text of my Lord Jesus Christ is there ‘*Hoc est enim Corpus meum*’ truly I cannot pass over it, but must confess and believe that Christ’s body is there.”¹⁶⁶ Luther equated this one article with Christ’s presence in the Eucharist bread and wine, stating, “...the articles of faith are not against dialectical truth, but rather outside, under, above, below, around, and beyond it.”¹⁶⁷

At the conclusion of the Marburg colloquy, Jacob Sturm (the Swiss prince) requested that his royal theologian, Martin Bucer, be given the chance to defend their side against Luther’s accusations that they did “...not preach correctly about the Trinity, and so on.” It was allowed. After Martin Bucer had finished his *apologia* on behalf of their Swiss articles of faith he asked Martin Luther, “I request your testimony, Herr Doctor Luther, on whether we are teaching correctly.” Luther answered:

Indeed no! I am neither your lord nor your judge. What you teach in Strassburg is no concern of mine. As long as you persist in not accepting my teaching I cannot tolerate you as disciples... Therefore I shall not give testimony to you... It is all too obvious that you have learned nothing from us. We would indeed be unwilling to have such disciples. I shall not be your teacher. You have my writings and my confession.

The parties exchanged apologies for any uncivil offenses and offered repentant prayers:

Oecolampadius cried, “I call upon the will of God to protect the poor church.”

Zwingli apologized, “I call upon you, Doctor Luther, to forgive my bitterness. I have always desired your friendship a great deal, and I want it still. [With tears in his eyes] There are no others in Italy and France whom I would rather see.”

Luther curtly retorted, “Call upon God, that you may receive understanding.”

Oecolampadius, feeling insulted, answered, “Call upon him yourself, for you need it just as much as we!”

As historian Markus Wriedt summarized the colloquies of this period, the public debates were never a serious attempt toward confessional unity; moreover, the arguments put forth “...tended to become ritualized exchanges of arguments to demonstrate the strength of irreconcilably antagonistic positions.”¹⁶⁸

* * *

In 1541 Emperor Charles held a colloquy in the city of Regensburg that began a solid path of compromise and dialogue between Catholics and Protestants. Just prior to the Regensburg Colloquy Melancthon had reached some common ground with the Calvinist sect of protestants from southern Germany with a revised version of his *Apology to the Augsburg Confession* (1531) by altering its strong language on the Eucharist to reflect a more ‘spiritual’ interpretation of ‘Christ’s presence’ in the body and wine. The Catholic party for its part, lead by the more flexible Gasparo Contarini, had agreed to a definition of salvation by faith that appeased his protestant opponents as well as Pope Paul III. The Catholic party had also tentatively accepted their opponent’s

insistence that the word ‘transubstantiation’ be excised from a definition of Christ’s presence in the Eucharistic elements. This final compromise, however, went too far for Contarini who expressed to Emperor Charles V that that word ‘transubstantiation’ was as equally important to the Catholic Faith as the word *homousious* was to the Council of Nicaea in 325. With the breakdown of dialogue between Catholics and Protestants, the Regensburg Colloquy ended any hopes of establishing concord; and, in 1545 the Council of Trent declared all expressions of Protestantism heresy and published the ‘true’ orthodox Catholic doctrine. Emperor Charles V too was convinced after this impasse that only the temporal sword could hope to bring these German princes into submission. With the passing of Luther in 1546 and Charles’ military engagement with other rebellious countries subdued, in particular France, the Emperor was freed to engage a military campaign against the militant Schmalkaldic League of Protestants.

Two years later in 1548 the Schmalkaldic League was defeated by the Emperor’s forces. Melancthon’s appeal to submit by way of *adiaphora* or compromise to the new regulations imposed by the Augsburg Interim branded him a traitor in the eyes of a new Lutheran fraction, the Gnesio (literally, the True) Lutherans. During the Interim, the burgeoning establishment of orthodox Lutheranism was fraught with internal fighting, suspicions of betrayal to the sainted Luther, and accusations of crypto-Calvinism against those (i.e., the Philippist) appealing to compromise. In addition to attacks on Melancthon’s *adiaphora*, his earlier textual alteration of the *Augsburg Confession* (1530) for the purposes of unity with other Protestant leaders at the Regensburg Colloquy took center stage. In particular, the Gnesio Lutherans objected quite vehemently to changes in the original text—namely, the substitution of the word ‘in’ for the word ‘with’

where it expressed Christ's presence in the Eucharist. The Gnesio party of Lutherans would decree Lutheran orthodoxy in 1577 through the Formula of Concord—*sans* Melanchthon's alteration.

In 1552, two years after the publication of the *Magdeburg Confession* (1550), a resurgent Schmalkaldic League once again joined forces against Emperor Charles. He deferred dealing with the Schmalkaldic League to the Austrian king Ferdinand, who three years later successfully garnered a treaty with them, the Peace of Augsburg (1555). Afterwards Melanchthon still could not escape accusations by the Gnesio Lutherans that he was a crypto-Calvinist and traitor for seeking compromises. Melanchthon's reworking of the *Augsburg Confession* (1530) into the *Variata* certainly made article ten on the Eucharist more palpable to Calvinist interpretations of 'the real presence of the Christ.' Yet, the ferocity displayed by the Gnesio sect made historian Euan Cameron refer to the reactionary backlash as "the pyrotechnics of adversarial confessional rhetoric."¹⁶⁹ After Melanchthon had passed in 1560 a year later the Gnesio Lutherans confronted the remnant of Philippist at the Diet of Naumburg, where they asserted that only the unaltered, original text of the *Augsburg Confession* (1530) represented true Lutheranism. Their fears of a crypto-Calvinist infiltration at the Diet were heightened by the participation of and pandering to Elector Frederick III of the Palatinate, whose eventual conversion to Calvinism was hastened by the obdurate example of the Gnesio Lutherans. The Philippist did not back down, however, and continued to promote the *Variata* by reprinting it several times throughout the 1560s. The Gnesio Lutherans in turn reprinted several editions of the unaltered *Augsburg Confession*.

A year before Melanchthon passed away in 1560 he welcomed a six month visit from Demetrios Mysos, a deacon in the Greek Church who was sent as an envoy by the Greek patriarch of Constantinople, Joasaph II (1555-1565). Melanchthon was excited for the chance to establish good relations with the Eastern Church, whom he had previously encountered only indirectly through a study of their history, theology, and orthodox predecessors. Together Melanchthon and Mysos translated the *Variata* into Greek and sent it to the patriarch attached with a personal letter from Melanchthon. Mysos, however, did not return to Constantinople preferring to serve Prince Heraclides (1561-1563) in Romania. Thus, the patriarch received neither Melanchthon's letter nor his Greek *Variata*, and ecumenical dialogue between the two churches did not occur until 1574. By that time the dignitaries had changed: Jacob Andrea (1528-1590) of the Gnesio party and the new Greek Patriarch Jeremiah II (1572-1579, 1580-1584, 1587-1595). When their correspondence was first published in 1584 Melanchthon's authorship of the Greek translation was removed by the Gnesio party and disingenuously replaced with Paul Dolscius's signature, a copyist not under suspicion of being a crypto-Calvinist. If it had been the choice of the Gnesio Lutherans they would not have even sent the *Variata* and been compelled in conversations with the East to refer its title as: *The Confession of the Orthodox [Lutheran] Faith*.

The ecumenical overlay of the text of the Greek translation is quite apparent, signaling both Melanchthon's erudite study of the Eastern Church and the assistance of Mysos. Here, the additions attempted to provide the *Variata* with language that was more reminiscent of the creedal tradition and more inclined to an Eastern theological understanding, without sacrificing the distinctly Lutheran interpretation of *sola fide*.

Article one reiterated the Nicæan Trinitarian formula.¹⁷⁰ In article two on the topic of ‘original sin,’ Melanchthon chose to translate from the Latin *lucē ac noticiā Dei* (the light and knowledge of God) into the Greek *tis theias ellampseos kai theognosias* (the divine illumination and knowledge of God) which was in more accord with the Eastern language of theosis.¹⁷¹ Article three described Mary as ever-virgin and the Trinity as a hypostatic union.¹⁷² Article four on justification exchanged the Latin *gratis* (grace or favor) for the Greek *charisma einai kai doron toy theou* (charism and gift of God).¹⁷³ The most telling evidence of the text’s ecumenical disposition was Melanchthon’s alteration of the tenth article from the Latin *quod cum pane et vino* (with the bread and wine) into the Greek *to soma kai to aimā tou christou ontos paresti* (the body and blood of Christ are really present).¹⁷⁴

When the Gnesio Lutherans finally made contact with the Eastern Church in 1574 by sending Patriarch Jeremiah II a letter of introduction along with a little book of sermons, they received a response from him. By the end of their correspondence in 1582 all ecumenical overtures, nuances within the text, and clear topics of agreement ended quite bitterly.

After receiving a brief letter from Patriarch Jeremiah in 1574 expressing his intentions to write again with a fuller response, Jacob Andrea wrote back in appreciation and notified him that he was sending him a Greek translation of the *Augsburg Confession* (he did not refer to it as the *Variata*). In Andrea’s letter from March 1575 he reflected on their achievements against Rome and the inspiration for their confession:

...fifty years ago we...were more thoroughly instructed by Martin Luther, a divinely illumined man, who was distinguished by his zeal for the truth... Forty-four years ago our most pious princes and our theologians compiled a summary of the ancient faith that had come down to us from paradise... Thus, they gave an account of their orthodoxy...This celebrated confession of our blessed forbearers...there have been thousands of witnesses...we held and had kept the faith which had been handed down to us by the Holy Apostles and Prophets, by the God-bearing Fathers and Patriarchs, and by the seven Ecumenical Synods that were founded upon the God-given Scriptures...we await your most wise and most pious judgment and reply with reference to the Confession which we have sent.¹⁷⁵

The patriarch sent a letter on the 4th of May 1576 that prefaced his detailed—article by article—response to the *Variata*. While the tone had been cordial between the patriarch and Andrea, in his letter the patriarch anticipated their disagreements by asking them not to be offended. He concluded with an exhortation:

...this very truth and this very philosophy of our Lord Jesus Christ with which His Divine Disciples and Apostles and their canonical and saving words, and with which the Ecumenical and local Synods of the Holy Fathers, and the theologically [oriented] preachers of the Church, manifestly agree, that salvation and the kingdom of heaven are attained by those who obey these writings. Just as eternal damnation and blame are for those who deny and transgress them. If, therefore, you desire and obey me (says the Lord), you shall eat of the goods of the earth. In like manner, my humble self, as the heir of Christ, by His mercy, exhort your

love...for the unity of each others' church, which hope will be for the glory of Christ.¹⁷⁶

The patriarch then proceeded to address each article of the *Variata* in turn.

Much like the Gnesio Lutherans had objected to Melancthon's insertion of the word 'with' into the tenth article of the *Augsburg Confession*, Patriarch Jeremiah protested the Lutheran's retention of the *filioque* in their confession of faith. Concerning the first article on God, he stated:

The confession of the sound faith of Christians, this most sacred symbol...most clearly reveals that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father...This is the treasure of the true faith...so that no one would omit anything nor introduce into it anything spurious. This divine, most sacred, and wholly perfect credo of our piety, the confession of all the Holy Fathers...¹⁷⁷

It could be assumed that the patriarch would have viewed the Western addition of the *filioque* to the Nicene Creed as an alteration or *variata*.

The patriarch chose next to address the third article on the Apostles' Creed—which he entitled *Articles of Faith*—instead of the second article on the topic of original sin. The third article provides an insightful summary of the Eastern Church's view concerning all articles of faith as they had been handed down generation by generation. Patriarch Jeremiah wrote that they were “beyond mind and reason” and “the only existing true confession;” and, therefore, the ancient articles of faith were important not only for the Church but more importantly for its members since “he who believes correctly must confess if he wishes to be saved.” Contained within articles of faith, the Patriarch

asserted, were the contents of what must be believed, that “teaches us and leads to salvation.” He then bid the “brethren” (i.e., Lutherans) to join him by “... cleans[ing] our mind with the correct faith.”¹⁷⁸

Finally, concerning article ten on the Eucharist Patriarch Jeremiah did not disagree but found it lacking in precision and clarity.

The first response from the Gnesio Tübingen theologians to the patriarch’s criticisms and affirmations, this time by Lucas Osiander on behalf of Jacob Andrea, was cordial. Nevertheless, it was also a harbinger of the trenchant discord that would follow the rest of their exchange. They expressed their appreciation for the patriarch’s careful and elaborate analysis, but prefaced their letter by stating that “Every human mind is subject to making errors.” The exchanges which followed only complicated matters of disagreement and even expanded its dimensions, opening wider spaces for discord and narrowing the areas of agreement. In the end the patriarch requested to no longer be bothered with what he viewed as *logomachy*—arguments over words. In turn, the Lutherans abandoned their ecumenical position, but even more encouraged and self-assured in their confession and articles of faith.

Nonetheless, in their final exchange of letters, when the impasse was quite evident and bitter, there was one topic they both agreed on without the need for further discussion—the Jews. On the issue of Jews they both were quite indifferent and fully segregated from them. As the Tübingen theologian Martin Crusius, who translated their letters into the Greek, stated:

...they [i.e., the Jews] have completely nothing to do with us. We are thus separated from them. They are banished from the jurisdiction of most of our governors, and they are not allowed to reside among us. The great teacher, Luther, in his published books, has wisely and effectively refuted their godlessness for the public by trampling on it...we have absolutely not learned their absurd opinions and unbelief, but merely their language in the same manner as with the Greek language, [i.e.,] from profane Greek writers.¹⁷⁹

This chapter began with an assessment of the *Augsburg Confession* (1530) that situates its importance between the media driven personage and fame of Martin Luther's early populism and the later academic 'Wittenberg Reformation' headed by Philip Melancthon. The formation of a German Lutheran confessional identity followed Eusebius' glorification of martyrs and confessors. Luther's early schema—the priesthood of all believers—was analyzed outside the royal courts and his 'break with Rome'; instead, Luther's response to the peasants' *Twelve Articles* (1525) revealed several rhetorical techniques in the confessor's arsenal, stripped of theological ornaments. For example, Luther claimed that soldiers for the crown were true martyrs; the self-defense Luther was publicly forced to give took the form of a polemical *apologia* and employed the strategy of mystification; he told the peasants to humble themselves and be willing to learn; finally, Luther called on them to be silent.

We also saw that attempts at unity among Protestants in a culture of belonging failed, but internal unity among German Lutherans succeeded *via* the Wittenberg professors, schools, and divine teachings that were beyond reason's limitations. The Marburg colloquy of 1529 gave a dramatic example of Luther *qua* confessor around the

table of communion, the Eucharist, a representation of the collective belief in a symbol of unity. The dialectical roadblock at Marburg was met again by Gneiso Lutherans as a result of their first historical outreach to the Ecumenical Patriarch Jeremias II of Constantinople, but both Lutherans and the Eastern Church nonetheless were of one accord on the subject of Jews.

Chapter IV

Confessional Geography Beyond Borders

The religion of the early followers depicted in the New Testament book of Acts was originally, maybe piously, referred to as ‘the Way.’ Yannaras provided five signposts or historical figures that helped preserve the fading path towards what he named “...the real Hellenism [and] the historical embodiment of the Church’s Gospel.” His outline begins with the sixteenth century Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople Jeremiah II and his correspondence with the German Gnesio Lutherans and ends with a ‘Hellenic revival’ in the 1960s.¹⁸⁰

Although Yannaras charged Patriarch Jeremiah II (1572-1595) with ‘doctrinal intellectualism’ and ‘moral individualism,’ he appreciated Jeremiah’s *Confession of Faith* for its time since it did “...not exclude a use of language which evokes the ecclesial and existential experience of faith.” Yannaras did not elaborate on Jeremiah’s ‘positive’ use of language, but he did praise Jeremiah’s explanation or definition of an orthodox confession of faith as “...a ‘sign’ and ‘defining boundary’ of true piety...” He continued by quoting Jeremiah’s answer to the Lutherans on the symbolism of confession: “[It is] the divine, most sacred and perfect sign of our piety at all times and in all places is the confession of all the Holy Fathers, the defining boundary of Christianity.”¹⁸¹ For certain Jeremiah emphasized the act of believing correctly, exhorted the Lutherans to cleanse “our mind with the correct faith,” and described the articles of the *Nicene Creed* as the “perfect *credo* of our piety.” Within this exchange with Lutherans over formulas, correct knowledge, and concepts that dealt principally with convictions, unbelief, and the

certainty of belief—the bedrock of confessionalism—Yannaras neither charged Jeremiah with western intellectualism nor the sixteenth century’s pathology “for certainties”;¹⁸² rather, he criticizes: “Jeremiah’s use of the word ‘piety’ (*eusebeia*) [because]...It refers to the practice of the virtues without suggesting participation in the Eucharistic realization of authentic life.”¹⁸³ Yannaras objected to his individualistic and abstract expression of piety (religion) divorced from the experiential—Yannaras appealed to the participatory *transubstantial* reality. What Yannaras valued most about Jeremiah’s confession was its focus on boundaries that refracted an internal call for collective unity and ultimately historical belonging.

The historical roots of western theology Yannaras traced back to Augustine’s ‘Latin’ distinction between *essentia* and *substantia*. However, the resultant turn of the West towards individualism and nationalism Yannaras, like Dositheos, locates in the ninth century with the crowning of Charlemagne, the new Frankish Empire, and “a national form of Christianity.”¹⁸⁴ It suffices to say that Yannaras’ conclusion ends with the accusation that a ‘cultural decline’ occurred early in the West and later in the East starting somewhere around the fifteenth century. The final result of this narrative of ‘cultural decline’ in the East (and in the West), Yannaras asserts, was the loss of “...the real boundaries of Hellenic existence, [and] its self-awareness and identity...”¹⁸⁵

The ‘eucharistic change’ occurred, Yannaras asserted, when the original meaning of the Greek word *logos*, “signifying manifestation,” became interpreted by the West as a type of rationalization that he defined as: “*Ratio* is the individual’s capacity for rational thought (*facultas rationis*), the mind’s ability to know things by their essence (per se).”¹⁸⁶

Yannaras applied the fourteenth century Palamite distinction between essence and

energies by contrasting the West's desire "...to know things by their *essence*" with the original Greek sense of "manifestation" which—according to the Christian idea of *Logos*—constitutes relationship and participation in God's energies.

Yannaras argued that in the West "The Church's Gospel, or theology, was transformed into a rationalistic structure, an *apodictic* or demonstrative methodology, able to convince the individual intellect by argumentation (*modus argumentativus*). It was turned into a sacred science (*sacra scientia*) which neglected experience and empirical evidence."¹⁸⁷ Although Yannaras dismissed the value of defending *apodictic* or demonstrable truth through a mode of argumentation, he could not avoid echoing arguments over 'the Eucharistic Question' and the contending confessors' dialectic in response to the question of "what is real?" Where does it lie on the spectrum between the symbolic and the real, the imagined and the experienced, the mutable and the immutable, the created and the uncreated? Yannaras expressed the dialectic as "the priority of the existential [i.e., the real] fact over the intellectually [i.e., the imagined] conceived essence."¹⁸⁸ Yannaras replied with the schema of a hesychast practitioner, Makriyannis, who experienced a vision of light and wrote: "...such is the union, where all things are one, so that the one who sees cannot distinguish either the means or the goal or the essence, but only that it is light and that he see light which resembles nothing created."¹⁸⁹

Despite Yannaras' objections to the West's *cataphatic* rationalism to the detriment of *apophatic* or demonstrable truth, he himself purposed an *apodictic* and appealed to a historical demonstrative that: "...from time to time across the centuries a conscious Hellenic presence shines through, linking Gregory Palamas to the present day."¹⁹⁰ This was Yannaras 'the confessor' speaking and pointing to what he called

“...the real Hellenism”—a historical miracle—whose modern presence, he claimed, can be observed in the figure of Alexander Papadiamantis (1851-1911) and his Greek School and the ‘literary’ works of the 1960s which led to a “Hellenic revival.”

This chapter is divided into four sections: the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, Transylvania, France, and the Jesuits. It begins by situating Dositheos’ *Confession of Faith* (1672) at the tail end of a ‘Protestant Reformation’ in Poland-Lithuania, as seen through the lens of Isaievych’s brotherhoods, the beginning of the Leichoudes’ teaching mission to Moscow, and Dositheos’ enchanted vision for Russia. The *Transylvania Confession* (1579) provides the context for a multi-confessional analysis framed between the failed Ottoman siege at Belgrade in the Kingdom of Hungary (modern day Serbia) and the Calvinist ecumenical overture in 1629 to Cyril Loukaris, the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople. In France, once again, the Eucharist takes center stage when the French Catholic Jansenists and Calvinists involved not only the Greek Church but also England in a truly international affair of diplomacy, conciliarism, and confession. It ends with disappointment on the Protestant French and English side and perhaps with quiet rejoicing by Catholic Jansenists and Jesuits. Finally, the Jesuits provide the example of early modernity’s advanced techniques of persuasion by means of theatrical productions. The chapter concludes with an example of theater as also a space for political performance and public affairs.

* * *

Poland-Lithuania

The initial dismissal by the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople Jeremiah II against the overtures of the German Gnesio Lutherans in the sixteenth century, if repeated, would have had dire consequences for the Eastern Church in the seventeenth century, which faced internal fracturing on its frontier borders over disputed lands and contested souls. Outside the patriarchal center of ecclesiastical fortitude in Constantinople and the canopy of Ottoman bureaucracy, the city of Kiev was located on the Dnieper River. The city attracted many migrants, peasants, freed serfs, and Jews. The first printing press in this region was established in 1567 by the Ukrainian and Muscovite refugee Ivan Fedorovych. He published a didactic Gospel two years later before moving to the Ostroh Academy, where a reformation based on the Greek Byzantine model was taking place. The result of such an enterprise was the first publication of a Slavonic Bible based on the original Greek manuscripts in 1581. The Ostroh Academy became a Jesuit College in 1620.¹⁹¹

Arguably the most noted work and pioneering study of multi-confessional societies in Poland-Lithuania remains Iaroslav Isaievych's book *Voluntary Brotherhood: Confraternities of Laymen in Early Modern Ukraine*.¹⁹² Isaievych's focus at the level of intra confessional conflict among Orthodox and Uniate brotherhoods or confraternities, monasteries, and schools was quite unprecedented. Isaievych connected the confraternities or the associations of lay parishes and monasteries with collective efforts to retain a sense of authentic religious identity. Although Isaievych concluded by comparing the direction of his narrative—"from a lay reform movement to reform guided by the hierarchy"—to patterns similar in the West, he is emphatic that any ideological or comparisons of historical phenomena must be seen "...as a result of local conditions,

rather than as imitations of the West...” These local conditions emerged, he rightly perceived, from an assimilated “Byzantine-Ruthenian tradition.”¹⁹³

In her book *The Western Front of the Eastern Church: Uniate and Orthodox Conflict in 18th-century Poland, Ukraine, Belarus, and Russia*, Barbara Skinner updated and expanded Isaievych’s continued significance and relevance by focusing on the formation of a distinctly Ruthenian Orthodox identity through a processes of confessionalization. From their base in the Danubian Principalities the patriarchs of Jerusalem and Constantinople had a formative role and interest in upholding a vision and mission of unity (i.e., an ecumenical or universal Greek Church) among those being contested for in Ruthenian lands by Jesuit Uniates. Patriarch Jeremiah II traveled there to intervene personally in 1589, and the famous ‘crypto-Calvinist’ patriarch of Constantinople Cyril Loukaris sent help in 1596.¹⁹⁴ Around 1640 the Moldavian refugee, Polish immigrant, and Metropolitan of Kiev Peter Mogila (1595-1647) crafted a confession entitled *The Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church* (1642). He was confirmed the Metropolitan of Kiev by the patriarch of Jerusalem Theophanes. Theophanes’ successor Patriarch Nectarios composed the forward to Mogila’s confession. Nectarios also had the confession edited by his emissary and ‘Doctor of the Church’ Meletios Syrigos and ensured its official approval in 1642 at a local synod in Jassy, Moldavia. Nectarios introduced his emissary Syrigos as “...the Preacher, Interpreter, and very Rule itself, of the most genuine and true Doctrine of the Faith, Representing therefore the very Person of the Patriarch [Nectarios].”¹⁹⁵ Nectarios’ successor Patriarch Dositheos also had Mogila’s confession confirmed at the council of

Jerusalem in 1672, which he chaired, but added his own confession, the *Confession of Dositheos* (1672).

The religious topography of the Ruthenian lands consisted of Roman Catholics, Uniate Orthodox, Ruthenian Orthodox and Protestants, Jews, and Russian Orthodox on the peripheries. Isaievych's chapter on the Lviv monastic confraternity's reorganization of lay education in the late 1580s and 1590s provides an analysis of intra-confessional conflict that demonstrates most importantly the competition over schools and print media.¹⁹⁶ Isaievych summarized the direction of this transition, stating that, "The increasing influence of the clergy on culture was particularly evident in the education system. If in the early confraternity schools most teachers were laymen, in the newly founded Kyiv Mohyla College all professors were monks."¹⁹⁷ Like Pettegree, Isaievych observed a critical time when "... [t]hose forces [i.e., the clergy] began to issue warnings and mobilize public opinion for action." The conversion of the masses, the simple folk, and the peasants were at stake. In response each confraternity mobilized their own vigorous propaganda campaign which extended beyond the use of the printing press to include political theatrics, violent force, and public persuasion.¹⁹⁸

While Isaievych hesitated to use the term 'Slavia Orthodoxa' for technical reasons, he rightly asserted the central place of the "Greek Orthodox heritage" from which the confraternities asserted the legitimacy of their campaign and mission on behalf of the "Eastern Church" (as Mogila titled his confession).¹⁹⁹ On all sides of the intra-confessional conflict the study of Greek, the importance of Greek teachers, and Greek publications were never about academics and scholarly pursuits alone; rather, as Isaievych explains, "...it was a way of learning about the roots of their Orthodox

identity...²⁰⁰ When the Arabic speaking patriarch of Antioch Joachim IV was greeted ceremoniously by the citizens of Lviv in 1585 and he confirmed their confraternity with an official seal, he proclaimed in writing the mission of its new school. Isaievych provides the text:

...the burghers of Lviv wish to found a school for the instruction of Christian children of every degree who would study the Holy Scriptures in Greek and Slavonic, so that their Christian race might not be left as if without a voice for lack of learning. And they also bought a print shop required for this school...²⁰¹

Here, Isaievych locates the intimate confluence of forces leading to what he admits resembles "...that of the activists of the Protestant Reformation."²⁰² In the middle of the seventeenth century a bitter schism occurred farther east between the Russian 'orthodox' Old Believers and the Muscovite Patriarch Nikon, when the former objected to the latter's 'conservative' liturgical reforms that corrected deviations from the Greek liturgical template.²⁰³ Thus, when Dositheos sent two of his most educated Greek missionaries to Russia in 1685, they arrived during a period already divided among the 'Russophile,' the 'Grecophile,' and protesting Raskolniks.

A century after ordination of the Lviv confraternity, the Greek islanders Leichoudes brothers, Ioannikios (1633-1717) and Sophronios (1653-1730) founded the Slavo-Greco-Latin Academy in 1685, the first official educational institution in Russian history. Silvester Medvedev (1641-1691) had taken over Moscow's local school for training state clerks after the passing of its director and his former teacher, Simeon Polotsky. Medvedev had sought to elevate the status of the school to the level of an

academy, but he was thwarted by Tsar Fedor who accepted the Muscovite Patriarch Joachim's proposal to establish a Greek school, the Typography School in 1681. Dositheos approved of the Greek project but warned, "Be sure to keep the flock of Christ pure from Latin writings and books, for they contain the teaching of Antichrist and they are full of novelties and full of blasphemy...they are wheedling and enticing."²⁰⁴ When the Leichoude brothers arrived the Slavo-Greco-Latin Academy replaced the Typography. Medvedev, sorely bitter and his school dissolved, inflamed a Eucharist controversy over the 'words of institution' versus 'the *epiklesis*' against the Leichoude seeking to defame their 'orthodox' character.²⁰⁵

Despite Dositheos' expressed fear of Latin writings and books, he selected the Leichoude brothers who were educated abroad in Padua and received a deeply Jesuit education. Dositheos trusted their ability to decipher between 'outside' wisdom and the Greek Orthodox tradition; he was personally familiar with their debates against Jesuits in Transylvania; and, since a Jesuit education was the envy of all, he had hoped the Leichoude brothers would make a fine 'Greek' impression on the Russian court of the Tsar and influence its educational direction.

Contrary to the conventional scholarship on the eventual soured relationship between the Leichoude brothers and Dositheos, the Patriarch never objected to the Jesuit curriculum they implemented at the new Russian Academy. According to the foremost study on the Leichoude by Nikolaos Chrissidis, older assumptions about the 'modernization' of Russia from the West are disproven by the fact that Jesuit education arrived *via* the Greek East. Indeed, Chrissidis argued in *An Academy at the Court of the Tsars: Greek Scholars and Jesuit Education in Early Modern Russia* that the dichotomy

between ‘Latinist’ and ‘Grecophile’ in Russia was only a false image created by later historians. Dositheos only turned on the Leichoudes after they mistreated Archmandrite Chrysanthos, whom he had sent in 1692 to establish a Greek printing press in Moscow and had assumed the Leichoudes would assist him. When the Leichoudes offered no help, only then did Dositheos seek their disbarment and objected to their ‘Latin’ curriculum. Both a jealous Medvedev and an insulted Dositheos had personal grievances with the Leichoudes.²⁰⁶

Dositheos had hoped to print in Moscow the entire corpus of Euthymios Zygadenos’ *Panoplia* for the first edition in Greek. That project was fulfilled in 1710 under the supervision of Patriarch Chrysanthos from Bucharest, Wallachia, three years after Dositheos’ passing and half a decade before Chrysanthos published Dositheos’ *History of the Jersusalem Patriarchate*.²⁰⁷

Dositheos harbored grander ideas about Russia and had visions for a resurrected Byzantium through a military conquest of the Ottomans. He believed a holy crusade would unite the Orthodox Commonwealth with Greek culture at the forefront and the Muscovite Tsar in the lead. A year before his passing, a final letter from him addressed to Tsar Peter the Great revealed that Dositheos still considered himself an informant on behalf of Russia, reporting to Peter on the beleaguered state and vulnerabilities of the Ottomans, but his earlier mystification and wild hopes had dissipated substantially. By the mid-1690s, Dositheos had lost control of the Holy Places to the Franciscans and Latin possession of the Holy Places was reconfirmed by the Ottomans in 1699 under the Treaty of Karlowitz. Dositheos wrote and pleaded with Tsar Peter and the Muscovite Patriarch to intervene on behalf of the Greeks but to no avail. He always advised Russia not to

make peace with the Ottomans and inflamed antagonisms between them. Worried that Russia might follow suit with the Catholic Holy League and sign a peace treaty with ‘the Turks,’ Dositheos warned Tsar Peter:

When the Austrians make the Danube their border and prevail over the lands of Serbia, Hungary, and Transylvania, while the Poles will take over Ukraine, Podolia, and the lands of Wallachia and Moldavia...then they will be the first enemies of Moscow, and there will always be war with them.²⁰⁸

Russia eventually signed a peace treaty with the Ottomans in 1700 and Tsar Peter became increasingly attracted to the ‘modern’ West, despite Dositheos’ repeated objections. Nonetheless, in 1706 he still believed any war fought by Russia was holy. Concerning Russian military strategy in the Great Northern War against the Swedes, Dositheos wrote to the Tsar “...that you do not mourn those who will die in war, if it is useful... Why do you pity the Cossacks, if they die? For if they die, they are martyrs.”²⁰⁹

* * *

Transylvania

More than anything the Transylvanian *Confession of Faith* (1579) reflected its borderland status, multi-confessional geography, and politically egalitarian principles. By 1579 four of the five main denominations in Transylvania—the Unitarian, Lutherans, Calvinists, and Catholics—shared unprecedented equality of rights within the magisterial

Diet. The Orthodox Romanians who made up the majority of citizens, however, had no representation at the diet and few owned land.

The roots of Transylvania's single-chamber Diet go back to 1459 when its urban magistrates and elite generals signed a decree and explicit order "...to defend their interests against peasant rebels and external threats."²¹⁰ Three years earlier in Belgrade, Hungarian magistrates barely averted a peasant rebellion, and into the sixteenth century the tensions between peasants and nobles remained a flashpoint and constant worry for all magistrates. In Norman Housley's study on *Religious Warfare in Europe 1400-1536*,² he demonstrated that what made this particular Serbian uprising a threat was the profound rhetoric—*in extremis*—of crusading ideology preached by the Franciscan humanist Giovanni da Capistrano.²¹¹

Housley described an embarrassing situation for the Hungarian magistrates of Belgrade who abandoned their city to flee from the Ottoman siege in 1456. An army of peasants inflamed by the orations of the Franciscan monk Giovanni and enchanted by eschatological visions roundly defeated the Ottoman army—alone. Housley provided an excerpt of their written testimony in the face of their unworthy nobles:

The crusaders had it publicly proclaimed on the morrow of victory, that the triumph which God had bestowed on them on the previous day had not been due to the work or labour of any single baron of the kingdom of Hungary, but had come about solely through the virtue of the most holy name of Jesus Christ and of his most sacred Cross, and through the merits and hard work of our most blessed father, Brother Giovanni da Capistrano.²¹²

This was the danger that posed such a threat: the peasants believed victory had come “...through the ministry and offices of the most blessed father [Giovanni],” as Housley stated. Later, the Franciscan monk publicly apologized and made a play-on-words with the “most blessed father” by attributing the victory to the “most blessed Father” in heaven in order to avoid responsibility and punishment. He also gave the peasant crusaders a departing blessing and officially ended their crusading mission—thereby also calming their aspirations for anything greater.

Yet, Housley noted, the apathetic or cowardly response by the magistrates to the call for crusade against the Ottoman Empire continued to be a point of contention on the frontier among other “...mounting grievances of the ‘Common Man.’” The 1514 Dozsa rebellion provided Housley with another case study of a ‘crusade-revolt.’ This one too, Housley asserts, was highly orthodox and an enchanting revolt of the ‘Common Man.’

By focusing on extreme situations of mass mobilization, particularly among the peasants, Housley hoped to provide “a link between religious belief and the use of violence.” Just as ubiquitous as the violence was during the early modern period, so was the extreme rhetoric Housley identified not only within the borderlands, but also in Spain, and in England. Housley gives “four patterns of thought and belief” motivating these religious feuds: the crusade, sectarian apocalypticism, eschatological formulations, and “...the need to defend doctrinal truth against external assault.”²¹³ Housley’s patterns of persuasion were familiar: mission, belonging, eschatology, and the defense of doctrine.

As a multi-confessional territory Transylvania earned a reputation within early modern historiography, and specifically within multi-confessional studies, for promoting

a tolerant political climate with the passage of the 1568 Edict of Torda, but tolerance was a longer process achieved from 1548 to 1571.²¹⁴ Tolerance in early modern culture was an act of suffering, and most—if not all—were not willing to endure it.²¹⁵ This made the political legislation of tolerance within a multi-confessional context reactionary and more practical than a matter of principle. Historian Graeme Murdock delved further into Transylvania's tolerance by describing the Diet's managing of religious diversity, throughout the sixteenth century and into the following century, as a matter of control. The Diets were particularly concerned with preventing public ridicule, insults, and offence among the clergy.²¹⁶

In 1541 Transylvania's crown was passed to the infant son—Janos Zsigmond (1540-1571). At the same time, Transylvania also joined the Danubian Principalities under Ottoman suzerainty.

Johannes Honterus, who had encountered humanism while studying abroad and participated in Basel's Reformation in the 1530s, was responsible for leading Kronstadt's conversion to the Lutheran confession. Not only was Honterus praised as a most learned teacher, he also improved its local library and established its printing press. These reform efforts benefitted most importantly from the successful collaboration or symphony between him and Kronstadt's magisterial council. In 1541 Johannes Fuchs was elected Kronstadt's council judge. Fuchs had been responsible for the hiring of Honterus, while he was on a diplomatic mission at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530. In 1543 Kronstadt published its first pamphlet containing Honterus' program for religious reform. Historian Istvan Keul notes the importance of the often overlooked missionary concerns found in this pamphlet's foreword.

Kronstadt was a major trading center between Transylvania and the Danubian Principalities and welcomed Greeks, Bulgarians, Moldavians, and Wallachians from the surrounding areas as well as Ruthenian and Slavic travelers from further away. Thus, what had originated as a Lutheran Reformation in Kronstadt under its professor Honterus quickly concerned a ‘Wittenberg’ defense against those, as the pamphlet stated, “...who persist in assailing us in numerous disputes with respect to matters of faith, and thereby even divert some souls from the truth, and otherwise through their unity awake doubt among simple people about things over which certainty reigns...”²¹⁷ In conjunction with an increase in peripatetic preachers throughout Transylvania in the 1540s, the single-chamber Diet decreed in 1544 a version of *cuius region eius religio* but prohibited any further doctrinal innovations.

In the 1550s Calvinist doctrine came through Transylvania’s most north-western regions from a number of villages and towns within the Patrium. The town of Debrecen was the largest, and from there the local pastor Marton Kalmancsehi Santa began preaching against ‘the real presence of the Christ’ in the Eucharist. He was excommunicated for his radical teachings, but the local magistrates and courts, and the weakened state of the Habsburg Empire, facilitated that a Calvinist confession would prevail. Keul provides a snippet from a contemporary report that described the “great uproar” which Kalmancsehi’s preaching had aroused in Kolozsvár two years earlier: “People have been heard arguing everywhere and disputing questions of faith. Kalmancsehi...laid out his teachings before the crowds in the middle of the market square.”²¹⁸ The nobleman Peter Petrovic took advantage of the peace left by the retreat of the Habsburg’s Catholic troops and called for a public disputation between the Lutherans

and Calvinists in Kolozsvár. The first local synod began in 1552 beginning with Beregszász and the second in 1556 at Kolozsvár. The results were published as *A Consensus by the pastors and Church ministrium both in lower Pannonia and the nations in all Transylvania*—and the entire Lutheran diocese of Nagyvárad converted to Calvinism.

In 1564 King Janos II chaired the famous Torda Diet which, in the official decree's own words, permitted "...every man [to] follow the preacher whose teachings appeal to him" and forbade physical violence and the threat of imprisonment to any preachers "...because of [their] teaching."²¹⁹ There were now three official confessions from which one could choose, but a fourth would emerge when the King's personal confessor Ferenc David converted him to anti-Trinitarianism.

At the Diet of Torda in 1568 Janos II called for a royal council to dispute articles of faith on the doctrine of the Trinity at the capital city of Gyulafehérvár. The mainstream 'orthodox' Meliusz party relied on the *Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creeds* of 325 and 381, appealed to prestigious foreign universities, and argued for the primordial divinity of Jesus. David's party applied a cuttingly narrow *sola scriptura* against the neologism of their opponents 'Trinity.' In addition each side accused the other side of inserting "...ready-made formulas, employing contrived syllogisms... [and] scholastic quibbling and cabbalistic arguments."²²⁰ The public disputation lasted ten days, after which the entire Calvinist diocese of Kolozsvár and most Hungarian nobles converted to the anti-Trinitarian, Unitarian party of Ferenc David. In that same year another royal council was held at Nagyvárad. There the King proclaimed the Unitarian party champions by claiming that Meliusz was trying to 'play the pope' by persecuting the true religion. Once

again, however, Janos II remained neutral by forbidding the burning of books and the use of force against anyone's beliefs. Transcripts and records were quickly published and the council heralded as the 'Great Debate' of 1568.

When a dynasty of Calvinist princes ruled after the Catholic Bathoris in the first half of the seventeenth century, David's Unitarians were a disparate group and suffered greatly to defend against the radical image their opponents propagated and projected on them to the public. Anti-Trinitarians were frequently grouped with the 'judaizing atheism' of the semi-clandestine sect of Sabbatarians. It was actually a trend that began before the turn of the century when Unitarianism was recorded in the Diet (under a Catholic ruler) as "the Arian Confession."

Ferenc David could be considered a late student of the anti-Trinitarian Fausto Socinus (1539-1604) who died in Poland. The heart of Socinus' argument was schematic—the *credo* formula 'our God is one' of Deuteronomy 6:4. Pelikan provides a succinct summation of Socinus' teachings: "God was [numerically] one and was unchangeable: no Trinitarian dogma about 'incarnation' or 'procession' could revise that, and nothing in the books of the New Testament could be interpreted in such a way as to contradict this absolute monotheism."²²¹ The relationship between Jesus and God, Socinus explained, was the imperative to be of one mind with the Father, as the Church is of one mind with its members who confess collectively, 'I believe...' Socinus' teachings were also christocentric, but he zealously began with the schema.

In 1613 the Ottomans placed a Calvinist Gabor Bethlen on the throne as the new Ottoman-vassal Prince of Transylvania. Gabor Bethlen's greatest legacy bequeathed to

Transylvania was his establishment of Gyulafehervar's Academy in 1622 whose missionary goals contributed to Bethlen's program for Calvinization. Part of Bethlen's 'Five Points' initiative reform program was the translation of texts into Romanian and the subordination of the Transylvanian Orthodox Romanians to the Calvinist superintendent. In addition, Bethlen proclaimed in 1624 the freedom for Orthodox Romanians to attend German Lutheran and Hungarian Calvinist schools in Transylvania.²²²

A letter from Cyril Loukaris—the patriarch of Constantinople at the time—in response to Bethlen's overture in 1629 for the unification of Transylvania's Calvinist and Orthodox Romanians attests to the threat of conversion faced by the Orthodox communities in that region. Bathori died soon after and nothing came of it. Keul's excerpt, however, lends easily to suspicions regarding Loukaris' possible disposition towards an Orthodox-Calvinist fellowship. Loukaris admitted that the Romanians being "deprived of all education" would likely be easy converts. He stated quite pragmatically that whether they united "openly or secretly" the greatest barrier was "...all bonds of affection and blood that tie the Romanians of Transylvania to the populations of Wallachia and Moldavia would first have to be severed. Without doubt, the neighboring rulers of said countries will not allow this and will certainly try to prevent it, if not by arms then by covert exhortations."²²³ Loukaris knew well that the people of the Danubian Principalities were a stronghold for Orthodox missions and the princes viewed themselves as defenders of the Eastern Church.

France

In second half of the seventeenth century the news of the famous contest in France between the Catholic Jansenist Antoine Arnauld (1612-1694) and the Calvinist minister Jean Claude (1619-1687) had reached not just Constantinople, but the sensation had also become part of England's media and translated for their readers and audiences. Since the last half of the sixteenth century, England's Protestant audiences had watched intently France's Reformation unfold; for them it was like a 'theatre of martyrdom,' as French historian David Nicholls preferred to call it. For the Protestants there in France martyrdom was glorious; indeed, the Catholics had to carefully manage the public execution of a heretic to ensure, as Nicholls stated, "...the victim would be a degraded non-person and not a hero."²²⁴

If the Reformation in France was any indication, as it was for Natalie Zemon Davis' study of French religious violence, the theatre of martyrdom in all its communicated forms (the stage, news media, and songs) was truly about religion. The reality of idolatry separated all media between the sacred and profane, the celebrated and the excommunicated. Headlines mattered; the trustworthiness of a printing press was weighed by denominational affiliations; and, the testimony of converts attracted recruits and grabbed the audience's attention.²²⁵ All these concerns catered to the court of public opinion. It is also why the French Catholics preferred a repentant heretic and the French Protestants praised the confessor—the theme was always martyrdom, a spectacle of life and death, presence and absence, light and dark. Nicholls poignantly summarized Catholic France's management and the staging of a non-martyrdom execution:

Repentant heretics who publicly abjured their errors were more desirable than dead heretics. They could be displayed as people who had been tempted by heterodoxy but had seen the error of their ways once the truth had been explained to them, and therefore constituted better propaganda for the church than the unrepentant, whose willing embrace of martyrdom had to be explained as convincingly as possible as the result of stubbornness, madness or demonic possession.²²⁶

Similarly, the audiences also interpreted the newspaper headlines, practiced selective reading, repeated distant rumors, and glorified celebrities with a hero's story.²²⁷

The Calvinist Minister Jean Claude had acquired much fame in France for his defense of the Eucharist against his Jansenist opponents who argued for a real change—transubstantiation—in the bread and wine. In 1683 Claude wrote *An Historical Defense of the Reformation: in answer to a book entitled, Just prejudices against the Calvinists*; in 1685, *A Treatise of Self-Examination in order to the worthy receiving of the Holy Communion together with suitable prayers*; and, in 1686 *A Short Account of Complaints and Cruel Persecutions and French Dragooning or Popish Persecution*. Claude's manual on *The Composition of a Sermon* (1688) was published and translated into English posthumously. Besides the art of illocution, it examined texts by dissection, collections of arguments, proofs, and manners of explication. Under the category of how to "...observe the nature of text, for there are doctrinal, historical, prophetic and typical texts," Claude includes confession of faith as a theme.²²⁸ Yet, he was most famous for a private debate held in 1678 between him and the Catholic Bishop of Condom, Jacques Benigne Bossuet

(1627-1704), in front of a royal audience of one, Mademoiselle de Duras.²²⁹ The debate was not intended for a public hearing.²³⁰ They were later leaked to the public.²³¹

Both parties were concerned for their local readership and were well aware of the broader audience.²³² They all apologized for the altercation and exclaimed their desire for readers to focus their attention on doctrine alone.²³³ As teachers, they framed their discourses on the belief that it would present a type of instruction manual for their respective membership, whenever in fact the audience might find themselves in a similar dialogue.²³⁴ As confessors, all parties echoed Bossuet's Catholic and confessional intentions when he admitted:

[So that] when the least instructed Catholic engages with a Protestant on this point, the Protestant, how able or subtle soever, will find himself reduced, not always indeed to silence, but what is no less strong than silence to the utterance, when he shall attempt to speak, of manifest absurdities.²³⁵

Silencing the opponent was the confessor's fame since the ecumenical debates beginning in the fourth century. The 'Great Debate' of 1678, as it was memorialized, concluded with Mademoiselle de Duras' publicized conversion to Catholicism.

By the time Dositheos convened the council of Jerusalem in 1672, the question of Cyril Loukaris' reputed crypto-Calvinism had become a scandalous matter for the Eastern Church, when it was invoked a decade earlier by Claude in a French publishing debate with the Jansenist Augustinian monks Pierre Nicole (1625-1695) and Antoine Arnauld (1612-1694). Prior to 'the Great Debate' Jean Claude had joined the publishing wars in Charenton, France, with his fellow Huguenot clergymen against the Jansenists, a

controversial Catholic sect. In the first half of the seventh century the French Protestants had been debating Catholics over the use of the word transubstantiation and its implied meaning that the bread and wine really changed into the body and blood of Christ (i.e., the real presence of the Christ)—not spiritually, not symbolically, rather truly. In 1659 Nicole and Arnauld published a copy of the Divine Mass accompanied by a preface with collected quotes from western and Greek forebearers of the historic church corroborating the doctrine of transubstantiation as a universally and perennially established teaching. Claude's public testimony and defense, as he referred to it, argued that not just the Greeks rejected transubstantiation but the entire Eastern Church neither subscribed to such a teaching nor described the change using the word transubstantiation. From Claude's perspective his opponents sought to "...make us confess..." transubstantiation as a doctrine "...of all Antiquity."²³⁶ Claude claimed the term only dated back to the tenth century—no earlier. He called for the inquiry and testimonies of "every Greek on the face of the earth."²³⁷

Nicole and Arnauld responded to Claude's criticisms by publishing *On the Perpetuity of the Faith of the Catholic Church touching the Eucharist* (1664); and, as Claude desired, in 1667 they began an investigation of the Eastern Church. In Russia they pointed to Peter Mogila's *The Orthodox Confession of the Eastern Church* (1642), which used the word transubstantiation. Mogila originated from Moldavia, but his formative educational years were spent at the Lviv Confraternity in Poland-Lithuania; and, later he studied abroad in France and the Netherlands. During this period the Russian patriarchate of Moscow, which was not officially ratified by the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople until 1589, was engaged in a protracted contest with the Ruthenian

Orthodox of Poland-Lithuania who had agreed to the Union of Brest in 1596 and became Greek Catholics under papal authority. The Muscovite Patriarchate had ordained Mogila the metropolitan of Kiev, where the Kiev confraternity school built its first printing press in 1615 and later became a collegium of surrounding schools and eventually an academy directed by Mogila in 1632. In the forward to Mogila's confession the patriarch of Jerusalem Nectarios emphasized its authenticity, stating, "...being called the Orthodox Confession of the Greeks...as it has hath no admixture of novelty from other religions."²³⁸

In Peloponnese, Cyprus, and on the far-east edge of Anatolia, the international investigation procured confessions from Eastern bishops, monks, and priests—all of which attested to the word transubstantiation as orthodox. Some of the professions also came from Nestorians, Armenians, and Coptics. Some confessions were in the form of signatures, while others were written statements carefully decorated with embroidery and silk.²³⁹ Arnauld quickly published the collected testimonies of the, as he wrote, "...Grec de nation" and claimed "...the full consent of this Eastern society on the doctrine of the real presence and transubstantiation." He also subtitled it, "...a Defense against the book of Mr. Claude, Pastor of Charenton." After the final chapter, entitled "Evidence of that consensus between the Greek Church and the Latin Church on the sacrament of the Eucharist," Arnauld provided the commission's final judgment: "...it is no surprise that [the pretended Reformed] seem to regard Luther like a great servant of God, whom will do penance for his heretical life and arch-Deviltries."²⁴⁰ Backed into a corner Claude rejected the evidence and appealed publicly to the *Confession of Loukaris* (1629) written by Cyril Loukaris (1572-1638)—the former Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople

(1620-1638). Arnauld, however, appealed to his predecessor Patriarch Jeremiah II (1568-1595); specially, to his correspondence with the Gnesio Lutherans in the sixteenth century.

In the seventeenth century Istanbul was the capital of the Ottoman Empire, and the gate of diplomacy through which foreign ambassadors entered was famously and widely referred to in the West by its French translation, the Sublime Porte. Political and religious representatives from every nation and division had, at one time or another, passed through its large, imperial door. Often times, it was crowded. In 1670 the French Jansenists with royal approval and financial support commissioned an embassy to Istanbul in order to further inquire and gather evidence from the Eastern Church on the Eucharist question of transubstantiation. The French ambassador and Jansenist, Charles Olier de Nointel, was accompanied by the multilingual scholar and translator, Antoine Galland. In their travels around the Levant the French embassy once again collected a wide variety of confessions from bishops and archbishops around the Greek Islands, Mount Sinai, Egypt, and Persia. These confessions helped corroborate the legitimacy of the Jansenists' earlier investigation, but the testimony of Greek representatives in Istanbul held greater weight.

In the Phanar Quarter of Istanbul was located the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople and its Greek residents, whose ecclesiastical and political affairs in the Danubian Principalities would soon garner them the infamous nomenclature the Greek Phanariots. Their opportunities for political advancement in the Ottoman Empire were greatly enhanced when the Ottoman Emperor elevated his long-admired Greek physician to the diplomatic position of the Grand Dragoman or the Great Interpreter. Nikousios

Panagiotis (1613-1673) was the first in a powerful, nepotistic succession of Greek Phanariot imperial interpreters. He was educated abroad in Italy (as were most of his successors) and by Catholic Jesuits on the Greek island of Chios. When the inquisitive French ambassadors arrived at the Sublime Porte it was Panagiotis who provided them with the evidence they sought: a letter of correspondence between the patriarch of Jerusalem, Nectarios, and the patriarch of Alexandria, Paisios; and, a confession from the patriarch of Constantinople, Parthenios IV. These and all the other confessions were published by Arnauld in 1674—including were the results of the council of Jerusalem in 1672, specifically, the *Confession of Dositheos*.

The English embassy to the Sublime Porte was first established by the Levant Company in 1581. There were ten English ambassadors by 1668, the year Daniel Harvey (1631-1672) became the eleventh. Six years later, Harvey passed away and was replaced by John Finch (1626-1682) that same year. At the turn of the seventeenth century the Levant Company also established the office of English chaplaincy to complement the embassy at Istanbul. In 1668 Thomas Smith (1638-1710) fulfilled that role until John Covell (1638-1722) replaced him in 1670 and held that position for seven years. By that time, both offices could equally be considered English political institutions, much like the mercantile relationship of the Levant Company to the English crown.

Thomas Smith probably heard about the Eucharist controversies in France between the Calvinists and Jansenists from his student John Cosin (1594-1672), Cosin being well aware of Smith's sympathies towards France's Protestant theater of martyrdom. As a scholarly liturgist living in Paris, Cosin himself was particularly curious about Eastern liturgies and was close friends with the Greek metropolitan Cyril of

Trebizond. Some have said that the metropolitan was “a self-confessed disciple of Cyril Loukaris,” while others claimed he signed “a decree of union” and “...made a profession of Catholic faith at Rome.”²⁴¹ The English public heralded Loukaris as a Protestant martyr. In retirement Smith published *An account of the Greek Church* (1680) and wrote sentimentally about the patriarch’s sufferings, murder, and death at the hands of conspiring Catholic Franciscans and Jesuits, and also expressed the desire for union between the Greek Church and the English.

Smith’s views reflected an era of English hopes for unity with the East. A contemporary of his and fellow English diplomat, Paul Rycault (1629-1700), articulated well their irenic vision:

It is true, saith this (Nicene) Confession, that Jerusalem may properly be called the Mother Church of the World, it having been the Stage whereon the Mystery of man’s Redemption was represented...the Gospel was first preached...the Universal Mother...having in the Infancy of Religion, Acts 2:22, sent forth her Teachers and Pastors into all places, and was famed for the glorious Blood of the Primitive Martyrs.²⁴²

John Covel, the English chaplain who replaced Smith, shared similar nostalgia towards ancient Jerusalem, the East, and its mysteries. Nonetheless, his youthful optimism about the Greek Church dissipated by the time he began in 1705 to write his *Some Account of the Present Greek Church* (1722).

Already in Covel’s inaugural year at Istanbul he was made aware of the Eucharist question and the French investigations of the Greek Church. The testimonies gathered by

the Jansenist Nointel had not convinced the Calvinist Claude that the term transubstantiation was orthodox, Greek vocabulary. Claude sent to Istanbul a questionnaire asking them "...to deny or, if they believed (*credere*) in the doctrine [i.e., transubstantiation], to testify and subscribe."²⁴³ Covell too was curious and suspicious of Nointel's evidence. Two years later Covell received his answer by way of the Jerusalem Council and the *Confession of Dositheos* (1672).

Covell accused "all the ministers and Powers of France, Germany, Poland, Venice, and other Popish Countries" of masterminding the Jerusalem Council and bribing its chairmen, Dositheos, to approve the term transubstantiation. He expressed utter incredulity at Dositheos' apparent contradiction and duplicity, writing, "Surely when he wrote this he was in a dream...those monstrous tenents...are the meer product of human wisdom; and all the sophistry and cunning craftiness, that the schoolmens wit can devise, have been employed to maintain them..." Covell also lamented that "Dositheos plays fast and loose in all his writings...He cries out against Latin thinking [and] Latinized Greeks... [He] declaims against all innovations, yet admits transubstantiation... [he] blows hot and cold with the same mouth."²⁴⁴ By the end of his book Covell marveled that "Dositheos for a concluding stroke to this his apology, or weighty synod, solemnly declares as an oracle... [and, for] other authorities...to recommend several modern Latinized writers to support this assertion..."²⁴⁵ Covell was convinced that Dositheos, Greek hierarchs, and elites had colluded with the French Jesuits against Protestants and subsequently betrayed their own Greek Church and spiritual heritage.

In the hope of finding authentic representatives of the Greek Church Covell made his own investigations, asking low level clergymen and laymen outside the purview of

Istanbul. Nonetheless, after visiting Mt. Athos he was disappointed to discover its residents unable to articulate or understand the theological issues. His frustrations quickened by what he viewed as the sad effects of "...an easternling brought up in the College de propaganda Fide at Rome or elsewhere in Italy...[with] some scraps of the common evasions and jargon of the school...[never] any tolerable reasoning or answer towards the clearing of the point." He considered them almost theological illiterate, stating, "Many of my acquaintance would avoid any such discourse about these matters, desiring rather to be quiet and not to embarrass themselves about these *frichta mysteria* (as they called them) dreadful or hidden mysteries." Covell returned to England having concluded that the 'native Greeks' he encountered were ignorant or otherwise 'Latinized.'²⁴⁶ Covell continued his own inquiry for several years, but by the time he started writing *Some Account of the Present Greek Church* in 1705 a bitter and prejudiced anti-Hellenism overcame him.²⁴⁷

* * *

Jesuits

The Jesuits were internationally famous for their successful propaganda and consequently received both the envy and scorn of their competitors. Their goal was world-wide conversions, and the frontier borderland territories only deepened their

eschatological vision and missionary commitment. In addition, Jesuits were also renowned for their prestigious schools and quality education, which was another coveted reputation. They had Jesuit schools established on many islands of the Aegean, such as Chios and Zante.

Historian John O'Malley acutely describes the distinction of Jesuit schools from its peers by stating, "The Jesuits interpreted the humanistic program to entail theater in which the students played the parts, which in turn often entailed singing and dancing...they also used the visual arts for instruction and evangelization..."²⁴⁸ Certainly, from the audience's perspective the Jesuit school of theatre reflected what O'Malley designated "a modern sense of propaganda."²⁴⁹ Jesuit drama helped cause the failure of irenicism (i.e., a movement for the unification of Catholics and Protestants) and the success of a Catholic counter reformation in the Hapsburg Empire.²⁵⁰ The popular appeal of the Jesuit theatre filled a gap between Maximilian's court of irenic elites and the masses with their own schematic message. Although Paul Shore has little interest for confessionalization studies, his analysis of Jesuit activity in Kolozsvár or Cluj, Transylvania, admits that the Jesuits had an "intended message."²⁵¹ Moreover this singular message seems to be quite similar to that of a confessor. Shore explains:

...the Jesuits, as an institution, and in their individual activities pressed home the older message of transcendence as a keystone to its theological teaching. The message of a transcendent reality that all should seek also informed the Jesuit educational enterprise. The art, music and rhetorical performances...the aesthetic they utilized was that of the pre-scientific, pre-rational Baroque, reveling in

dramatic display and calling upon the viewer to make intuitive, pre-rational connections to a metaphysical reality.²⁵²

Shore's study of the Jesuits concentrated on the period after the Catholics established the Uniate-Orthodox-Catholic Church in 1692 in Habsburg occupied Transylvania. He refrained, however, from delving into an answer to one of the most important questions on Jesuit propaganda, which seems similar to Benedict's query, when he asked, "...was it [Jesuit propaganda] something darker, a cynical manipulation of emotion and superstition?" From their opponents' view it most likely seemed scripted.

Much work has been devoted to the study of the public sphere with particular attention given to the role of theater in the production of lively debates and 'modern' criticism within the Dutch Republic. In Judith Pollmann and Andrew Spicer's introduction to *Public Opinion and Changing Identities in the Early Modern Netherlands*, they begin with an estimation of Habermas' coffee house public sphere, which also created a culture of communication.²⁵³ Although Habermas' *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* located its origins in the eighteenth century, Pollmann and Spicer agree with the current trend that includes the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—with two caveats. They note that confessionalization theory must allow "...the de facto need for rulers to accommodate public opinion;" and, the need for Habermas' secular phenomenon to defer to "...examples of engagement of large groups of subjects and citizens with public affairs [who] were concerned with religion."²⁵⁴

The contribution of Joke Spaan's study on the festival plays produced by Vlaardingens' Chambers of Rhetoric in 1616 provides a clear example of "...popular

academies, providing adult men with a formalized education in vernacular linguistic skills, both written and oral, that were necessary for all those aspiring to public office.”²⁵⁵

For example, Spaan situates the plays of Rotterdam in the attempt of the statesman (*landsadvocaat*) Johan van Oldenbarnevelt (d. 1619) to prevent a schism within the Reformed Church over the doctrine of unconditional election or predestination. Oldenbarnevelt did not want the Reformed clergy to convene a national synod. Spaan demonstrates how the actors in the play, personifying ideas with character names like ‘United Country,’ ‘Wise Council’ and ‘True Minister,’ instructed their audience on “...how human curiosity and intellectual pride have tempted theologians to search the divine mysteries.”²⁵⁶ One cannot help but think of Patriarch Nectarios’ introduction of Meletios Syrigos as his emissary and personal representative at the Council of Jassy, Moldavia in 1642. Syrigos was ‘the Doctor of the Church,’ ‘the Preacher,’ ‘the Interpreter,’ and even the more abstract character of ‘the very Rule itself.’²⁵⁷

In contrast to Oldenbarnevelt, the plays of Gorcum had the main character ‘True Minister’ persuade the two guards of ‘Good Government’—that is, namely, ‘Suspicion and Vigilance’—to request the intervention from ‘High Authority.’ Based on the appeal to “divine precepts” and the need “to restore order,” Spaan explains that “...the brothers of Gorcum make True Minister plead for a national Synod to decide the doctrinal conflict.” A National Synod did in fact convene two years later, anathematized Jacobus Arminius for his teachings, and resolved the paradox of the doctrine of election with a concise formula. Spaan summarizes, “Both parties held that God elects those who, by His saving grace, believe and persevere in the faith. Theologians were forbidden to go beyond this point in their biblical exegesis and interpretations of the Confession.”²⁵⁸

Spaan disagrees with historians who have framed these rhetorical plays within a discourse or ‘discussion culture’ that encouraged public debate, personal opinions, argumentative complexity, and simply offered ‘food for thought’ at the public’s leisure. Spaan repeats the problem between propaganda and the success of its message, but insightfully explains that the plays were a public ritual with a singular purpose “...to create and celebrate concord.” What Spaan describes resembles the task of elites to manage religious disputes, just as the Transylvanian Diets practiced.²⁵⁹ Spaan concludes, “...conjuring up harmony and concord with the magic word and gesture...in times of sharp discord, [this] was the core business of the chambers of rhetoric.”²⁶⁰ Moreover, Spaan’s analysis and conclusion reflects much of Paul Shore’s description of the Jesuits’ ‘intended message’ and evangelical mission.²⁶¹ A look at the existence of Jesuit theatre in Constantinople and the Aegean Islands does not reproduce the specific plays described by Spaan, but it does reveal the popularity of Jesuit theatre in the east.

The Jesuits arrived to the Greek Islands and began establishing Jesuits schools a short time before 1630. The historical record of Jesuit plays there, however, was not well known until relatively recently, and the evidence still remains scant. In 2007 historian Walter Puchner published his article “Jesuit Theatre on the Islands of the Aegean Sea” in which he demonstrated that Jesuit performances were prevalent, and the Greek plays which historical fortune had preserved from the seventeenth century were strategically and fully intended to be performed in ‘Jesuit style.’ In the 1970s historians found, lost, and rediscovered five Greek Orthodox plays from the island of Chios. These were: Michael Vestarchis’s *The Presentation of Holy Mary in the Temple* (1642), *The Passion and Resurrection of Christ*, and *The Martyrdom of Eleazar and the Seven Maccabean*

Boys; Gregory Kontaratos's *The Three Children in the Fiery Furnace*; and, Gabriel Prosopsas's *The Tragedy of St. Demetriu*. Michael Vestarchis (d. 1662), as Puchner informs us, was a student in the Jesuit College of Chios and "a celebrated preacher in the Orthodox community." Like many others, Vestarchis had "signed a confession of the Catholic faith," but Puchner states that he remained Orthodox, his plays were Orthodox, and only ostensibly converted to obtain a teaching position at the Jesuit school of St. Antonios. Little is known about the others.²⁶²

Prior to the discovery of these plays, Greek historians had only one surviving Jesuit play, the Jesuit performance of the well know and multi-translated Latin tragedy *Zeno*. In addition, found in the library of Leo Allatius was the play *David* and an uncompleted play on "the martyrdom of St. Isidoros, the patron saint of Chios." There was also a Catholic report from 1628 on the performance of a certain tragedy before a mixed audience of Catholics and Orthodox—in addition to the *Bey and the Kadi* play—from the island of Naxos. The report stated, "[T]he subject was the converted sinner." Puchner also came across another two plays in 1986 on *The Martyrdom of St. Demetrius* and *Herod and the slaughter of the innocents*.²⁶³

Unfortunately, Puchner was limited to an analysis of these theatrical 'footprints' of Orthodox history for their conversion politics. Missing pages and fragments sometimes only allowed Puchner the title of the play or a historical commentary about a play, but there was an emphasis on martyrdom, drama, and conversion. For example, Puchner uses "a performance about the childhood of St. John Chrysostome who converted his parents and sister through a debate with a representative of the oracle of Apollo" and situates it within "a diplomatic game of the Great Powers" in Antioch. A 1624 report about the

Jesuit play explained “the strategy of the Jesuits.” Puchner provides an extract, “To gain more easily the hearts of the Greeks, the whole play was given in their vernacular language and on the same day that they celebrate the feats of St. Chrysostome.”²⁶⁴

What Puchner found most interesting from this report was the contradictory approach of the patriarch of Constantinople—Cyril Loukaris—who had previously and publicly condemned all Jesuit theatre as a conversion trick, but later requested an invitation to attend a performance from the French ambassador De Cesy. Puchner explains Cyril’s hypocrisy as a political maneuver within a very public setting and accompanied with an intended message. On one side was “[t]he party of the French and Austrian ambassadors together with the Jesuits;” on the other was “the party of the Protestant ambassadors (of Holland and England) together with Kyrillos Loukaris.” Both sides attempted to gain control of the Constantinopolitan patriarchal throne, but when Loukaris won in 1623 by offering more money to the Sultan—only then did he request an invite to the Jesuit performance. As Puchner explains, “His triumph over his French-backed rival could be publicly demonstrated if Loukaris would make a gesture of forgiveness and ‘friendship’ by attending the performance of De Cesy’s son. The French ambassador refused to invite the Orthodox Patriarch to the Jesuit church.”²⁶⁵ Even public apologies were part of a rhetorical game in the theatre of public opinion.²⁶⁶

Puchner also noted the performance of Jesuit theatre in Constantinople at least three times in the early seventeenth century (1612, 1614, and 1615) and as late as 1666. Another peculiar clue Puchner found was a 1648 report that briefly mentioned the performance of “allegorical representations and skits” on the Island of Chios “...in honor of the French ambassador Nointel...” who also liked to attend theatre performances when

he was in Constantinople. The fame for theatrical performances in general was quite international, and therefore, subject to the politics of public affairs as well. The Jesuits, however, excelled in theatre and persuasion. Although Puchner's article lacked attention to the processes of conversion, he clearly demonstrated that 'the people' desired a show.²⁶⁷ As Norman Russell rightly stated, "Dositheos was fully aware of the vulnerability of Orthodox theologians who thought they could engage in debate with the Society of Jesus."²⁶⁸

If the international Jesuit theatre is any indication, by the end of the seventeenth century the quantity of *apologia* abounded in Europe, and especially in Great Britain where they had almost a daily and self-generative presence. Just as Jesuit theatre could become an arena for the performance of political maneuvers, diplomacy, and public *apologia* by members of the audience, likewise, print media was flooded with *apologia* and confessions for all kinds of intents and affairs in, with, and under the production of a text. A large number of collective and personal confessions accompanied believers from Europe to the east coast of America where the overflow of confessional theatre continued throughout 'the new world' on the ground of denominational belonging and segregated seating.

Chapter V

Dositheos and His Universe

Dositheos' preface to his second collection of Greek authors in *Agape*, published in 1698 in Moldavia, began with an *apologia* in defense of himself for engaging by written debate (*logoi*) against Francis Richard's the *Targa [Shield]* specifically and Jesuit propaganda in general. He appealed to the fourth century Greek Bishop, Basil of Caesarea (330-379), and the seventh chapter of his *Ethics*, which emphasized the importance of the cenobite monastic order over the anchorite (i.e., solitude, hermetic) according to 'the law of love' in community and unity.²⁶⁹ Dositheos encouraged his readers to engage the secular world:

...to whom the preaching [*ton logon*] of the Lord's teaching was devoted, if he is silent [concerning] those things pleasing to God, [and] is guilty of the blood of those he endangers, how much more deserving of punishment is the guilty [one] who is silent and does not battle according to his might on behalf of orthodox thinking when heretics multiply and other teachings arise like a scorpion raised high to heaven? Because on land the result is someone shall be blinded by heterodox [teachings] and no longer be a believer.²⁷⁰

In addition, Dositheos also began his *Shield of Orthodoxy* (1672) in defense of Loukaris by quoting from the Old Testament book of Ecclesiastes, "That there is a time to speak and a time to keep silence."²⁷¹ Dositheos offers a justification for his speech when others might have been more reticent.

After the fall of the Western Roman Empire in the fifth century, the Papacy maintained permanent representatives in Constantinople, often called legates or papal nuncios. Each of the eastern patriarchates also kept representatives at the capital. They were officially called the *apokrisiasrios*, meaning the one who answered. This office and its diplomats became especially important for the Byzantine Empire after its recapture of Constantinople in 1261 from the Latin crusaders and its subsequent negotiations for union with the West in order to gain military support against the Ottomans. Under Emperors Palaiologus Michael VIII (1259-1282) and Andronikos II (co-emperor 1272-1282 and sole 1282-1328) involving the failed Union of Lyons (1274) to the failed Union of Ferrara-Florence (1439-1445) under Emperor John VIII (1425-1448)—the state of diplomacy could best be described as confessional.

Whereas, respected monks such as the Greek Cappadocians Basil (330-379), Gregory of Nyssa (332-395), and Gregory of Nazianzus (329-389) greatly participated in state diplomacy, Dositheos somewhat had to resurrect the significance of engaging with ‘outside’ wisdom and figuratively venture in the seventeenth century out from their monastic centers of piety. From the Athonite Gregory of Cyprus, who was the patriarch of Constantinople from 1283-1289, and his leadership in the rejection of the Union of Lyons by the later Synod of Blachernae in 1285 to the monk and Metropolitan of Ephesus Mark Eugenikos (1392-1444) and his sole protest against the Union of Ferrara-Florence—these famed monks helped cement an anti-union sentiment that morphed under great religious zeal into an anti-Western attitude and the proliferation of accusations of ‘Latin-thinking’ against Byzantium’s imperial diplomats. By the seventeenth century the accusations of Ioannes Karyophylles, the Grand Orator and

director of Constantinople's Patriarchal Academy, against Dositheos chiefly charged him with 'Latin-thinking' for using the term transubstantiation and expressing too cataphatically about mysteries that required *apophatic* limitations on speech and reason. During Dositheos' tenure these types of accusations equated Latin-thinking with the western art of scholasticism.

Marcus Plested took up the issue of anti-scholasticism in his article "Light from the West" arguing that this sentiment was not so prevalent in the East prior to the Fall of Constantinople. Plested critiqued the modern anti-scholastic presumptions of theologians Sergius Bulgakov, Vladimir Lossky, Georges Florovsky, John Meyendorff, and Christos Yannaras—a virtual *catalogus testium* for modern-day *apophatic* authorities. For example, Bulgakov and Lossky rejected "the positive rationalizing" of the West; Bulgakov, as Plested explained, argued that the West made "... [an] unwonted probing of the mystery of transmutation," and Lossky protested that "... [t]he *filioque* represents an unwarranted rationalization of the mystery of Trinity... [leading] to secularism." Plested put forth the paradigmatic exponent of western scholasticism Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) in order to demonstrate the ambivalent reception and use of Thomistic scholasticism among leading Byzantine intellectuals.²⁷²

Neilos Kabasilas, Theophanes of Nicea, Joseph Bryennios (1350-1430), Makarios Makres (1391-1430), and Kallistos Angelikoudes—all of whom Dositheos approved—demonstrated a variety of uses of Aquinas that defy a binary approach to 'western' scholasticism. Neilos defended the *apophatic* method while adopting the scholastic formula of proposition and objection and rejecting the method of positivistic syllogisms. Theophanes criticized Aquinas while himself utilizing, as Plested states, "... a series of

aporiae or difficulties requiring solution—a sure sign of his affinities with Scholastic methodology.”²⁷³ But, perhaps, Plested’s best witness was Gennadios Scholarios (1400-1473), the patriarch of Constantinople after the Ottoman conquest in 1453 and converted former leader of the anti-unionist party. Patriarch Scholarios praised Aquinas for his infallible treatise on *Ethics* and his application of Aristotelian philosophy. Like Dositheos, however, he too had to defend himself against the perennial charge of being Latin-minded.

Plested also points to Byzantium’s Demetrios Kydones (1324-1397), who translated Aquinas’ *Summa Contra Gentiles* in 1354, and Maximus Planoudes (1260-1330) whose translation of Augustine’s *De Trinitate* was greatly influential, and the Greek renaissance and Byzantine scholasticism they helped inspire in the late thirteenth century. He notes the approval of Aquinas by Emperor John VI Kantakuzene (1347-1354), whom Dositheos defended and praised, and his use of Aquinas in conjunction with scripture and philosophy.

Dositheos introduced his perspective on Aquinas in book nine of his *History of the Jerusalem Patriarchate*, after discussing the Union of Lyons (1274) and just before introducing Barlaam of Calabria (1290-1348). He attributed Aquinas’ fame to his stay in Colon, France, where “...they thought [him] a worthy teacher... [for his]...Aristotelian learning and education in the scriptures.” Dositheos acknowledged that Aquinas was referred to in the West as the second Chrysostom. He also thought that Pope Urban VI’s (1378-1389) scholastic theology was inspired by Aquinas.²⁷⁴

Dositheos rejected Aquinas' scholasticism "...because he theologized according to the innovation of the Latins"—namely, the *filioque* and papal primacy. This was Dositheos' common refrain. Dositheos elaborated further on what he considered to be the western scholastic method and in particular 'thomistic scholasticism':

...he mixed Aristotle with the Gospel and his foreign and illogical dogmas he thought to conclude from outside wisdom. In addition he also wrote questions and solutions to the holy scriptures, setting [things] up, objecting [to them], and resolving [them], as if to say [he] analyzed and distinguished all the scriptures at once, and spreading antagonisms and sophisms, and perhaps even illiteracy or [at least] according to the holy Spirit.²⁷⁵

One can sense from Dositheos' description that he objected perhaps to Aquinas' lack of humility and his *Summa Theologica*. More pertinent to Dositheos' concerns with the dangers of Thomism were, as he stated, that "He wrote against the health of our faith...twisting the holy scripture, and justifying Latin dogmas..." Dositheos also blamed Demetrios Kydones, whom he charged with Latin-mindedness, for his translation of Aquinas' *Summa Contra Gentiles* "...which were not known in the Eastern Church until [the reign] of Emperor John VI Kanatakouzene." In addition, while complaining that the Latins had ordained Aquinas a revered father, Dositheos rejected "...the miracle [which] the Latins offered to established [Aquinas'] holiness." It was reported by the inquiry committee on Aquinas' canonization that God had miraculously transformed sardines into herrings because it was Aquinas' last deathbed wish and craving.²⁷⁶

Thus, Dositheos certainly opposed the appraisal of a thomistic version of scholasticism. Yet, throughout his *History of the Jerusalem Patriarchate* and dialectical exchange with the Latins, Dositheos appealed to Aquinas when it was beneficial to his argument. Likewise, Dositheos cited the works of Peter Lombard (1096-1160), whose *Sentences* could be considered the catalyst of western scholasticism, and even the Catholic church historian Caesar Baronius (1538-1607) when it was advantageous.

Dositheos confined the art of syllogism, dialectics, and debate, to a specific field of engagement apart from the interpretation of scripture, synods, dogma, and even heritage. Specifically, Dositheos devoted a chapter in *History of the Jerusalem Patriarchate* on "...the power of syllogism in the Church." He based his conclusions by way of Nicephoros Gregoras (1295-1360), whom he otherwise disparaged for writing against the Synod of 1351 that condemned Barlaam (although Gregoras also opposed Barlaam), but here Dositheos wrote that in other matters "...concerning the dogma of faith he was orthodox." Among the ten points Dositheos outlined, the first of which appealed to Basil the Great "...that the truth is not equal," Dositheos considered the use of syllogism as an instrument in the *ars dialectica*. From points five on, however, he elaborated on what he considered its limitations. "There is not space for syllogism upon divine [matters]," Dositheos argued, "...neither from demonstration because the divine is a difficult to grasp science, as Plato makes clear...nor from the dialectic which must place the parts [i.e., syllogisms] upon each other..."²⁷⁷

He concludes on a synodical note with what he considered the key question: who shall judge? Dositheos ridiculed the Papacy's claim to absolute authority since it would be "...not even necessary to think." Dositheos repeated the familiar arguments on behalf

of the equality of all patriarchates in the *ecumene* with the seat of Rome, and emphasized the importance of the conciliar tradition. Dositheos explained, “The ancient and patrimonial ethos is...to think about issues communally.” Dositheos denied the necessity of a final, singular arbiter of truth and lies for the Eastern Church because “...we ourselves have protected the inherited faith and the patrimonial customs...hence, it is necessary to judge them [i.e., the Latins].”

Dositheos much preferred Platonic philosophy—with its focus on typological ideas and the metaphysical—over Aristotle; moreover, he criticized Aquinas and others for employing and extending Aristotelian philosophy in matters divine. Nevertheless, Dositheos was not beholden to Platonic philosophy. As Dositheos warned, “The words of certain Greek [*Hellene*] philosophers, although being true, were received without examination, but [we have] the words of the saints and the tradition of faith...” Concerning the scriptures Dositheos appealed to the mystery of interpretation versus what might be called an Aristotelian excavation of names and words by etymology. The latter philosophical approach, Dositheos opined, could be “...received in the form of human [capabilities].” Concerning interpretation Dositheos stated in contrast that “...certain [things] are hidden, as if under a cover among those holy words [*logoi*]...” Comparing the two, Dositheos considered the dialectical method an easier art than the “toil and labor” of divine interpretation.²⁷⁸

Yet, if the boundaries of syllogisms and dialectics are circumscribed, and the Eastern Church inherited authority from the common patrimonial and conciliar tradition, Dositheos asked, “...of what use is the dialectic to us...[F]or what do we not keep with

silence and piety [that] we should seek by the dialectic?” In point seven Dositheos answered his own question, stating:

[I]f syllogism were used by the holy fathers, it was not in order to demonstrate the nature of God, generation, and procession—but in order to prevent those seeking [into] these things... For the Latins do not dialect in order that they might be corrected, but because they love strife, and this is their custom—so that already they would be most clearly victorious, to boast that they won, and strategizing, to oppose so that they might stand triumphantly.²⁷⁹

Finally, in point ten Dositheos repeated the necessity of the holy fathers, whom he emphasized “dogmatically and economically wrote together,” to battle against opponents of orthodoxy. He concluded that, “Hence, indeed to dialectic was not by chance and the aim of all [things]. For without order and the synodical law and collected according to inherited ethos of the holy synods—it is not necessary to dialectic.”²⁸⁰ From this analysis of Dositheos’ prescription for the legitimate and illegitimate use of dialectics and consequently scholasticism, the context of his opening apology becomes clearer: Dositheos employed the *ars dialectic* in order to combat the West, especially the *Targa*, and equip his readers with a manual in theological explication and defense.

Nonetheless, Dositheos’ *apologia* seems more apt as a disclaimer to his *History of the Jerusalem Patriarchate* than his *Agape* since the latter made much less use of such scholastic methods. Indeed, *Agape* resembled more Dositheos’ *Shield of Orthodoxy* and the defense of ‘orthodox’ persons, such as Cyril Loukaris. In this case, however,

Dositheos defended the orthodoxy of Gregory Palamas (1296-1357), the Archbishop of Thessaloniki from 1350 to 1359 and leading hesychast figure.

* * *

During the latter-half of the seventeenth century Dositheos faced an unprecedented time, for not only was he tasked with protecting the Orthodox inhabitants of Transylvanian from Calvinism, but he also had an intuition that his own confession of 1672 would be the last of the Old World. Dositheos could hardly pretend that Mogila's earlier *Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church* (1642) had no critics, nor could he persuade an international audience of such a claim. Dositheos longed for the simplicity of defending Orthodoxy in the same manner as the Patriarch Jeremiah II of Constantinople had so curtly dispensed with the inquiring German, Gnesio Lutherans in the sixteenth century. And, he had promised the Greeks of Transylvania and all Orthodox Romanians of the Danubian Principalities a written response to Calvinist proselytism.

In Transylvania the Great Debate of 1568—which occurred only five years before the first correspondence between Patriarch Jeremiah and the Gnesio Lutherans (1573)—between the Trinitarian Peter Melius and the monotheist Francis David had been widely publicized in great detail. It was quite a spectacle with the personal attendance of the King Janos II, the highest chancellor Mihaly Csaky, four referees on each side, and a Jesuit priest "...as an observer."²⁸¹ We can be sure that the international theatre of

seventeenth century Transylvania appeared in some ways similar to the sixteenth. As one Unitarian reported from inside the Great Debate:

...both sides emphasized the authority of the Holy Scripture, but at every turn they tried to insert their own, ready-made formulas, employing contrived syllogisms...scholastic quibbling and cabbalistic arguments. In this all-out intellectual duel each side exhausted the last reserves of its dialectical arsenal...Therefore it is not surprising that the ten-day-long dispute brought about no concrete result.²⁸²

Despite Dositheos' attempts to avoid debates, nonetheless, in 1690 not even his position as the Jerusalem patriarch could allow him to ignore the international courts of public opinion. And, he had promised the Greeks of Transylvania and all Orthodox Romanians of the Danubian Principalities a response to Calvinist proselytism. It was important for him to uphold the unity, concord, and single vision of an ecumenical Orthodoxy.

Certainly, Cyril Loukaris of Crete (1572-1638), the patriarch of Constantinople (1620-1638), remains the most famous conversion account from the seventeenth century and it was a major scandal within the Greek Church—but only because this conversion was accompanied by the patriarch's *Confession of Faith* (1629). First published in Latin and then Greek in 1633, Loukaris never publicly disavowed his reputed authorship of what was considered a confession infused with Calvinist doctrines masquerading beneath the title of an *Eastern Confession*; and, in 1638 a Constantinopolitan council anathematized and excommunicated Loukaris on this basis. Shortly thereafter, the Sultan

ordered his assassination. Loukaris' *Confession* had lingering effects within the international marketplace of confessions, and an additional council (1641) was convened in Jassy, Moldavia, to meet the necessity for another public condemnation of Loukaris.

Dositheos' defense of Loukaris's orthodoxy and the evidence he provided was an apologetic articulated within a broader, public examination and court of opinions. The decrees and anathemas of the Jerusalem council of 1672, therefore, were much more than the denunciation of one patriarch, a singular issue or scandalous conversion story. In part because of Loukaris' reputed apostasy many other patriarchs, bishops, and clergy submitted a profession to Rome and converted. Cyril Kontaris, at the time Loukaris' chief opponent, provided the most outstanding example of an Orthodox convert to Rome, who was also consequently murdered in exile for it. Historian Kallistos Ware listed eleven public conversions outside of Constantinople, including the patriarch of Antioch in 1662, numerous Athonite monks, and the entire monastery of St. John Patmos in 1681.

In 1672 Dositheos chaired a council in Jerusalem, which he convened in order to publicly respond to the polemical reverberations of Loukaris' *Confession* (1629). The official acts and decrees of this council were published and distributed from Paris in 1676. Its abridged title was appropriately: *The Shield of Orthodoxy*. The full explanatory version was: *Or An Apology and Refutation addressed to those who calumniatingly aver that the Eastern Church thinketh heretically concerning God and divine things, as they themselves, the Calvinists to wit, do wrongly think*. Dositheos addressed it "To all Orthodox Bishops everywhere, whether on land or on sea, our brethren and fellow ministers...to all pious and Orthodox Christians..." The final chapter of *The Shield of Orthodoxy* contained Dositheos' *Confession* (1672), which he authored along with the

approval of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate, and it was addressed to a broader audience: "...to those that ask and inquire concerning the faith and religion of the Greeks, namely the Eastern Church."²⁸³

The first four chapters of *The Shield of Orthodoxy* Dositheos devoted to a defense of Loukaris and included evidential excerpts from Loukaris' sermons. Chapter five provided the decrees of Constantinople (1638) and Jassy (1641); an epistle from the legates and patriarchal exarchs of Constantinople which was addressed to John Basil, the Duke and "the God-fearing Prince and Ruler of Moldavia;" and, concluded with Dositheos' own summary and interpretation of the person and character of Loukaris whom he insisted was orthodox. Dositheos mostly absolved Loukaris from guilt, and thereby, set forth an *apologia* for the memory of him, for the unity of the Church, and for the maintenance of continuity between the Jerusalem council of 1672 and the previous two councils (1638, 1641) which anathemized Loukaris. Loukaris' *Confession* (1629) was declared a forgery by Dositheos.

At the end of Dositheos' preface to *The Shield of Orthodoxy* he briefly summarized five points in response to the accusation that Loukaris was a crypto-Calvinist and the genuine author of that *Confession* (1629). First, Dositheos argued based on "the testimony of those who knew him" that Loukaris was widely regarded as orthodox and emphasized the "vast numbers who bear testimony", while also including testimony from Loukaris's own sermons. Second, Dositheos appealed to the lack of patriarchal signatures on Loukaris' reputed confession; the absence of an official record of it in the patriarchal codices as was done with Jeremiah's *Confession* (1576) sent to the Gnesio Lutherans; and, therefore, leaving the only possibility of it being, as Dositheos suspected, a "covert

publication.” Third, Dositheos disregarded a rumour, that Loukaris was playing the “crafty fool” and had secretly converted, by reassuring the reader that the “Eastern Church...does not rely upon one, or two, or more who represent [the accuser’s] party...” Fourth, paying particular attention to the last iconoclastic article of faith in Loukaris’ *Confession*, Dositheos reiterated the victory of the iconodules, the celebration of the Sunday of Orthodoxy, and reiterated the ecumenical anathemas from Constantinople.²⁸⁴

Finally, Dositheos concluded by explaining that Loukaris was previously condemned by the councils of 1638 and 1642 “...only because he [Loukaris] did not write against them [adversaries]...” In order to provide a better assurance of his orthodoxy, Dositheos asserted that Loukaris should have followed the example of Basil the Great and “...set forth an apology for himself.” He closed by stating that Loukaris’ (unwritten) silence, in addition to some other “unlawful” ecclesiastical activities not mentioned by Dositheos, made Loukaris “more suspicious” and justly killed according to Dositheos. The decrees of the previous councils were then included by Dositheos before attaching his own *Confession* (1672) in the final sixth chapter.²⁸⁵

While visiting Bucharest in 1690, under the patronage of the Wallachian Prince Constantine Brancoveanu (1688-1714), Dositheos republished *The Shield of Orthodoxy* (1672) under a new more emotive title: *A Manual against the Calvinist Madness* (1690).²⁸⁶ The volume also contained the work of Meletios Syrigos (1585-1664) entitled *An Objection against the Calvinist Chapters and Questions of Cyril Loukaris*. The work of Syrigos was a reprint of the 1641 publication from Jassy, Moldavia, but it was translated “...from the Greek into the common dialect.” In the first publication of *The Shield of Orthodoxy* (1672) the acts and decrees of the council were addressed to “...all

Orthodox Bishops everywhere, etc...” In this 1690 edition Dositheos emphasized his presidency over the Jerusalem council of 1672 in the title: “Dositheos by the mercy of God Patriarch with those saints of Christ our God of the city of resurrection Jerusalem to all Orthodox Bishops...”²⁸⁷

Also included with the volume was a collection of statements descriptively entitled: “Statements of other certain witnesses [*martyria*] of the ancient holy fathers and other orthodox church writers, presented on the worship in the act of adoration to the mystery and the real [*ousia*] presence of the savior on account of an essential [*ousia*] change [*metavoli*] of the bread and of the wine into his worthy body and blood of the savior, which is the transubstantiation mystery.”²⁸⁸ Among these statements Dositheos edited out a couple of opinions that supported purgatory, since by 1690 he had changed his view somewhat. Finally, there was also a short biography on Syrigos written by Dositheos.

Dositheos’ opening statements from his preface to *A Manual against the Calvinist Madness* (1690) expressed the urgency to confess under “these terrible times of persecution,” especially to the Orthodox communities in Transylvania, and his reticence to step up on such an international stage and speak before a multi-confessional audience. He began with Ecclesiastes, chapter three, verse seven: “That there is a time to speak [*logos*], and a time to keep silence...”²⁸⁹ The author of this well known and often referenced Old Testament book Dositheos calls “the wise one of Ecclesiastes.” In Greek, the phrase could be rendered as ‘the wise speaker of an assembly (*ecclesiastic*).’ Most ascribe the book’s authorship to the famous King Solomon; however, the writer only self-

identifies under the pseudonym “Qoheleth,” which could be translated as preacher, teacher, or even office.

Dositheos explained further by reiterating the pithy excerpt: “...as if he [the wise speaker] had said: ‘When there is no necessity [to speak], keep silence; but when the time requireth, speak.’”²⁹⁰ He framed its context in a manner of dialogue with questions and answers, or what could best be described as an exercise in public catechesis, stating, “For there is no necessity for one to speak who is not interrogated about some useful and necessary matter, and although able [to do so], to refrain from answering, would be the height of wickedness.” Here, Dositheos clarifies the pragmatic use of silence from the imperative to speak, when asked for example ‘What do you believe?’ He continued with more Old Testament examples. He noted the command from the book of Deuteronomy, “He shall order [*economia*] his words with judgment”; when God ecumenically commanded the prophet Ezekiel, saying, “Son of man, speak unto the house of Israel” (in the book of Ecclesiastes “Qoheleth” is also referred to as the “Son of David”); and, when God told Moses to speak despite his lack of rhetorical eloquence.

Before continuing on with the particular situation Dositheos faced in Transylvania, he concluded by reframing it within the New Testament context of 1 Peter 3:15, which states: “...in your hearts honor Christ the Lord as holy, always being prepared to make a defense to all who ask you for a reason...”²⁹¹ In Greek, the word holy (*agios*) could be rendered as separate, to separate from something or set oneself apart from a group. The Greek word for defense is *apologia* and for the word reason—*logos*. These words were and have always been, by some divine providence, critical avenues for marking one’s confessional orthodoxy.

The necessity to break the silence, however, did not mean that the catechized knew how to answer or how to respond with the correct formula. This was the dilemma facing the Orthodox inhabitants of Transylvania. The role of the catechumen was definite, and Dositheos made it clear: “‘For, be silent,’ saith He, ‘and hear, O Israel,’ for we are commanded not only to speak, but also to *listen* to those that say what is profitable.” This was Dositheos’ employment of the *shema*. In Dositheos’ attempt “...to expose the sophistry concealed under the guise of piety, and the quibbling of our accusers...” the defense he purposed relied on the basic fundamentals of managing or economizing belief. The extracts Dositheos colligated from Loukaris’ sermons provided not just evidence of Loukaris’ reputed orthodoxy, but more importantly a manual for speaking, as Dositheos wrote, “...theologically and *orthodoxly*.”²⁹²

After the introduction Dositheos addressed his French opponent directly, namely, “...a certain Claude, a minister of the Calvinists at Charenton.” Since 1680, when Dositheos received the request for support against Calvinist proselytism, the future prospects for Transylvania’s Orthodox communities looked increasingly dim. Three years after Dositheos’ publication of *A Manual against the Calvinist Madness* Transylvania was taken over in 1693 by the Hungarian Empire and the Jesuits revitalized their missions there, especially in Kolozsvár. Dositheos knew the urgency of the situation. He lamented, “...I will not keep silence, for my soul hath heard the sound of the trumpet and the cry of the war.” Dositheos made reference here to Jeremiah 4:16: “Tell this to the nations, proclaim concerning Jerusalem: A besieging army is coming from a distant land, raising a war cry against the cities of Judah.” Similarly, Dositheos bemoaned, “For more sounding than the terrible trumpet, and louder than the cruel war, there are now reaching

us from France (how we would we had not heard them!) rumblings.” And, many rumors circulated. The battle would not take place on bloody fields and violent crusades, but in the court of public opinion and an international judge who was not as supportive as the emperors, kings, and princes from ‘the Old World.’

Dositheos opened by pointing out that the Calvinists were already disqualified from debate because they had been “...severed or rather rent away from the Westerns...and consequently being absolutely rejected by the whole Catholic Church.”²⁹³ Dositheos used their excommunication from the western Roman Catholic Church as their preemptory disqualification from the universal (*catholic*) Church. Similarly, just as Dositheos entitled his publication *A Manual Against the Calvinists Madness*, he compared them to the German “sophists” and “the madness of Luther.” He stated, “...for the notions of Luther and of Calvin are really very much alike, though they seem to differ in some particulars...”²⁹⁴

Cleverly, Dositheos accused his challenger of admitting this syllogism because the French first appealed to the Greek Church as an authority and claimed that the East too rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation. Dositheos suggested they feared their own audience “...who have unhappily listened to them [and] might perhaps be converted...” on hearing that one syllogism alone. Dositheos resolved that that was the only explanation for their inventing “[the] most transparent lie” against the memory of Loukaris and defamation of character towards the Eastern Church. For the Calvinist, Dositheos reminded his readers, had once pretended to have had the same doctrine on the Eucharist as the East. Dositheos wrote that if it was true that Calvinist taught as the East taught “... [they] would have agreed [with us] in all things; nor would they have desired

to have become our teachers...but would have been willing to learn of us, and to obey us, who hold what the Apostles preacher, and what the Catholic Church hath held...”²⁹⁵

Dositheos’ argument follows a familiar but fundamental formula to then describe the external manner of this authorial medium—the office of teaching. Dositheos feigned exasperation and explained, “[T]he Church is taught indeed by the Life-giving Spirit, but through the medium of the holy Fathers and Doctors (whose rule is acknowledged to be the Holy and Ecumenical Synods; for we shall not cease to say this ten thousand times).”²⁹⁶ In the parlance of rhetoric and the *ars dialectic* Dositheos had opened and ended with a perfect round.

Dositheos continued to unfold his schematic argument with evidentiary extracts from Loukaris’ sermons. Each excerpt corresponded to and presented refutations to the topical chapters of Loukaris’ reputed *Confession* (1629). The first disputed Loukaris’ acceptance of the western addition of the *filioque* to the first ecumenical creed. The second contradicted Loukaris’ appeal to *sola scriptura*, the Protestant formula that held scriptures—the written word—over church authority. Here, Dositheos centered on the issue of exposition and interpretation, and the sermon extract from Loukaris echoed a familiar refrain. Loukaris’ sermon exhorted his listeners: “Let reasoning be laid aside, since theorizing appertaineth to things physical; we are now concerned with faith which has need not of reason [*logos*] but of an [authoritative] witness [*martyria*].”²⁹⁷ With regard to faith or the act of believing the limitations of reason are repeated; however, the excerpt’s appeal to an authoritative witness invokes a unique sense of *martyria*.

The excerpt continues by stating, “For if thou had not this [authoritative] witness [*martyria*], thou wouldst not be able to believe.” This use of the Greek word *martyria*

reflects its own particular properties and much richer qualities than its antiseptic Greek synonym *exousia* (authority). Both can be used in a court setting, but with significant nuances. For example, the judge has authority (*exousia*) to declare a verdict, and lawyers can submit eye-witness (*martyria*) testimony and request a specialist (i.e., an authority) to take witness stand. The difference is made clearer when the excerpt appealed to the example of Moses. It continued, “How is this made known to us, except that it is [authoritatively] witnessed to by Moses, who could not lie...”²⁹⁸ It pointed beyond the scriptural words of the text to the author or speaker and the space of interpretation, speech, and hearing.

Again, the excerpt repeats Dositheos’ introductory arguments in favor of the teaching office, but emphasizes its important relationship to the act of believing. The excerpt asserted, “We believe...How do we know this except that the Evangelists have taught it, and the Doctors explained it, and a credible [authoritative] witness persuaded us...God spoke through them.” The excerpt concludes the topic on exposition and interpretation by combining the act of belief, witnesses, and the teaching office:

God will tell us by writing—by the writings of these peoples, that is, of the Doctors, for they are many, and of the princes that have been in her. Who are the princes of these peoples? The Evangelists and Prophets. Consequently, whatsoever you hear from such peoples and princes is all spoken by God through them: therefore, they are worthy of *credence*. Wherefore, what we hear ought to be *believed*.²⁹⁹

Dositheos did not only defend the orthodox legacy of Loukaris against the accusations of crypto-Calvinism with extracts from Loukaris' sermons and discourses, Dositheos also attached his own *Confession* (1672) that rebutted the *Confession of Loukaris* (1629), article by article, line by line. Thus, they are both similarly addressed to "...those that ask and inquire concerning the faith and worship of the Greeks, that is of the Eastern Church."³⁰⁰ At the end of their confessions, however, are presented four questions, the first two being the most significant.³⁰¹

The first question asked: "Ought the Sacred Scriptures to be read in the common language by all Christians?" The reputed confession of Loukaris answered affirmatively, "All faithful Christians ought to know, believe, and confess...and to proclaim what is in [the Sacred Scriptures]...whether it be by reading...or by hearing what is therein expounded by faithful men..." The second question further inquired, "Are the Scriptures plain to Christians that read them?" Loukaris admitted there were "great difficulties, but the essential dogmas were clear ...when enlightened by the grace of the All-holy Spirit."³⁰² Loukaris left some room for the necessity of teachers.

In response to the first catechetical question Dositheos curtly answered, "No." He did, of course, allow "...every Orthodox to hear indeed the Scriptures, that he may believe with the heart unto righteousness, and confess with the mouth unto salvation." Yet, he stated that only those "...with fitting research [should] inquire into the deep things of the Spirit, and who know in what manner the Divine Scriptures ought to be searched, and taught, and in detail read." Concerning the second question, Dositheos appealed to the office of teaching within the Church or, as he stated, "...God had placed the gift of teaching in the Church." He too agreed with Loukaris that the scriptures were

difficult to understand and required wise and holy teachers. "... [T]hey need learned and divine men," Dositheos wrote, "to search out their true meaning, and a sense that is right, and agreeable to all Scripture, and to its author the Holy Spirit."³⁰³

Before concluding, it must also be noted that Dositheos had to defend against rumors that Loukaris had perhaps "...taught one thing publicly, but believed another in his heart...who had one thing in his heart, but made profession of another with his mouth."³⁰⁴ To the possibility of Loukaris' duplicity Dositheos appealed to the schema and asserted that "the Eastern Church does not give heed to rely upon one, or two, or more who represent a party, but not the whole." Against the accusation that a Christian could "believe one thing with their heart, and confess another with their mouth," Dositheos expressed the spiritual gravity of such an offence by referring to the act of believing by Judas who was "secretly a traitor." Dositheos responded to the suggestion that Loukaris might have "played the secret fool" from fear of persecution. He explained the difference between divine fear and human fear in the context of confessing the faith under persecution. Stating that "where there is divine fear, one must not believe one thing and profess another..." He boasted:

... [The Easterners] are above fear and threats; so that they have come to shine as martyrs...they count it joy to be afflicted for Christ, considering that they would become partakers of the sufferings of Christ through obedience, with the Apostles, Prophets, and Martyrs...³⁰⁵

Dositheos had in fact advised Nazar Ali Khan the Georgian king of Kartli (1688-1703) to do such a thing when dealing with Muslim Persians:

Deceive them, smile at them, tell them lies...if only to benefit Christians. Do not love them... even if they love you... And when death approaches... then, as much as you can, appear as if you are melancholy or in a trance in order to avoid saying the confession of faith of the impious; but often repeat: 'I believe in one God,' and in this way die.³⁰⁶

King Nazar had converted to Islam, but the Greek Brotherhood of the Holy Sepulcher continued commemorating the Muslim king in the Divine Liturgy. Dositheos claimed that Nazar was Muslim for external reasons, but internally a Christian. Dositheos never separated diplomacy from religion, but he understood political expediency.³⁰⁷

* * *

When Dositheos published *A Manual against the Calvinist Madness* (1690), as stated above, he also included the work of Meletios Syrigos (1586-1664), entitled *An Objection against the Calvinist Chapters and Questions of Cyril Loukaris* (1690). Both Syrigos and Peter Mogila used the Latin term transubstantiation to describe how the bread and wine became the body and blood of Christ through a miraculous change.

In article seventeen of Dositheos' *Confession* (1672), Dositheos did state that the elements were "transmuted, transubstantiated, converted and transformed" (after incorrectly denouncing "the followers of Luther" for believing "ignorantly" in the real presence by impanation). Dositheos used the term two more times with the compliments "converted" and "changed"; however, he also described the term within the Latinized categories such as "accidents". Nonetheless, after Dositheos followed another western

analytic by dissecting the “Evangelical Mysteries” into seven sacraments under article fourteen, he provided somewhat of a dialectical qualifier explaining that “...the Mysteries consist of something natural and of something supernatural...” This was further expanded in article seventeen.

Dositheos instructed the reader on the meaning or conceptual tension that the “one Body of the Lord [be] in many places, and not many [places]” by appealing to the limitations of reason, the ineffable, and incomprehensible. He continued with an exhortation:

...and therefore this Mystery is the greatest, and is spoken of as wonderful, and comprehensible by faith only, and not by the sophistries of man’s wisdom [and] vain and foolish curiosity in divine things...Further, we believe that by the word ‘transubstantiation’ the manner [of change] is not explained..for that is altogether incomprehensible and impossible, except by God Himself, and those who imagine to do so are involved in ignorance...³⁰⁸

A few months after Cyril Loukaris’ assassination in June of 1638, the patriarch of Constantinople Cyril Contari of Beroea (Cyril II), who had chaired the council in September that anathematized Loukaris, converted to Roman Catholicism. At the inauguration of Patriarch Parthenios I, who replaced Contari, a sermon was given by the director of the Patriarchal Academy Theophilos Korydalleus (1570-1646)—praising the departed Loukaris. Korydalleus also took this occasion to denounce publicly Peter Mogila’s *Confession of Faith* (1642) for using the term transubstantiation. Meletios Syrigos, who edited Mogila’s *Confession*, responded later with a public sermon

denouncing both Loukaris and Korydalleus. Korydalleus' protest represented what historian Papadopoulos described as a movement against western scholasticism.³⁰⁹ Korydalleus was certainly convinced that Loukaris was a "godly and wise man," although later he was forced to give an apology for his public eulogy.³¹⁰

In 1642 at another council in Constantinople, Parthenios I took a different route in denouncing Loukaris by presenting a document purportedly written by Loukaris which implied that he had intended on converting not to Calvinism but to Roman Catholicism. Parthenios I then retaliated against the Korydalleus movement by defrocking and exiling many of its leaders and sympathizers.³¹¹ Korydalleus retired in Wallachia, but his student Ioannes Karyophylles (1600-1692) inherited his teacher's sympathies for the departed Loukaris and his dissatisfactions with western scholasticism, especially the term transubstantiation. Karyophylles replaced Korydalleus as the director of the Patriarchal Academy in Constantinople, but he too was eventually forced from that office and resettled in Wallachia, where he joined the faculty at the Bucharest Academy from 1676-1691. In 1691 he was condemned for his continued rejection of the term transubstantiation by a Constantinopolitan council at the urging of Dositheos.

The conflict between Dositheos and Karyophylles did not ignite until the publication of Karyophylles' *Tetradion* in 1690. The Romanian historian Dura provides two previously unpublished letters: one from 1685 by Karyophylles to Dositheos and the other from 1689 by Dositheos to Karyophylles. In the former letter, however, it is difficult for the historian to discern the level of sincerity in Karyophylles' flatteries toward the powerful patriarch of Jerusalem. It could even be suggested that Dositheos' letter to Karyophylles in 1689 did not artlessly offer to print Karyophylles' views on the

Eucharist—but, perhaps, Dositheos might have baited Karyophylles to express in writing his well-known opposition to the term transubstantiation. When Karyophylles had his *Tetradion* printed Dositheos did not hesitate to publicly ridicule it and charged him with crypto-Calvinism, innovation, and opposing orthodoxy.

In Dositheos' *A Manual Against Ioannes Karyophylles* (1694) he recalled these early events by stating that he and other hierarchs had written to Karyophylles in 1689 imploring him:

...to neither write nor speak about those things out of harmony with the ecclesiastical dogma, and clearly blasphemies. Nonetheless, he only became more hardened...But Karyophylles, thinking he found the timely opportunity wrote the *Tetradion*. Indeed, it is clear that he discarded the word transubstantiation, but the truth is that he clearly denied the salvation of the Eucharist mystery.³¹²

In his defense Karyophylles wrote a few letters in September of 1690 to Dositheos' nephew (and later biographer) Chrysanthos, requesting Chrysanthos to intercede on his behalf and to stop Dositheos from publicly accusing him.

Karyophylles could no longer “suffer in silence,” as he expressed it, and wrote a second letter to Chrysanthos. Karyophylles appealed to the ancient Holy Fathers and juxtaposed them with Dositheos' “Byzantine Theologians,” asserting that:

Our faith is not that of [George] Koressios [1566-1660], Gennadios Scholarios, Symeon [the New Theologian (949-1022)] and [Meletios] Syrigos, but the faith that the God-bearing Fathers and doctors have explained to us. And we have their command that we should not dare to change any word or any concept.”³¹³

Karyophylles continued by referring to the course subjects taught by him and the other faculty in Bucharest—mathematics, poetry, rhetoric, logic, physics, metaphysics, and theology—and that other “lovers of learning” called him and his teachings a “light of piety” (*phos tis eusebeias*). Karyophylles emphasized his defensive stance stating that on “the Testimony [*Martyrus*] of my Savior” he did not start the scandal between him and Dositheos, but only felt it necessary to return the charge of Dositheos by publicly accusing him with papism and Latin-thinking.

In October of 1690 Karyophylles reached out against to Chrysanthos by letter; he lamented again the influence of Mogila’s *Confession* (1642), its editor Meletios Syrigos, and “Russian theologians.” Regarding the affirmation of the term transubstantiation in Mogila’s *Confession* at the council of Jassy (1641), Karyophylles wrote:

...as if the Eastern Church in your day [half a century ago] was lacking, destitute, and you make the words which were used by the Holy Teachers into an ambiguous meaning with respect to the mystery of the holy communion...Perhaps you are not familiar with or even did not know what the holy Damaskinos said concerning this mystery, ‘if you seek the manner in which it has become [changed], it is enough for you to hear that it is through the Holy Spirit’ and nothing more do we know.³¹⁴

He continued by attacking Syrigos asserting that he had not learned from ‘real’ theology and noted the failure of Syrigos to prevent two-thirds of Russians from joining the Catholic Uniates. He addressed Syrigos directly, stating, “... if you had spiritual faith in this mystery, you would not investigate and if you investigated piously you would investigate the Saints to learn what they say and be silent.”

Karyophylles' own explanation of the mystery of the Eucharist seemed very close to what Dositheos had written—that is to say, when Dositheos avoided the term transubstantiation. Karyophylles wrote, “The bread being eaten is truly the body of Christ...and the wine of his all-holy blood...certain words have been used ‘to be changed’ [*metavallesthai*] for the bread and wine—‘*metarrythmizesthai*,’ ‘*metapoieisthai*,’ ‘*metastoicheiousthai*’—into the all-holy body and blood of our Savior...not having other words to signify this...For all of these mysteries were received, not naturally but metaphysically—for such is the physics of Divine [Things].” Later on in the same letter he located the miraculous manifestation of the mystery “...through the reciting of the words of offering by the priest...by the power of the all-holy Spirit metaphysically , ineffably, mystically...according to the pious and orthodox faith of the holy Eastern Church of Christ and according to the Holy Teachers.”³¹⁵

Dositheos reiterated his views on the Eucharist in his *A Manual Against Ioannes Karyophylles*, which also included the synodical resolutions of the Constantinopolitan council of 1691. Dositheos stated:

...after the sanctification of the bread and wine the bread is altered and changed [*metavoli*] into the true...body of Christ, and the wine into the true...blood of our saving Christ and God...For this body of Christ exists also in heaven and in the mystery of the Eucharist...this bread and wine is changed [*metavoli*] into that body and blood of the Lord essentially [*ousia*]. And, the body and bread is invisibly present truly and really [*ousia*] in the mystery. Hence, many have become officiating priests in the *Ecumene*, not that they have become many Christs and many bodies, but one Christ...³¹⁶

In the above passage Dositheos avoided using the contentious word transubstantiation, and therefore, his emphasis on the mystery of the change from bread and wine into body and blood resembled the words and tone of Karyophylles' articulation of the Eucharistic Question. Thus, Dositheos continued by denying Karyophylles' accusations that the term transubstantiation was of a late Byzantine invention. He compared it with other synonyms used to traditionally express the mysterious change of elements, and asserted that "[It] was not borrowed from the Latins, but from the house [ecos] of and the real [gnesio] Orthodox Teachers..." Instead of using the Greek *ousia* for the word real, as he did in the above passage, Dositheos employed the Greek *gnesio*—which coincidentally was the name used by the Gnesio Lutherans who opposed Philip Melanchthon and corresponded with Patriarch Jeremias II in the later sixteenth century.

Following the conventional course of disputations, he then provided a list which included "that shield of religion Lord Gennadius Patriarch of Constantinople," the other witnesses noted by Karyophylles, and his predecessor in the patriarchal throne of Jerusalem, Nectarios.

Finally, and most definitively, Dositheos concluded:

Together we confess this word, namely transubstantiation, is neither diluted, nor heterodox, nor has it infiltrated the Eastern Church through the bad opinion [*kakodoxa*] of certain heterodox, but [is] in house and truly [*gnesio*] from each of our Holy Teachers and by those pious Teachers of the Church [it] was written *orthodoxly* and expressed...³¹⁷

In 1691 Karyophylles was summoned to the council of Constantinople and "...was called to apologize," as Dositheos wrote, "...and he confessed that the things having been written with this *Tetradion* were opposed to the ecclesiastic dogma, and he himself signed the written Synodical letter concerning the mystery." Dura, however, rightly perceived a 'double agenda' in Dositheos intentions at the council by using this opportunity to publicly confirm Mogila's *Confession* (1638) and its delineation of seven mysteries. Dura also noted that Karyophylles had signed the Synodical document primarily out of fear. During the celebration of the Divine Liturgy on the day after the proceedings of the council, as Dositheos recounted later in his *History of the Jerusalem Patriarchs*, that he himself tore apart the Karyophylles' *Tetradion* and anathematized anyone who did not likewise burn it. Dositheos further recorded that Alexander Mavrocordatos, "...who being full of zeal for the faith," grabbed Karyophylles by the hair and dragged him outside where he continued to beat him. Dositheos explained, "For this reason the Sunday of Orthodoxy of 1691 received the appellation "the fist of orthodoxy."³¹⁸

* * *

The publication of the French Jesuit work the *Targa [Shield] of the Faith of the Roman Church* (1658) was, through the medium of seventeenth century print culture, a theatrical affair. Its public burnings in 1658 not only occurred in the former city of Constantinople, but as Dositheos stated: "...the [Ecumenical] Patriarch Parthenios IV wrote to the City and to Galata, and indeed also to Smyrna and every city and Orthodox

land against it...the Orthodox burned a great many copies of it in the market places...”³¹⁹

This public protestation was more than a matter involving the rarified arena of elite polemics and histrionics; the *Targa* had been translated into the vernacular Greek. Not just a defensive shield, as stated in the prologue, it aimed to convert by the persuasiveness of “...the divine scriptures, the God-testimony [*Theos-martyria*] of the holy fathers, God-taught historians, synodical dogmas, and God-logic [*Theos-logikos*] manuals.”³²⁰ The *Targa* sought to demonstrate that the Greek Church had apostatized from the West, as well as, their eastern confessional tradition. Equally threatening to the Greek Church was the *Targa*'s question and answer format written within the context of a dialogue and dialectic between a minister and a bishop.

The *Targa* was published in two volumes. The first volume deals with a number of ritual and theological disagreements between the Latin West and the Greek East, from baptism to the Eucharist and confession, and from minor matters in the use of holy oil, relics and the New Calendar. The second volume covered more thematic issues still important to the latter half of the seventeenth century, such as the Pope's sole authority versus the East's synodical authority, the proper and improper use of indulgences, and “Questions [*aporia*] about the light of the holy tomb.”³²¹

The *Targa*'s preface, also written by its author Francis Richard, began with a familiar declarative and followed with three rhetorical questions. Richard dedicated it to his beloved lovers of knowledge and commenced:

Good Christians desire nothing other than for the truth to triumph against the lie, knowledge [*episteme*] against ignorance, and the catholic faith over heresy and

schism. What is more glorious to God, what is more honorable to the holy church? What is most beneficial [than] to be desired the salvation of souls or to reason [*logicize*] mightily?³²²

The closing paragraph of Richard's preface ended by reiterating the intention behind the *Targa*'s publication: "As much as you desire to read it with the greatest care and attention, so much better you shall want to learn the truth and want to know most clearly the sycophancy of the unjust Romaic faith...those heretics."³²³ The shield was for self-defense, the text a manual for battle, and the dialogue catechetical.

The Greek Church lacked its own printing press since the one established by Cyril Loukaris was destroyed in 1627. In a letter to his readers Dositheos stated, "Save for the few books which remain and into a short time even fewer and they have almost disappeared. Thus, the communion of the orthodox is endangered, so that the most necessary good might even be left behind."³²⁴ Over two decades had passed since the *Targa*'s publication in 1658 before Dositheos succeeded in building a Greek press under the auspices of the Moldavian Prince George Ducas in 1681. Dositheos' publication of Symeon's *Dialogue Against the Heretics* in 1682 laid the foundation upon which his readers would enter the arena, equipped to confront and battle against the *Targa*. The aspirations Dositheos had toward his new printing press can only be appreciated with the same 'air of the supernatural' and 'the miraculous' which accompanied the German Reformation. It was Dositheos' publication of Symeon's *Dialogue Against the Heretics* and later publications that caused Nicola Iorga to see the roots of a Greek renaissance in the Danubian Principalities.³²⁵

Dositheos wrote two prefaces for its publication in 1682, while also making preparations for his extensive three volume collection of texts [i.e., *Reconciliation* (1694), *Love* (1698), and *Joy* (1705)]. Dositheos' first preface in *Dialogue Against the Heretics* was addressed to Governor John Duca, "...the third [Prince] of all Moldavia and the first of the Ukraine."

Dositheos made a comparison between the Old Testament "Gospel of man" (*Evangelic anthropos*) and the New Testament's "Gospel of Truth." In other words, Dositheos contrasted the Jewish "prophetic spirit" with its fulfillment in "holy Spirit." He began, "Comparing certain holy Fathers of ancient Israel with the Gospel man, it was said, 'O man, how much grace you have been made worthy, seeing God. Abraham saw and heard but exoterically... Jacob saw and heard... Moses saw... Isaiah saw but exoterically... [and] Ezekiel saw, but he also exoterically... They had not seen, however, the holy Spirit.'" Dositheos was implying, of course, the incarnation of the Christ, but he pointed more specifically to the Day of Pentecost, when Christ's followers received the miraculous indwelling of the Holy Spirit as recorded in the New Testament book of Acts, the historical account given by the Gospel writer Luke. Every preface Dositheos wrote was catechetical in its intention.³²⁶ Through the publishing of Symeon's work Dositheos invited his audience to study the text, but also to become students of the word (*logos*) and enter into its deeper teaching. To make disciples out of his hearers was every confessor's goal—the heart of the matter of every topic of dispute.

The New Testament scripture passage which Dositheos chose comes from the earliest written reports on the activities of the early church, and relatively speaking is rather particular and obscure. The brief report interrupts Paul's journey, traveling from a

public disputation with the Jews in Achaia to another synodical debate with the Jews in Ephesus.³²⁷ Paul was defending ‘the Way’ (the eponym given to the earliest Christian-Jewish sect before its mission to the Gentile nations) and also persuading (*dialogos*) the Jews to believe.³²⁸

The narrative of Acts states that between his debates Paul stumbled upon twelve students (approximately), who had heard of his fame.³²⁹ He first asked them an aporetic question: “Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?” They turned and looked at one another dumbfounded. At a loss, they replied, “No, we have not even heard that there is a Holy Spirit.” Paul further questioned them about the kind of baptism they had received, to which the students solemnly informed him that they had been initiated “...into John’s baptism.” Paul explained the differences between his baptism and John’s kind; and, he “spoke” (*logos*) to the larger audience of people gathered, telling them to believe in Jesus, the incarnated Christ. “On hearing this...” the twelve students submitted to Paul’s baptism. The students then received the Holy Spirit through the ritual “laying on of hands” ministered by Paul, and they in turn performed miracles and announced the new prophesy, according to Luke’s self-described investigative record.³³⁰

Dositheos clarified that Paul’s students had access to the Holy Spirit in the sacred scriptures, even though they were under John’s baptism. He reiterated that they had not received the Holy Spirit because they had not heard about it. Dositheos proceeded in this manner to draw his audience’s attention to the importance of the printed word, the speaker, and the ‘Spirit of Truth’—thus, making hearers into participants. Dositheos spoke directly to them, reminded them of this inner light, and quoted Jesus’ words saying, “But you yourselves have been made worthy of this grace essentially [*ousia*], as

the Lord announced, ‘I myself will ask the Father, and he will give another intercessor [the Paraclete]...the Spirit of Truth, which the world was not able to receive, neither to see it, nor know it. You yourselves know it for it dwells within you and shall be in you.’” He quoted Jesus’ words on the universal desire, “Hence the Lord said, ‘Amen I say [logos] to you, many prophets and righteous [men] desired to see which you see, and they did not see, and hear which you have heard, and they did not hear.’” The Jesuit Francois Richard also prefaced the *Targa* with a discourse on desire.

Dositheos was not only building up his audience’s anticipation for the publication of his book, but he also placed these expectations within a larger framework of the eschaton, revelation, and mystery. He continued:

Thus, only those faithful in the last days, when the Word of God [*Theos Logos*] shall rise up among you, the holy Spirit will be given and remain with you for eternity, according to the measure of Christ’s gift. How much more the measure of this gift in each of us shines most brilliantly in [this] age for in the season of this governor has come to our generation the Greek press, on account of which a Spiritual blessing shall be announced [*evangelized*] to all the world.³³¹

The presentation of the Greek printing press by Dositheos was connected with the appearance of God’s *logos*, with cosmological significance and providence, and with an evangelical mission.

Dositheos further explained, “Just as King Josiah had read the Book of Law, and it went before Israel in Jerusalem, it went or rather shown most brilliantly, I give this book to the universal [*catholic*] Church that it might not appear dimly, but [that] all might

be blessed in the Evangelical truth, and indeed in the present time.” Dositheos equated the King Josiah’ Book of Law with “the right Christian dogmas,” as well as, King Josiah’s reformation with the “cutting away” of heretics and separation from schismatics like “thorns and acorns.” He compared Symeon’s works as a similar discovery. “Through which now a certain kind of light radiates by means of the printing press,” Dositheos wrote, “and sets the clear from the unclear, the manifest from the unmanifest, as a prophetic fullness foreseen—like an encircled wall and raised fence—so that murders do not jump into the church.”³³²

Dositheos pointed again to historical precedent and the exemplar model for the Moldavian prince to follow: “For pious governors should always act in the same manner, and as much as possible to worship and to serve the universal [*catholic*] religion of the orthodox Christians, the one on the basis of Constantine.” Dositheos provided the schema, “Above all this is said, into one purpose, which by the multitude blessings of the universal [*catholic*] Church, one faith, and real love, to maintain the same opinion and religion concerning God, the creator of all God.” He further elaborated on the external ministry and the hierarchical order on the temporal horizon. Dositheos concluded:

And if a certain wise saying be true, that it is necessary among those things of nature to praise God, and righteousness, and foresight, it is good to teach [it] in the customary laws, society, and the citizenry. All these things are most generously now accomplished concerning the theology of God and divine truths, as much as concerns creation, prescience and the eternal judgment, as much as concerns, mysteries, nations, classes, ecclesiastical orders, and the communion of

the orthodox and non-union with heretics and schismatics, and as much as concerns the polity in divinely inspired symphonia [*synoda*] with the Scripture.³³³

The scene described above by Dositheos in his preface reflects the scriptural basis upon which communities of believers in every age often returned. It was a pattern of self-identification dating back to the scriptural communities of the third and fourth centuries; back to the spiraling periods just after Garth Fowden's assertion of a revolutionary 'scriptural turn' among early *ortho-praxis* communities to *ortho-doxa*, believing communities.

In the preface Dositheos stated that Symeon's works had laid hidden in Adrianople but were revealed and printed by him for the first time. The first work by Symeon, the *Dialogue*, was subtitled: "An *apologia* given at the time to each of the questions." The question and answer lecture occurred between a clergy member and his bishop; therefore, the inquirer was already catechized in "...the proclamation of one essence and divinity, of the one in triad," and thus the inquiry pertained more to the field of classical apologetics or polemics than initiation. The bishop began with the chief article, "Brother, to us, the true proclamation and the pious confession is necessary before all things. And, this is to be confessed before all needs. For this ought to always be believed."³³⁴ He explained that for the sake of living in peace with one's neighbors it was not always possible to persuade by force. He encouraged them, however, that "...according to the most divine Paul great confessedly is the mystery of piety, and with the use of piety and attention whatever you dialogue [about] you [will] dialogue about it well."

The priest asked the bishop whether a most steadfast dialectic should be based on “natural thinking [i.e., philosophy] or scriptural witnesses [*marytria*].” The bishop answered, “It is not wholly necessary to proceed or think outside the divine scriptures.” Their conversation continued with the first category or typological opponent the atheist and the minister’s question about strategy, “How should we persuade [him] that there is a God?”³³⁵ Symeon’s *Dialogue* between the minister and the bishop was just as relevant to Dositheos’ epistemic context as Augustine’s instructions for catechizing, as Elias of Crete’s seventh century commentary on the word (*logos*) and the mind (*nous*), and as Francois Richard’s dialogue between the teacher and student in the *Targa*: the act of believing, the examination of what to believe, and the act of persuading others to believe.

Along with Symeon’s the *Dialogue*, Dositheos also included Symeon’s *An Explanation of the greatest necessity: Concerning those words in the holy Symbol*, which gave a systematic, line-by-line, brief explanation of the *Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed* (381); and his *Containing as [is] possible the only twelve chapters of our Christian Faith*, which provided its readers with a delineation of that “Divine Symbol” as interpreted and abbreviated by Symeon.³³⁶ While the former focused on the specific words of the *Creed* (381), the latter examined its structure; in other words, Symeon’s broad principles and fundamentals on how to believe. Symeon’s synopsis provided a type of *prolegomena* that generalizes from particular and historically shaped confessions to the formulation of an ideal confession of faith, trans-local and trans-historical—universal. It was prescriptive for leading the direction of a dialogue toward ideas of the greatest profundity: ‘the one in three’ schema. Symeon exhorted his readers:

The true and only, of our Christian faith, above the essence of thinking and speaking [*logos*], and only faith [or faith alone in the Greek *mone pistis*; or in the Latin *sola fide*]; of the most true confession of the only God in triad beyond knowledge, in these chapters in synopsis are contained the uncontainable, which each Christian rightly [*ortho*] believing and wanting to be saved ought to confess.³³⁷

Symeon, like Dositheos and his press, also figuratively compared the Divine Symbol to a type of light, like “a never setting sun.”

In Symeon’s conclusion on the Divine Symbol, he tackled the dialectical distinction and dilemma between theory and practice, or thinking and acting, or believing and seeing. He wrote that the *Creed* (381) “...contained the philosophy according to Christ in theory and philosophizes also according to the practice of philosophy in Christ.”³³⁸ The manner of true philosophy, Symeon argued, intersected the twin poles of conceptual theory and ideas with the way of acting and being—thinking with experience. In the manner of approaching a symbol, the philosophical binary between theory and practice could have been rephrased by Symeon as the dialectic between believing and the act of confessing. Afterwards, Symeon provided a summary of seven virtues, and, as all confessors did, he emphasized the chief virtue by listing humility first.³³⁹

Finally, Symeon concluded where Francis’ *Targa* had begun: desire. After Symeon repeated the eschatological hope of resurrection into “the inheritance of its Master,” he defined the three parts of the soul: the Logistic (*Logos*), Zeal, and Desire. All three properties of the soul as defined by Symeon also corresponded to Dositheos’ own

anthropological definition: the Mind (*Nous*), Memory, and Will. Symeon elaborated on how these properties could be purified. He explained, “On the one hand, the Logistic [is cleansed] by the pious confession of the Trinity, and the incarnation of the word [*logos*], and the transmission of Baptism; on the other hand, Zeal [is purified] by remembrance of the savior’s incarnation, and his suffering, [and] humility through these teachings with gentleness and patience. Desire [is cleansed] by the proclamation of his resurrection, both the ascension and the glorious advent, and the eternal life...”³⁴⁰ If this were a theatrical play, the characters would correspond to Logistic, Zeal, and Desire—maybe even ‘the Spirit of Truth.’³⁴¹

In summary, Dositheos engaged the West in a polemical manner that had not been witnessed in the post-Byzantine period for some time. While he objected to the prevalence of Aquinas among Orthodox theologians of the past, he held a nuanced perspective of ‘western’ scholasticism. The *ars dialectica*, Dositheos argued, was an appropriate and traditional avenue for combating opponents of orthodoxy. The remaining chapter outlined, however, not Dositheos’ theological arguments in his *Shield of Orthodoxy*, but his confessional defense of Loukaris’ orthodoxy against the French Calvinist. This was followed by Dositheos’ self-defense against accusations of ‘Latin-thinking’ by Ioannes Karyophylles, where once again the Eucharist framed internal boundaries of unity and heterodoxy. The chapter closed with Dositheos’ response to the French Jesuit *Targa*. Here, special attention is given to Dositheos’ preface to the publication of Symeon’s *Dialogue Against the Heretics* in order to highlight his rhetorical force and confessional tropes. Finally, Symeon’s text was analyzed within the context of persuasion and the act of believing.

Dositheos took many opportunities throughout his *History of the Jerusalem Patriarchate* to address subjects of contention and minor points of dispute with the first volume of the *Targa*. He did the same with the publication of collections from two other Greek authors: Nectarios' *On the Papal Primacy* (1682) and Mark of Ephesus' *Commentary on the Liturgical Office* (1683). The former addressed the *Targa*'s defense of papal monarchical authority, and the latter focused on ritual differences, which the historian Norman Russell concisely described as "...shar[ing] a common theme: the mystical interpretation of the Divine Liturgy."³⁴² It was, however, Dositheos' later three volume publication entitled *Reconciliation* (1692), *Love* (1698), and *Joy* (1705) that responded to the second volume of the *Targa* and the threat against Dositheos' grandeur project: the hesychast international.

Chapter VI

Rethinking the Byzantine Commonwealth and Its Sequels?

South-East of the Transylvanian Alps and the Eastern Carpathian Mountains, the Danubian Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia (i.e., Romania) had become for the Greek Church a central focus in their efforts to impede the influences of Western Christendom. By the seventeenth century the northern borders of Moldavia, which it shared at various times with Russia, Poland-Lithuania, and the Habsburg Empire, presented the Patriarchate of Constantinople with a foreboding view of its ebbing fortitude and jurisdictional presence outside the confines of Ottoman possessions. The Russian Orthodox Church had gained formal independence from the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople in 1589 by establishing a Patriarchate in Moscow. The Ruthenian Orthodox Church had submitted to the ecclesiastical authority of Rome by signing the Union of Brest in 1596. In the multi-confessional Transylvanian State, the Greek Church was precluded from confessional politics and official recognition from Catholics, Lutherans, Calvinist, and Unitarians. The borders of Moldavia and Wallachia presented a new frontier in the efforts of the Greek Church to maintain the Byzantine vision of an Orthodox Commonwealth based on the *symphonia* of Church and State that was expressed in the Creedal Tradition. The final two *Confessions* of the Greek Church—Peter Mogila’s *The Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church* (1642) and the *Confession of Dositheos* (1672)—were printed from the presses established through the missionary and diplomatic activities of the Greek Church in the Danubian Principalities.

During the seventeenth century, the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia were semi-autonomous from the central administration of the Ottoman Empire. Both principalities gained their independence in the fourteenth century; however, by the fifteenth century, they were paying tribute under suzerainty to the Ottomans. The princes of Wallachia and Moldavia remained legitimately self-ruling and under their governance the princes brought stability to the once migratory lands between the Danube and Dniester Rivers. The religious contributions of the Greek Church to the cultural and ritual life of the Romanian people were an intimate part of their history since the ninth century Slavic missions of Cyril and Methodius. The centrality of Byzantine Christianity through the Greek Church, Greek liturgy, and Greek literature to the early formation of Romanian culture has been well documented by historians. The famous title of historian Nicolae Iorga's book *Byzance après Byzance* (Byzantium after Byzantium) became descriptive for the field of Byzantine historians succeeding him who explored Romania's historical connection with the Byzantine Empire and the bridge provided by the Greek Church's missionary activities. Nicolae Iorga had introduced to a nationalist trend in the early twentieth century of Byzantine historiography the concept of an ecumenical vision of Byzantine imperialism. According to Iorga, this imperial vision or ideology was exported to the Danubian Principalities after the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople in 1453.

Dimitri Obolensky carried Iorga's 'Byzantium after Byzantium' a step further with the publication of his book *The Byzantine Commonwealth* in 1971, which emphasized the ecumenical vision of Byzantine imperialism prior to 1453. Obolensky described the formation of a common cultural tradition shared among the Slavs, the Balkans, and Byzantine Christianity beginning with Emperor Justinian I's (527-565)

reconquista of the West Roman territories in the sixth century. The incorporation of Bulgaria into the Byzantine Empire in the ninth century and eventually the Danubian Principalities in the mid-fourteenth century established, Obolensky argued, a Byzantine Commonwealth. Obolensky asserted that the bonds of ecumenicity in the Commonwealth were constituted by the adoption of Greek education (*paideia*), an honorific reverence for the primacy of the Constantinopolitan Church, and a tenuous concession to the Byzantine Emperor. Obolensky amended Iorga's 'Byzantium after Byzantium' by emphasizing the ecumenical ideology of Emperor (*Basileus*) and its conceptual flexibility among the Balkan Princes of the Byzantine Commonwealth prior to 1453.³⁴³

Obolensky places a large responsibility for the cultivation of this Commonwealth on the bi-directional channels of communication with the city of Constantinople and the stature of its Patriarchate as a symbol of unity across the landscape of Byzantine Christianity. The centrality of Byzantine Christianity to Balkan culture during the Middle Ages (500-1453) with Constantinople at its head assured the Greek Church a wide-ranging significance in the formation of Balkan Christianity. Both Principalities were granted metropolitanates by the patriarchate of Constantinople in 1359 (Wallachia) and 1401 (Moldavia). Monastic influences also made its way into the Principalities, primarily through Bulgaria, and the princes there and elsewhere made frequent donations to monasteries on the revered Athos Mountain. Within one generation, the princes claimed the imperial title Emperor (*Basileus*), which the Constantinopolitan patriarchate begrudged but eventually accepted, thereby equating the princes' donations with the Byzantine heritage of imperial patronage to Mt. Athos. For example, princely chronicles placed Mircea the Elder (1386-1418) and Alexander the Good (1400-1432), within a

universal history beginning with King David of the Old Testament, the Byzantine Emperors of Constantinople, and the Wallachian and Moldavian Emperors (*Basileus*). Byzantine identity served the vision of the Danubian princes who insisted that they shared in the imperial legacy of the Byzantine Emperors.

In the tenth century, when Emperor Basil II (926-1025) extended the Empire's domains over Bulgaria, a hierarchical political structure was formed that emphasized the supremacy of the Emperor (*Basileus*) of 'New Rome' over the Bulgarian princes. But, distance and political instability occluded any real intervention or enforcement of supremacy from the imperial capital. By the late-fourteenth and early-fifteenth centuries, the Ottomans had annexed parts of Thrace, Macedonia, and Bulgaria which in effect circumscribed the Byzantine Empire to the rapidly collapsing and financially exasperated city of Constantinople. For the emergent Wallachian and Moldavian Princes their adoption of Byzantine Christianity did not relinquish their independence to the Emperors of the Palaeologan period (1261-1453). The political ideal of Emperor (*Basileus*) for the princes was grounded in mythical time and nostalgic space by the ideological significance of Constantinople as the historic capital of Byzantine Christianity. The imperial city provided the princes with a legitimizing authority that bolstered the sovereignty of their territories. The ambiguously defined imperial state of the late-fourteenth century, which Obolensky noted could be variously defined as Empire (*Basileia*), the inhabited world (*Ecumene*), and Government/State (*Politeuma*), applied equally to the aspirations of princes in Wallachia and Moldavia.

By 1425, Moldavian princes considered Manuel II (1391-1425) the last legitimate Emperor of the imperial capital after he was forced to pay tribute to the Ottomans.

Nevertheless, neither Alexander nor Mircea assumed primacy within the Commonwealth. The transmitting of the imperial lineage to the princes applied to their sovereign territories, but did not imply autocratic authority in an absolute sense. The ‘Holy City’ of Constantinople and its patriarchate remained the symbols of universal authority and a centrifugal pull shaping the history and identity of the Danubian Principalities. Therefore, Obolensky could argue, the princely rulers of Wallachia and Moldavia, as well as Bulgaria and Serbia, were addressed ecumenically as ‘the Emperors of the world (*ge*).’ Each could officially claim the imperial title over their own territory and ‘King of kings’ among the Balkan Christian States (*Politeuma*).

Furthermore, during the final years of the Byzantine Empire, these princes of the Danubian Principalities were the last hope for western intervention on behalf of Byzantine Christianity against the impending fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans. The geographic distance between the Principalities and the imperial capital created a heightened sense of being on the vanguard of Byzantine Christianity and facilitated a fluid assimilation of their own princely identity as fulfilling the role of Byzantine emperors on behalf of Greek Churches in their princely capitals (Arges in Wallachia and Suceava in Moldavia). The Byzantine Commonwealth adumbrated by Obolensky does not lend itself to analysis as easily as defining the geographic boundaries of the Byzantine Empire in traditional historiography. Obolensky’s Commonwealth transcended state borders and cut across cultural and local variations. Nonetheless, as Obolensky asserted, the bonds of the Commonwealth were “...no mere figment of men’s imagination.”³⁴⁴ What made the Commonwealth a reality depended primarily on their shared identity with the central administrative and spiritual head of Byzantine Christianity—the patriarchate

of Constantinople. It was the pervasiveness of this expression of Byzantine identity in the Balkans and Danubian Principalities by the early fifteenth century that enabled Obolensky to provide a narrative of the Commonwealth up to 1453.

Defining a collective identity, especially across linguistic and cultural differences and over an extended period of time, remains a form of analysis that has been exposed to many modern critiques. But, Obolensky's connection of Byzantine Christianity within a specific political community and historical period rendered an imperative for Byzantine historians to recast and reassess the collective identity expressed in Nicolae Iorga's 'Byzantium after Byzantium.' While Iorga's timeline was bracketed between the fall of Constantinople and the age of western enlightenment, an appreciation for Obolensky's Byzantine Commonwealth required more consideration for the importance of the imperial capital of Christianity since late antiquity, and especially the reception of Byzantine Christianity on the western frontiers and its influence on collective identity there. Greek scholar Paschalis Kitromilides has provided an appropriate sequel to Obolensky's works on the Byzantine Commonwealth by labeling the bonds of union after 1453 as an Orthodox Commonwealth. In doing so, Kitromilides avoided the flat narratives of power struggles over ecclesiastic affairs, jurisdictional boundaries, and political authority; even more, he deftly navigated the often oblique arguments over an oppressive or liberal millet system. Instead, the Orthodox Commonwealth presented by Kitromilides investigated the vibrancy of Orthodox culture that survived and in no way remained dormant within the millet system and the former western frontiers of the Byzantine Commonwealth.

While Obolensky established 'the Emperors of the world' on the western frontiers and thereby stretched the chronological beginning point of Iorga's "Byzantium after

Byzantium” prior to 1453, Kitromilides emphasized the importance of the Greek Church as not only the bearer of Byzantine heritage, but more importantly, the bearer of Orthodoxy after 1453. Kitromilides provided more weight to religious beliefs, liturgical practice, and sacred time and space to the formation of collective identity. As he put it, “By considering religion as an expression of human experience with its own psychological dynamic and complex symbolic significance, we can appreciate the ways it supplies meaning to the life of individuals and groups and thus understand its power and resilience.”³⁴⁵ Kitromilides’ Orthodox Commonwealth contributed to Obolensky’s ‘the Emperors of the world’ by highlighting the ‘Orthodoxy’ of the Wallachian and Moldavian princes and its ideological importance for the nobles and the people.³⁴⁶

Missing from Iorga, Obolensky, and Kitromilides’ accounts are the creeds, which offer an historical record of state and religion or the *symbiosis* between the Emperor (*Basileus*) and Orthodoxy within a political community and over an extended period. The first creed—the *Nicene Creed*—was produced in 325 C.E. From late antiquity in the city of Constantinople through Obolensky’s Byzantine Commonwealth, the *Nicene Creed* was reproduced and expanded upon in the east and the west. In general, it symbolized the unity between church and state in the Byzantine Empire until the *Confession of Gennadius* in 1455-56, which was formally presented to an Islamic Emperor. The eastern creeds continued to be reproduced after the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople until the final ‘official’ creed—the *Confession of Dositheos* in 1672. The period of the first seven creeds (325-787) established the traditional unity between the Emperor (*Basileus*) and Orthodoxy that continued through the Byzantine Commonwealth (800-

1453). The composition of the post-1453 creeds reflected the struggle for the Greek Church to maintain Orthodoxy without the imperial Emperor (*Basileus*).

The reorganization of Constantinople as the new Islamic capital of the Ottoman Empire in 1453 is well-known among historians for establishing the *millet* system of governance over its subjected populations. After the destruction and repopulation of the Islamic capital, the organization of 'nations' proceeded according to religious identification under the reign of Sultan Mehmed II, the Conqueror (1432-1481). This drastically altered the relationship of the Constantinopolitan patriarchate to the Byzantine Commonwealth by redefining its political significance to *ethn-arch* (national-ruler). According to *millet* categorization, the diversities of ethnic or national identities were parsed into religious confessions: Orthodox, Armenian, Copt, Roman Catholic, and Jew. The religious head of each confession or the *millet-bachi* (i.e., the Constantinopolitan patriarchate) led the administrative affairs and responsibilities of an intermediary institution.

Within the *millet* system, the Constantinopolitan patriarchate expanded its ecclesiastical jurisdiction; as an instrument for tax collection, the patriarchate exercised wider political influence over the Orthodox citizenry; and arguably, it experienced greater autonomy from state influence. Debate continues among historians over the efficiency of this classification system, its social injustices or liberalities, and its political inventiveness or cultural rigidity. Piercing through these circuital arguments, however, is the glaring practicality of the *millet* system as a solution for Mehmed to reorganize the depopulated and devastated city of Constantinople and sustain the expansive Empire. Although the patriarchate was relocated to the Phanar Quarter of the city, the integral structure of its

hierarchy remained untouched and a ready instrument for the political reorganization of state. The official privileges granted to the Patriarchate attest to the stabilization of the city under Mehmed's reign and the recognition of a new political reality demarcated by confessional identity.

Subsequent to the repopulation and reorganization of the new Islamic capital in 1454, Mehmed II invested George Scholarios, the newly elected Constantinopolitan patriarch (Gennadius II), with the scepter and orb, the first time this symbolic ceremony was consecrated by a non-Christian Emperor. The *axis mundi*, upon which former Byzantine Christianity shared in the imperial ecumenical vision, was entirely realigned and symbolized by this act of consecration. The once 'Holy City' of Constantinople had become segmented into profane spaces and sacred memories. The state was no longer Christian; *Hagia Sophia* was now a Mosque; and the patriarchate a vagrant in the Phanar district of the city. The ecumenicity that characterized the imperial capital of Byzantine Christianity and the Commonwealth had become relegated to one section of the city, whose *ethnarch* represented only one religious confession among others. As *ethnarch* over the Orthodox nation, the patriarch's new position in the Islamic state and the reordering of the Byzantine *symphonia* between the temporal and spiritual—required a confession of faith. The significance of Gennadius's *Confession* (1452) and its radical departure from the creedal tradition cannot be overestimated. Its opening address reflected the reality facing the future of the Orthodox Commonwealth:

Confession of the correct and blameless faith of Christians made by the [Patriarch of Constantinople]... When the Sultan Amera Mehmed asked him, "What do you Christians believe?"³⁴⁷

Between the fourth and eighth centuries of the Byzantine Empire, the seven confessions of faith which were produced received the official title of Ecumenical Creeds (*Ecumene Symboloi*). The designation of these confessions as Ecumenical Creeds reflected clearly the imperial regality of their historical production. These seven Ecumenical Creeds were recognized by their city of origin: 1. The *Nicene Creed* (325) 2. The *Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed* (381) 3. The *Confession of Ephesus* (431) 4. The *Confession of Chalcedon* (451) 5. The *Confession of Constantinople II* (553) 6. The *Confession of Constantinople III* (680-681) 7. The *Confession of Nicaea* (787). These seven Ecumenical Creeds provided four centuries of historical narrative and the affirmation of church and state. By 850, the Byzantine Commonwealth had encompassed the Slavic communities of the Balkans, particularly Bulgaria and regions just south of the Danube, most of Eastern Europe, and Russia. The second Byzantine Commonwealth (800-1453) continued to produce group biographies, martyrs, hagiographies, and catalogues of heretics. By the time of Gennadius's *Confession* (1455-56), the eastern confessions recognized six confessions of faith: The *Confession of Photius* (866); *The Edict of Michael Cerularius and the Synod of Constantinople* (1054); *The Synodical Volume I* (1341) and *Synodical Volume II* (1351); the *Confession of Gregory Palamas* (1351); and, the *Confession of Mark* (1439).

Gennadius's *Confession of Faith* (1455-56) addressed to the Sultan Mehmed II was the final confession of the Byzantine period, but it was also the first confession to represent the period of the Orthodox Commonwealth (1453-1821). Gennadius's composition grieved the loss of the Emperor (*Basileus*), but also articulated the continuation of Orthodoxy and the *credo* community's impulse to confess collectively

stating, “We believe.” The absence of the Emperor (*Basileus*) and its significance for the Byzantine Commonwealth, however, meant in reality that the question “What do you believe” could only be solved in front of the inhabited world (*ge*) with many cities and many princes.

The transition from a Byzantine Commonwealth to an Orthodox Commonwealth has been cast by historians onto a spectrum of advantages and disadvantages with regard to the welfare of the Constantinopolitan patriarchate and the continuity of post-Byzantine unity. The prevailing view of Orthodoxy under the millet system has been familiarized as the “Babylonian Captivity” to signify its poverty. Yet, the production of post-1453 eastern creeds witness to Orthodoxy’s lively engagement with the confessions of Western Europe. ‘Byzantium after Byzantium’ in Wallachia and Moldavia became the western frontier in the protection of Orthodoxy. In the context expressed by Iorga, Dositheos’ upheld a vision of an Orthodox Commonwealth after Byzantium. Within his own international and ‘modern’ context, this was the unity Dositheos had sought to foster through a revival of confessional Hesychasm after the fall of Byzantium. What might better be referred to as an Athonite Commonwealth.³⁴⁸

* * *

In the second volume of the *Targa*, the Jesuit Francis Richard broached the discussion of Gregory Palamas’ orthodoxy with the following heading: “Concerning the heresies of Gregory Palamas, the architect of the [doctrine] of uncreated light.” He produced testimonies (*martyria*) from the East such as Demetrios Kydones, Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos (1353-1354 and 1364-1376), Peter Arkoudios, John Karyophylles,

Paisios Ligarides, Leo Allatios, and Gennadios Scholarios to demonstrate that the church of the Greeks themselves had anathematized Palamas. In the dialogue constructed between the bishop and the minister the *Targa*'s accusations were effective; the minister responded, "I rejoice that as much as you have said about Palamas everything is assured by the witnesses of Greek teachers."³⁴⁹

Part of Dositheos' endeavor involved the task of collecting manuals and refutations from the patriarchal libraries of Jerusalem and Constantinople in order to compete against the arguments put forth in the *Targa*. The other part of Dositheos' project was the preservation and cultivation of hesychasm. In his preface to *Agape* Dositheos described the problem, writing, "...it is said that the *Targa* has been tested by bishops and approved teachers of France, and the *Targa* is recommended because of the worth of these bishops and teachers."³⁵⁰ *Agape* had three anonymous texts: one was entitled *Against the Latins*³⁵¹ and the other's title also described its dialogic content *An abridged explanation from a certain Greek Orthodox to some Latin concerning the procession of the holy Spirit*.³⁵² Dositheos described the third anonymous text as "...the most theological, the most instructive, the clearest, and the most orthodox," whose self-descriptive title was *A Theology or Interpretation of the Creed [Symbolo]*. It was divided into thirteen chapters: the first nine chapters explained the principles and axioms of the Triune schema; the final chapters were descriptively entitled *About the miracles of Christ, About the seven mysteries, About the incarnation, About the resurrection and judgment*.³⁵³

Agape included a refutation by Patriarch Jeremiah II against the New Calendar, as well as, a supportive synodical decree from 1593 presided over by Jeremiah against "the

change” (*apovoli*) to the Old Calendar. The text of the synodical decree of 1484 was also included reiterating the prohibition against rebaptism and the rejection of the former unionist council of Florence in 1439. And, two other texts of *Agape* also related to the unionist council: an epistle addressed “...to orthodox Christians everywhere upon the land [*ge*] and the [Greek] Isles,” and a confession of faith against the union by the renowned Mark of Ephesus, the Confessor.³⁵⁴ Dositheos stated that the texts of Mark of Ephesus were gifted to him by a certain Metropolitan Peter Dorotheos, who had heard about and praised Dositheos’ publishing activity. Dositheos also revealed his desire to publish all the works he could find of Gregory Palamas, Gregory Scholarios, Nilos Cabasilas of Thessaloniki (1298-1363), and Josphe Bryennios (1350-1436).

Reconciliation also contained two anonymous speeches against the Latins, and although incomplete (the final chapters of one and the beginning of the other were missing) Dositheos praised their eloquent denunciation of papal monarchy and the *filioque*. Dositheos also included the works of Nikolaos Kerameus of Ioannina (d. 1663) and George Koressios of Chios (1566-1660).

Just as Dositheos defended Loukaris against false accusations and forged documents, Dositheos briefly did the same for Koressios. Concerning him, Dositheos emphatically concluded, “Thusly, the sycophant Papists being against the saints, do not think it bad to lie also against the blessed [teachers]. Koressios, however, was not only inexorably opposed to the Papists but also to the Lutheran/Calvinist enemy. He was the absolute friend of truth and hated the lie absolutely.”³⁵⁵ Koressios received his western education at the University of Pisa in Italy, where he attempted to refute Galileo’s scientific theory on the mechanics of liquids and the Aristotelian renaissance occurring at

the University of Padua. He was also the official diplomatic ‘Theologian of the Great Church’ as the public debater or defender at Constantinople during the first half of the seventeenth century.

Dositheos shielded Koressios’ western education from suspicion by distinguishing outside (*exoteric*) wisdom from inside (*esoteric*) wisdom. Dositheos preemptively nullified any objections to Koressios’ western education by subsuming all ‘secular’ education under the idea of outside wisdom—valuable for earthly purposes but not for heavenly pursuits. Dositheos appealed to a ministerial use of outside philosophy in service to theology.³⁵⁶ In *History of the Jerusalem Patriarchate*, after introducing Manolaki, Dositheos devoted a paragraph to the Greek scholar, stating, “George Koressios of Chios was taught the encyclopedic education in outside wisdom in Italy, he was appointed a teacher in Venice and in Florence, where he was endangered by the Papists.”³⁵⁷ He wrote approvingly of Koressios as “... [a] Teacher of Philosophy and Theology in Chios.” He supported his many writings “...concerning outside education and concerning theology...,” but what mattered most was that “...[Koressios] was opposed by the Latins and he wrote many [things] against them.” While defending Koressios as an orthodox teacher, Dositheos was not going to cede the tradition of Greek education (*paideia*) over to the West.³⁵⁸

Although Koressios was charged with the same crimes as Loukaris, there was one major difference between the two figures whose ‘orthodoxies’ Dositheos protected. Koressios, together with Meletios Syrigos (1585-1664), publicly opposed the Korydalleus school of thought originating from Theophilus Korydalleus (1570-1646), who was appointed by Loukaris as the first director of the newly ‘reformed’ Patriarchal

Academy of Constantinople in 1622. Korydalleus was also the teacher of John Karyophylles (1600-1692)—Dositheos' opponent in the debate over transubstantiation. Concomitant with Dositheos' identification of Koressios as orthodox was his opposition to this internal 'school of thought' espoused by Korydalleus. And, Koressios defended the orthodoxy of transubstantiation.³⁵⁹

Kordyalleus became famous for contributing to a renaissance in neo-Aristotelian studies at the University of Padua, and later his 'scientific' acclaim continued at the Danubian Academies of Bucharest (1690) and Jassy (1707). Nonetheless, Kordyalleus rejected the notion of Christian Aristotelianism and the Latin Scholastic 'school of thought' usually associated with Aquinas and Peter Lombard (1100-1160). Kordyalleus was a fervent opponent of Latin theology. Historian Marcus Plested succinctly summarizes Kordyalleus thought, writing, "The Roman Church's deviation from the truth is squarely associated with the scholasticism of Aquinas, Scotus, Bellarmine, and Lombard, with their 'modern innovations' and 'excessive curiosity'. Scholastic approaches to the Eucharist serve as glaring examples of such unwonted prying. Korydalleus, for his part, is content to insist on the mysterious nature of the sacrament."³⁶⁰ It was not so much Korydalleus' anti-scholasticism, however, that threatened Dositheos; more pernicious was Korydalleus' apophaticism that denied the hesychastic miracle—the taste of divine light.

The text from Koressios that Dositheos selected for *Reconciliation* was entitled, *Manual on the Procession of the Holy Spirit*. The majority of the twenty-four chapters are devoted to a rejection of the *filioque* and a defense of the original, unaltered *Creed* (381). The final two chapters on *Concerning the light of Thabor*, however, defended the

essence-energy distinction and the vision of uncreated light, as was seen by Jesus' disciples at his transfiguration on Mt. Thabor and later experienced again by the hesychast monks on Mt. Athos. Koressios' interest in and esteem for hesychasm and the Palamite 'school of thought' was somewhat of a rarity among Greek scholars by the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The specific essence-energy distinction in hesychasm was lacking—if not completely absent—among Greek authors like Maximos Margounios (1549-1602), Gabriel Severos (1540-1616), Meletios Pegas (1549-1601), Peter Mogila (1596-1646), and finally of course neither Loukaris nor Korydalleus displayed any interest. Even on Mt. Athos with the monastic scholar Nicholas Koursoulas (1602-1652) it was missing. Yet, while the Palamite distinction was no longer a matter of debate, missionaries from Mt. Athos had already successfully incorporated monastic hesychasm into the literary, religious, and political life of Bulgaria, Serbia, the Danubian Principalities, and farther north into Ruthenia. The sweeping results and established networks of communications from this spiritual migration has been called by historians—the hesychast International.

In the dialogue between the bishop and minister from Francis Richard's Targa, the issue of the light of the transfiguration or the taste of divine light followed a discussion of illumination (i.e., beautification according the West) and preceded its attack on Palamas' orthodoxy. The *Targa* refrained from a direct defense of Barlaam's orthodoxy—instead, the author employed the schema. It began with the minister's question on the anathemas recited on the Sunday of Orthodoxy (originally commemorating the triumph of the iconodules over the iconoclasts in the ninth century):

Why on the Sunday of Orthodoxy in their Triodion [a collection of liturgical texts] do the Greeks anathematize those who think and say that the light of transfiguration of our Lord Jesus Christ [on Mount Tabor] was created or the essence of God. [And] according to the opinion of Palamas they say that that light was uncreated...³⁶¹

The bishop answered her question with an appeal to authority, asking rhetorically, “What greater judgment do you want than [that] the Greeks anathematized all the fathers and all the teachers and enlightened [ones] of the *ecumene*?”³⁶² The bishop continued with nine reasons interspersed with testimonies from revered Greek Fathers such as John Damascus (676-749), Gregory Nazianzus (329-390), and John Chrysostom (347-407).

In summary, the bishop argued that Palamas’ concept of uncreated light betrayed the simplicity of the schema—namely, that only the essence (*ousia*) of God was uncreated and anything outside of the Triune persons was created.³⁶³ He quoted John Chrysostom from one of his two exhortations to Theodore the Lapsed (*Ad Theodorum Lapsam*) that discussed the incomparable glory of Christ’s return in the last days and the future benefit of temporal martyrdom. Chrysostom described Peter’s vision of the transfiguration as looking dimly at an icon of what the future paradise would bring. The bishop asserted that Palamas inverted this order because “...he wanted to see this kingdom, neither in an enigma nor in a looking-glass, but face to face—thus, not by faith but by sight.”³⁶⁴ He turned to the minister and sternly asked, “Now who do you believe, Palamas or Chrysostom?” He reiterated Palamas’ inversion and said again, “I ask you who from the two speaks the truth, Palamas or Chrysostom?” The minister replied rhetorically asking herself, “What is truer than the ecumenical teacher Chrysostom?”

Nonetheless, the minister further inquired, “Why if they [the three Apostles] saw it, without [entirely] grasping what the thing was—created or uncreated—and if they knew it, how is it possible that not one of them wrote about it?”³⁶⁵

The bishop chose the example of the Apostle John, who was both a witness of the transfiguration and wrote the fourth Gospel. He first posed the theoretical problem asking how it was possible that Palamas, writing many centuries later, knew better than John “the teacher of both men and angels.” He then summarized the beginning of John’s Gospel which stated that all things which came into being or were created happened through the Son “...and without him nothing came into being.” He curtly asked the minister, “Therefore who spoke the lie, Palamas or the theologian John?” The bishop answered his own question for her, stating, “...For I would say it much better that Palamas said the lie not John because we know that the testimony of John is true.” She agreed and repeated the axiom that all things on earth came through the Son but added, “...not those things in heaven.”³⁶⁶

The bishop resorted to the testimony of the Apostle Paul, who wrote in the epistle of Colossians that “...all things in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible” were created through the Son. He put the question to his figurative opponents asking, “I ask them: the light of transfiguration was it visible or invisible? Where was it begotten? Where did the Apostles see it—in heaven above or on the earth below? For if they would say [the latter], then they must confess that it was made and not uncreated.” The minister’s response was nothing less than aporetic: “Clearly, the divine scriptures speak and I do not know how they do not see the light of truth. I am amazed by it; indeed, I wonder even more...”³⁶⁷

The bishop concluded by further explaining how Palamas feared contradicting the simplicity of the schema. Thus, Palamas cleverly, the bishop admitted, distinguished the uncreated light from the essence of God and named it ‘the energy’ of God’s essence (*ousia*). The bishop exclaimed, “But the unrighteous [i.e., Palamites] do not confess it [i.e., the energy] to be the essence because in reality they want it [i.e., the energy] to be distinguished from the divine essence. Thus, [the energy and essence] are standing together.”³⁶⁸ He continued, “But nothing stands together with nor is it possible to stand in God...because if even one thing is found standing with God, then God would not be simple but a composite.”³⁶⁹ The bishop gave his final reason and what he considered a “powerful syllogism” by comparing the unique qualities of God’s essence (i.e., unbegotten, eternal, and infinite) to Palamas’ uncreated energy. He explained, “The uncreated is being, and it is eternal for it precedes time which is created. The light of transfiguration was not eternal; it had a single beginning and end.”³⁷⁰ He then compared the light of transfiguration to the Bethlehem star, which also shone brightly for a specific time and led the wise shepherds to the place of the Christ’s birth.

The minister was convinced and compared the bishop to the prophet Jeremiah, saying:

[As] God once said to the prophet Jeremiah, ‘If you lead forth the honorable from the dishonorable, you shall be like my mouth.’ I believe also God wants to have you yourself like his mouth because you know and distinguish in so many forms the lie from the truth, the honorable from the dishonorable, and the orthodox article from heresy.³⁷¹

She continued by repeating the arguments made by the bishop and interspersed with her own disbelief and amazement that the opponents (i.e., Palamites) did not see the light of truth. She concluded that they did not believe in the Trinity but in a Tetragon.

The bishop praised the minister's comprehension of the issues at stake and reiterated his conclusion, stating, "One and three makes four: that uncreated light and the three persons is four. For as many that believe with Palamas they do not believe in the holy Trinity; rather, they believe in four... All the faithful worship the monad of essence but three hypostases."³⁷² He posed a hypothetical stating that "If Palamas is holy, then he alone is in paradise." He gave a list of revered Greek Fathers, beginning most importantly and strategically with Dionysius the Areopagite and ending with Augustine, and said that all of them must be false teachers if Palamas was a saint. He finished with the schema: "With all of them there is one faith and only one God, and whoever does not have this one faith and perfectly is neither holy nor has salvation."³⁷³ They continued with a discussion on "Difficulties concerning the light of the holy Sepulcher," the bishop's defense (*apologia*) to that question, and his answer on which calendar was false and the other true—the New or the Old one.

In his preface to *Reconciliation*, following Dositheos' introduction to the publication of the Mogila's *Confession* (1642), Dositheos turned to those who through "...fasting, sleepless nights, mercies, the lifting up of prayers, so as to say, [do] all [kinds] of counter-worldly asceticism..." on holy Mt. Athos. Dositheos pointed to the example of the Athonite monks who forsook the comfort and peace offered by 'secular' living for the spiritual violence against one's own body. Dositheos continued:

Hence by the seat [of the *nous*] return those hating peace, as the ancient Gregory the Great Theologian said: not to be an additional labor to the world, but labor on the famous mountain of Athos—mimicking Moses, Elijah, and our Holy Fathers—until they quickly arrive into a perfect man, in the true measure of Christ’s fullness, mortifying the body, crucified to the world, thusly a martyr separate [from the world], to come to the truth.³⁷⁴

Dositheos included two important texts in this collection that were published for the first time: after the works of Koressios Dositheos placed the work of the Athonite monk Markarios Makres (1391-1430) who participated in the fifteenth century Council of Florence (1431-1449), four years before the fall of Constantinople. Makres rejected the proposed union with the West and wrote a minor work against the *filioque*, whose full title was *To say that the holy Spirit proceeds from the Son is neither necessary but an innovation of the orthodox faith*. In *Agape* the issue of the Holy Spirit’s manner of ‘procession’ is found again in the text Dositheos included written by the patriarch of Constantinople from 1283-1289, Gregory of Cyprus (d.1290). The simple title of the work *Concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit*, from Gregory’s book on *Faith*, betrays its significance for hesychasm. Its creedal significance did not escape Dositheos, however.

Dositheos informed his readers how he had come across Gregory’s *Faith*, writing, “...we found [it] in Constantinople in some very old book, copied it, and printed it.” The seemingly ‘modern’ neglect that Dositheos implied about Gregory’s book lies in stark contrast to the fourteenth century and Gregory Palamas’ esteem and praise for Gregory of Cyprus. John Meyendorff, who helped revive modern-day hesychasm through his studies

and translations of Palamas' work, recognized Gregory of Cyprus as the major forerunner of a hesychast revival in the late thirteenth century. Besides Palamas' own testament to being a disciple of Gregory of Cyprus, Meyendorff assigned Gregory's historical importance to a creedal formula Gregory introduced while presiding over the Synod of Blachernae (1285) in Constantinople.

In addition to denouncing the union that was previously decreed in 1274 at the council of Lyon, France—under Pope Gregory X and Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos—the Synod of Blachernae (1285) accepted Gregory's *Faith* as their official proclamation of faith. Gregory's synodical decree condemned the unionist compromise on the *filioque*, which replaced the preposition 'from' (*ek*) with 'proceeds' (*ek-poreusis*), and affirmed Gregory's new formula the 'eternal manifestation' of the Spirit. By appealing to this formula 'eternal manifestation' (*ek-phansis aidios*) Gregory admitted the Son's role in the 'sending' or 'manifestation' of the Spirit—Photius had also used the formula the 'eternal procession' in the ninth century. Gregory qualified the term 'manifestation' with the adjective 'eternal' to intend—just as Photius had intended—that the 'manifestation' was not related in any manner to time and creation. Gregory's new creedal formula the 'eternal manifestation' protected the Father as the chief principle of being or cause of the Spirit, and the formula denied the term 'from,' which Gregory rejected for implying a second temporal cause of the Spirit by the Son. On the positive end or the demonstrative side, however, Gregory's choice of the term 'manifestation' affirmed and articulated the temporal reality or experience of the eternal spirit of God—the divine light later confessed and defended in the next century by Palamas. Gregory's

new creedal formula pointed to a union between time and eternity, creation and spirit, earth and the heavens, and a cataphatic resolve to the dialect.

In Gregory's *Faith* article three addressed the term 'manifestation' in relation to its causal "...existence from the Father." Article four, however, substitutes the term 'Spirit' with the common synonym 'the Paraclete,' which was nothing unusual since the term derived from the New Testament.³⁷⁵ Yet, the accompanying formula with 'the Paraclete' Meyendorff singled out as making the hesychast distinction and "the Palamite thesis."³⁷⁶ Gregory of Cyprus began the fourth article with an analogy and ended in the apophatic: "...the very Paraclete shines and manifests Itself eternally by the intermediary of the Son, as light shines from the sun by the intermediary of rays...; but that does not mean that It comes into being through the Son or from the Son."³⁷⁷ Just as Gregory made 'shines forth' analogous with 'manifestation,' Meyendorff makes the correct analogy that Gregory's formula the 'eternal manifestation' was equivalent to Palamas' formula the 'eternal illumination.' Likewise, if we substitute Palamas' the 'uncreated energy' with Gregory's the 'uncreated Paraclete,' we can see that both confessors were concerned with a temporal experience and participation in the divine. And, both confessors asserted that formula was demonstrably true.

Although Dositheos devoted little space to Gregory of Cyprus in his *History of the Jerusalem Patriarchate*, Dositheos did reproduce in the preface of *Agape* the ecclesiastical narrative from Gennadius Scholarios on the events between the unionist Council of Lyons (1274) and the Synod of Blachernae (1285). Scholarios labeled the latter synod an Ecumenical Council. In *Agape*, after the pro-hesychast works of

Philotheos Kokkinos the Patriarch of Constantinople (1364-1376), Dositheos included five works from Scholarios dealing mostly with a refutation of the *filioque*.

The second in line to Gregory of Cyprus was the hesychast teacher Theoleptus of Philadelphia (1250-1326), whom Palamas ranked among the spiritual masters “...who bore witness shortly before our time, and who are recognized to have possessed the power of the Holy Spirit [and] have passed on to us these things by word of mouth.”³⁷⁸

Meyendorff highlighted three significant influences of Theoleptus on Palamas’ ‘theological system.’ First, Palamas was *initiated* by Theoleptus into the hesychast practice of prayer. Second, Meyendorff emphasized that in the case of Theoleptus this method of prayer was not focused on bodily practices (i.e., controlled breathing and gazing at the chest or ‘navel gazing’); rather, it centered on inward ‘spiritual’ prayer. Meyendorff explained that Theoleptus’ ‘spiritual’ prayer developed its inspiration from Symeon the New Theologian, who synthesized two contrasting schools of monasticism: the traditional hermetic practice associated with isolated desert mountains and the cenobite practice more often found in cities or smaller communal monastic villages. Theoleptus’ hesychasm was missional and proclaimed for all citizens to practice mentally, spiritually.

Third, this mental practice or spiritual prayer that Palamas inherited from Theoleptus was called *nepsis*. The idea of *nepsis* is almost synonymous with *nous* (mind) but carries a stronger emphasis on self-awareness, self-observation, and self-reflection. Meyendorff defined *nepsis* as “spiritual vigilance,” but he truly captures the essence of this new fusion of cenobite-hesychasm in a quote from Theoleptus’ advice to Princess Irene Choumnos. Theoleptus answered, “Quietly in thy house entertain the memory of

God: remove your spirit from everything... clinging to him by love. For the memory of God is a contemplation of God, which draws the vision and the desire of the intelligence [*nous*] to him, and illuminates it with his own light.”³⁷⁹ From memory to self-*kenosis* (humility) to illumination—this also was Dositheos’ esoteric hesychasm. Dositheos shared another emphasis with Theoleptus and his ‘second generation’ hesychasm.

Dositheos’ exoteric hesychasm, it could be argued, also refracted the evangelical mission of ‘second generation’ hesychasm. Meyendorff noted not only a missional emphasis in Theoleptus’ hesychasm, but also a unique sacramental one. When Dositheos’ revival of the hesychast international is considered alongside his synthesis of Athonite missions (i.e., Paroria and Kilifarevo) and creedal hesychasm (i.e., Blachernae [1285] and Constantinopolitan [1341, 1347, and 1351]) and Theoleptus’ sacramental focus, there was an intransigent element common to both of them. Meyendorff reproduced the salient quote from Theoleptus: “By holy baptism and by his precious blood...he has recreated thee...He has formed local churches, each a paradise, and assembled us therein; but he has established the Church, one in faith and doctrine... The trees of this paradise are the orthodox pastors... who have been sent to churches appointed and charged with the duty of instructing and governing Christians...”³⁸⁰ What Theoleptus equated with ‘the trees,’ Dositheos qualified with ‘Balsam trees,’ and Richard described as ‘the organ’ in his *Targa*—that is, namely, “...the minister who exoterically administers the mystery” and speaks the formula.

In his book *The Byzantine Commonwealth* Obolensky provided an overview of the hesychast international prior to 1453. He began with the Byzantine monastic tradition and locates its three historical elements in “...the writings of the early Egyptian and

Palestinian monks, the eremitical practices of Mount Athos, and the Constantinopolitan Studite Rule...³⁸¹ Sava's (c.1236) contributions in Serbia are well-known, especially for his success in gaining a greater measure of autonomy for the Serbian Church by requesting that it only be directly responsible to and under the sole jurisdiction of Constantinople. Obolensky emphasizes the point that Sava's reforms at the Serbian monastery of Chilandar were introduced from the *typican* (instructions) of Mt. Athos, first, and from Jerusalem, Palestine, second. Sava had laid the foundation for a cosmopolitan monastic reform. In addition, Sava's monastic reforms worked in such close symphony with Serbia's governing rulers that the political hesychasm' of the fourteenth century—with its many civil wars and imperial councils—pales in comparison.

Another famous Athonite missionary, originally from Smyrna, the monk Gregory of Sinai (1265-1346) established a monastery within the mountains of Paroria, Bulgaria, around 1330. Obolensky noted that Gregory's fame drew to himself Slavic and Greek disciples from most areas within the Byzantine Commonwealth even before he arrived there. Yet, what particularly ensured the lasting effects from Gregory's arrival to Bulgaria was its cosmopolitan make-up of highly educated men who, Obolensky emphasized, took their master's teachings back with them and spread his fame throughout the royal courts of the Commonwealth. About twenty years later, a disciple of Gregory named Theodosius of Trnovo (d. 1363) established another hesychast monastery farther north in Kilifarevo, Bulgaria. These two hesychast missionary outpost—Paroria and Kilifarevo—popularized the acclaim for Mt. Athos. In the later fourteenth century two hesychast

‘missionary’ monks from Kilifarevo pollinated the hesychast message in the Danubian Principalities.³⁸²

Nicodemus of Tismana (d. 1406) and Euthymius, the eventual patriarch of Trnovo from 1375-1393), were disciples of Theodosius of Trnovo. Obolensky describes Nicodemus as “...a living image of that cosmopolitan culture which, centered in Byzantium and cemented by Hesychasm, linked together the monasteries of Eastern Europe in the late Middle Ages.”³⁸³ Nicodemus was half Greek and half Serbian, but he also traveled extensively. In Wallachia Nicodemus established the monasteries of Vodita (1374) and Tismana (1385), and his disciples helped bring monastic hesychasm into Moldavia. Theodosius’ leading pupil and closet disciple, however, gained international fame for his linguistic reforms of the (Church) Slavonic language and sacred texts. Euthymius is described by Obolensky as “...the outstanding representative, in its third generation, of the Slavonic Hesychast School founded by St. Gregory of Sinai.”³⁸⁴

There is a pious image of the hesychast Euthymius as the peripatetic monk and manuscript copyist and author; a disciple of his had also popularized and aggrandized Euthymius’ softer virtues by recording in dramatic fashion his spiritual master’s lamenting and crying out on the path of exile from the fall of Bulgaria to the Ottomans in 1393. While Euthymius was still the patriarch of Bulgaria, however, his ambitious literary reforms were comparable to the evangelical mission and literary reforms of Cyril and Methodius to the Slavs during the ninth century. At a purely elementary level Euthymius’ linguistic reform was scriptural: he attempted to change the ‘modern’ language of Church Slavonic back to the Old Church Slavonic, as Obolensky stated, by “...return[ing] to the grammar, orthography and punctuation of the original translations

of Cyril and Methodius.”³⁸⁵ At a more metaphysical level, however, Obolensky’s deeper point asserted that Euthymius’ linguistic reforms demonstrated the intimate identification of the Slavic people in relationship to the word. This conservative reformation of sacred language and liturgical texts was part of a collective idealization of the Slavic past that projected a ‘golden age’ of uniformity, which the textual variations and mistranslations of their era reflected poorly.

Obolensky diagnoses this nostalgic collective turn to the past as a “symptomatic” response to the Ottoman political threat. Euthymius’ message of reform resonated with a scriptural people who easily translated the discovered textual errors with, what Obolensky accurately identified were, “spiritual disunity and moral decline [and] doctrinal error.”³⁸⁶ As a community they believed this internal ‘spiritual’ malnutrition was to blame not only for the Ottoman victories but also the emergence of heretical sects like the Bogomils. In contrast, spiritual unity would be mirrored by literary standardization.

The turn forward Euthymius offered them—the announced message of ‘good tidings’--was also a pious return back to the original sources. At an elementary level Obolensky described Euthymius’ textual project as “...remodel[ing] the morphology and syntax of the Church Slavonic as closely as possible on Greek.”³⁸⁷ This meant the the printing of Greek manuscripts and Byzantine liturgical texts. Obolensky specified the publications of three significant figures: Symeon the New Theologian, Gregory of Sinai and Gregory Palamas. The publication of these hesychast luminaries, accompanied with Euthymius’ commentaries, was patterned after the hagiographical tradition of writing and remembrance. But, in the promotion of the idea—the form and substance—of the

hesychast international Euthymius' message exemplified a schematic Greek model of persuasion. Obolensky's explanation of this literary phenomenon deserves a full reproduction:

...the new style of hagiographical and panegyric writing, which was to enjoy great vogue in Eastern Europe during the next hundred years: a style ornate, rhetorical and emotional, with a tendency to interweave the narrative with theological reflections and to reduce the concrete and factual material to a minimum, [had] the aim of raising the subject-matter above the level of historical contingency to a timeless and universal plane.³⁸⁸

This historical moment of translation, Obolensky concludes, moved the Balkan Slavic people from "the Cyrillo-Methodian ideas of ethnic self-determination" to the Byzantine theater.³⁸⁹

* * *

In chapter seven of his *History of the Jerusalem Patriarchate*, Dositheos rhetorically asked, "Why should one marvel if we say that many of the saints see uncreated light?" He emphasized that Barlaam was very learned in outside wisdom, and this was unfortunately Barlaam's 'foreign' mindset when he sought to investigate the monastic life of the Eastern Church. In the fourteenth century Barlaam encountered an elder monk in Thessaloniki—described as being unlearned or uncivilized—who reported to Barlaam that the monks saw a heavenly light while praying. Barlaam did not believe that the monks experienced a vision of miraculous light and proceeded in writing to

publicly denounce and accuse them of heresy and the hieromonk Gregory Palamas who was asked to represent the monks. It was not the vision of light *per se* that Barlaam objected to—the West also had a tradition of beautification—but its description as ‘uncreated.’ Dositheos explained the phenomenon of the vision of light stating that “...many who were recognized as martyrs for Christ and indeed the divine Anthony [251-356] saw this light...” Dositheos continued with a familiar defense that appealed to the example given in the Gospels of the transfiguration of Jesus on Mt. Tabor and the divine light seen by his disciples Peter, James and John.³⁹⁰ He concluded, “Barlaam hearing that the light of Tabor was uncreated blasphemed in many ways and wrote to Palamas against these things.”

Given that Dositheos’ *Agape* was primarily devoted to a defense of Gregory Palamas’ orthodoxy, it seems paradoxical that Dositheos’ *History of the Jerusalem Patriarchate* limited the famous fourteenth century debate that made Palamas ‘the Champion of Orthodoxy’ to a single chapter in book nine consisting of five pages.³⁹¹ The results of that debate—the declaration of orthodoxy and the casting of anathemas—were collected in three synodical volumes and placed by Dositheos in the prologue to *Agape*. After the prologue follows fourteen orations (*logoi*) by Philotheos in defense of Palamas and the synodical decrees of 1341, 1347, and 1351 in his favor and denouncing his accusers. Afterward Dositheos placed the aforementioned two large treatises by Scholarios “in the form of a confession” on the *filioque*. The final quarter briefly addressed a number of topics and collections gathered by Dositheos. Dositheos mentioned in his introduction to *Agape* that he had sent Palamas’ writings to another print shop for publication.

Dositheos prefaced the collection of synodical volumes with a brief description of the event which led up to ‘the Great Debate’ between Palamas and Barlaam. In many provinces and villages of Byzantium, such as Andrianople, the threat of revolt was palpable; historian Donald Nicol went so far as to call it “the spirit of revolution.”³⁹² There was social and political unrest—especially between the capital city of Constantinople and its sibling the city of Thessaloniki.

After decades of fending off foreign invaders and repeated civil wars, the aristocratic classes had almost monopolized Byzantium’s wealth and the citizens of Thessaloniki had come to resent the centralizing force of its capital city. Thessalonians felt much the same way as German citizens would in the sixteenth century, when they expressed their anger towards Rome for treating Germans like a proverbial ‘cash-cow.’ Steven Runciman devoted a single paragraph to the revolution which eventually broke out in 1341 after Emperor Andronicus III’s death (reigned from 1328-1341). Runciman provides a concise summary based on the description given by John Cantacuzenos (1292-1383), a distant relative of the Palaiologos dynasty, who responded to the revolt with similar sentiments felt by Martin Luther against the peasant rebellions. Runciman stated:

...in the strange movement of the Political Zealots of Thessalonica, a group of poorer citizens who seized power there in 1342 and held it for seven years, at first in nominal loyalty to the legitimate Emperor, John V, but later in defiance of all Imperial authority. The Zealots despoiled the local nobility and the rich merchants of the city, slaughtering many of them, and confiscated the property of the monasteries; and they regarded Cantacuzenos as their chief enemy and would not allow Palamas to enter the city when he was appointed its Archbishop. Yet they

showed favours to the poorer clergy and monks, who elsewhere were the political supporters of Cantacuzenus and the religious supporters of Palamas. When at last they fell, it was not any government official but Palamas who, by his benevolence and charity and his refusal to countenance reprisals, restored concord to the city.³⁹³

Political strife engulfed Byzantium in a civil war from 1341-1347 after Emperor Andronicus III passed away in 1341, and John Cantacuzenos shared the position of regency with the widowed Empress Anna of Savoy Italy (1306-1365) on behalf of the Emperor's son John V Palaiologos who was only eight at the time of his father's death. Cantacuzenos had supported his close friend Palamas during the first synod against Barlaam, while the patriarch of Constantinople John Kalekas (1334-1347) sided with Barlaam's party. While Cantacuzenos was away from the capital in the Peloponnesian province of Morea, which was also brimming with the spirit of revolution, Patriarch Kalekas colluded with the Empress and the commander of Byzantium's military, the grand duke Alexios Apokavkos (d. 1345), to have her son crowned the new Emperor under her sole care. Cantacuzenos looked to the King of Serbia Stefan Dusan for military assistance against the Empress; at first, they joined forces, but later on King Dusan's desire for a new Slavo-Greek Byzantine Empire, as Nicol stated, "...meant that there were now three Emperors in a world where God had ordained that there was room only for one."³⁹⁴

Before Emperor Andronicus III passed away he had sought to restore diplomatic relations with Rome in the hope, once again, that a union between the two churches would lead to military assistance. Barlaam was called to Constantinople in 1330 by John

Cantacuzenos in order to be the head professor on Pseudo-Dionysius studies, and subsequently the Emperor recruited the famous teacher to represent the Eastern Church in negotiations with the West. As par for the course, the diplomatic proceedings centered on the issue of the *filioque*. The Latins defended the addition while Barlaam rejected it and wrote up his well respected and appraised *Anti-Latin Treaties* in 1335, which the Greek Church continued to defer to even after the synods excommunicated him. In his treatises Barlaam attacked the syllogistic methods employed by the Latin's in their defense of the *filioque*; he did so on the basis that all premises involved with theological syllogisms were revealed by the universal Church and not a product of inductive reasoning. Paradoxically, however, as diplomatic negotiations continued, Barlaam encouraged the East to accept union with Rome regardless of the obstacle presented by the *filioque* since the premises were revealed and there was no hope for a solution by dialectic debate.

Barlaam had appealed to the apophatic method on the exhausted issue of the *filioque*. As a universally recognized expert on Pseudo-Dionysius, Barlaam was well equipped to point out the limitations of human reason, the necessity for epistemological humility, and the necessity for knowledge revealed and taught. On the basis of apophaticism Barlaam concluded that since it is impossible to speak of and know God's essence, this principle also applied to the question of the Holy Spirit's procession from (*ek*) or through (*dia*) the Son. Barlaam was quite familiar with the differences between Platonic and Aristotelian epistemology and rejected the supposed 'Thomistic-Aristotelian' of the Latins which asserted that reason—in harmony with divine revelation—could demonstrate the truth of a proposition (i.e., the procession of the Holy Spirit) without any logical contradictions. Barlaam argued that, when reason contradicted

revelation, humility required reason to accept logical contradictions and paradoxical syllogisms.

Some truths, Barlaam asserted, could not be demonstrated—only believed. He wanted the issue of the *filioque* to be circumscribed to the category of theological opinion or *theologoumenon* for purposes of union with the Latins and asserted that "... [the] solution to the theological quest is *fideism*."³⁹⁵ According to Barlaam, whether one side accepted it or not, the *filioque* was a matter of faith or subjective believe since the manner of the procession of the Holy Spirit could not be reasonably demonstrated. The Latin could not be proven wrong about their addition to the *Creed* (381). The *filioque*, he exhorted, should not preclude union.

Palamas, who being from the aristocratic class had an exceptional education in Aristotelian and Platonic philosophy, was at Mount Athos during the negotiations over union with the West and felt compelled to write his own response to Barlaam's apophatic refutation of the Latins. His *Apodictic Treaties* or *Demonstrative Treaties* agreed with Barlaam in that there were indeed epistemological limitations, but argued that certain divine truth could in fact be cataphatically demonstrated.

In contrast to Barlaam's assertion that the *filioque* was a matter of *theologoumenon*, Palamas stated, "We do not take as our starting point for theology premises which rest on opinion, but we are firm in our belief about them, since they were divinely taught."³⁹⁶ Palamas stood on the immovable ground, as a confessor does, that belief and divine teachings were certain and not negotiable. While both debaters accepted

the priority of revealed knowledge, Palamas drew a line in the sand: the *filioque* can be proven demonstrably false, against the schema, and therefore, not *theologoumenon*.

For example, Palamas pointed to the Trinitarian schema: “But that there is a God, and that He is One personal being and not [an impersonal] One, that He does not transgress the Trinity, and many other things which can be theorized of Him—all this can be searched for and demonstrated (*apodeixai*)...” Palamas gave examples of premises and axioms that originated from ‘divinely taught premises’ (*archai Theo-didakttoi*) of the Trinity that did not contradict the schema. The chief divine principle on the question of the *filioque* Palamas schematized as, “The mode of engendering; procession; the complete and at the same time un-emanating procession; both the indivisible and complete division, and all the other things which are granted in a ‘scientific [or epistemological] manner’ by faith.”³⁹⁷ Here, there was no possibility for demonstration. His apodictic syllogism from this was:

The transcendent Holy Spirit originates by its nature from God; what originates by its nature from God has its source in God; this is the same as having its existence from the deity as source; the Father is the only deity as source; therefore the Spirit must have its existence from the Father alone.³⁹⁸

Naturally, Palamas also appealed to the revelations drawn from the scriptures, the holy Fathers, and the Synods, while accusing Barlaam of relying on Hellenistic philosophy and not the teachings of the universal Church.

In summary, Palamas argued based on the schema and the revealed doctrine of the Trinity that the *filioque* was demonstratively wrong. Moreover, this same argument, he

asserted, could apply to many other minor or dependent doctrinal issues tethered to the chief principles that were derived from revelation. Palamas posed a couple rhetorical questions to Barlaam, asking, “Why then should we call this kind of syllogism dialectical and not apodictic [i.e., demonstrative]? Are we not to accept this as self-evident and undemonstrable [i.e., revealed] premises, and are we not entitled to call everything, which follows from these premises, and can be concluded of necessity from them—divine demonstration?”³⁹⁹

The current scholarship on the debates between Barlaam and Palamas often examines these two leading figures by investigating their philosophical persuasions and arguing that one or the other reflected either an Aristotelian or Platonic school of thought. As Hakan Gunnarsson noted, however, this approach can be misleading since it creates an artificial binary: “There are influences of Neoplatonism and Aristotelianism in both Barlaam and Palamas, as in virtually any Christian writers in the Greek patristic tradition...” Gunnarsson asserted that this also applied “...to the question of [their] theological identity.” At an even much broader level scholars have disagreed over which one best represented the Eastern tradition and the Western tradition. This assessment, however, relies heavily on authorial influences; for example, Michael Azkoul argues that Barlaam represented the lineage of Augustine, but John Meyendorff thought Palamas was “the greatest Augustinian.” Yet, just as Dositheos was ambivalent about the use of scholasticism, the same can be said about confining these protagonists to a specific Eastern or Western ‘orthodoxy’ anatomy. This ambivalence is evident when Romanides asserted that Barlaam represented an “Augustinian Franco-Latin Scholasticism,” and Yangazoglous identified Barlaam with “Thomistic scholasticism and the positivism of

Duns Scotus,” and Meyendorff said that Barlaam exemplified the Neo-Platonic ‘nominalism’ of William of Ockham.

If such a broad and diachronic analysis of the debate is acceptable to current scholarship—an analysis that locates the protagonists within sweeping traditions and perennial categories—then there seems to be no justification to exclude both Barlaam and Palamas from the confessional tradition. More specifically, this fourteenth century debate satisfies the paradigm of the *ars dialectic* in the arena of confessional debate and rival speeches (*logoi*) delineated by Richard Lim, where the contenders sought to persuade their audience by characterizing the absurdity of their opponent’s position through a dialectical interrogation—and most importantly by demonstrating the rationality (*logos*) of their own argument. Of course, this method of debate also pertained to philosophical contenders, but with confessional contenders two elements differentiated them from their secular ‘philosopher’ peers: a) the strategy of mystification; b) the demonstration of a miracle. According to this analysis based on the confessional tradition, the debate between Barlaam and Palamas may be assessed commensurate with the one between Luther and Zwingli—both debates had as their focal point a demonstration of the Eucharistic miracle. Instead of a demonstration of ‘the real presence of the Christ’ within the elements, however, Palamas sought to prove ‘the real experience’ or taste of divine light.

It should be noted that in Dositheos’ *History of the Jerusalem Patriarchate* the introduction of Barlaam and Palamas followed a brief paragraph criticizing the western festival of *Corpus Christi*, which was officially confirmed in 1262 by Pope Urban IV (1261-1264) but facilitated by the popularity of the prophetess Juliana of Liege (1192-

1258) and her revelations. Pope Urban IV (who had previously been the titular western patriarch of Jerusalem) had Thomas Aquinas compose a liturgy for the celebration of *Corpus Christi*. Both Juliana's prophetic revelations and the festival were fervently welcomed by a populace that was enraptured with the miraculous powers of the Eucharist. After the Lateran Council of 1215 publicly decreed the official use of the term transubstantiation for describing the miraculous change in the bread and wine, there arose a heightened sense of and collective enthusiasm for the Eucharist among the people. This led many to treat the physical elements of the Eucharist as a type of amulet and resulted in many popular acts of piety that were later considered abuses (similar to the reactionary response of iconoclasts to the iconodules of the eighth century). The festival of *Corpus Christi*, which celebrated the Eucharist with an extravagant procession through the streets, helped regulate this fervor of popular devotion towards the Eucharist, the miracles associated with its divinity, and the transfigured union between the earthly and heavenly realms.

Dositheos rejected the manner in which the festival was “led by certain female revelations” and its unilateral confirmation by Pope Urban IV. He also criticized the need for a special festival devoted to the Eucharist since “...all Liturgy is a festival of the body and blood of the Lord.”⁴⁰⁰ Most importantly, Dositheos asserted that “the Mysteries” were not for the uninitiated and unbaptized catechumens. He accused the Latins of allowing “Jews and unbelievers” to partake of the Eucharist, and asked rhetorically: “How much blame are they worthy [of receiving] for becoming the cause of such blasphemies towards the dogma of piety?” He continued by comparing the Latins to “... [t]he Jews, Nations, Heretics, and simple [people]—as many are uninitiated and

unbelievers—who say, ‘Behold, the Creator of all! Behold, our God is contained physically in a box and in the smallest [piece] of bread,’ and other blasphemies [because] of this festival...” In this latter accusation Dositheos was arguing that “the Mysteries do not appear for the uninitiated,”⁴⁰¹ but the festival of *Corpus Christi* implied that even unbelievers could claim they possessed God by stealing or keeping the bread for public display and deceitful boasting.

He concluded by addressing the reader directly with three points the latter should note. He stated that the Latins wanted to make their “innovations” a matter of Church Laws; that a synod in Venice compelled the Papacy “to confess” the legality of this festival (here, Dositheos did not miss the chance to reiterate that “synods were greater than Popes”); and finally, other innovations such as simony were introduced and confirmed in the West.⁴⁰²

While Dositheos’ ecclesiastical narrative continued with the controversial events concerning Barlaam and Palamas, in *Agape* Dositheos followed his abridged introduction of the Barlamite scandal with a defense of hesychasm and its elected spokesman Palamas on behalf the monks of Mt. Athos. Their response, entitled *Hagiorite Volume: On behalf of the holy hesychasts, for those who, because of their own lack of experience and disobedience to the saints, deny the mystical energy of the Spirit which—in greater ways than speech [logos] [can express]—are at work in those who live in accordance with the Spirit, manifested through works, but not demonstrated by words [logoi]*, elaborated on the necessity for initiation into ‘the Mysteries.’ In addition, it connected the issue of initiation with the mystery of piety.⁴⁰³ As aforementioned, Dositheos had sent Palamas’ works to another print shop for publication; nonetheless, the *Hagiorite* from Mt. Athos—

considered the Holy City or the Jerusalem of ecumenical monasticism—addressed the heart of the matter between Barlaam and Hesychasm, and suited Dositheos’ desire to collect the major and authoritative synodical decrees issued against Barlaam. After the *Hagiorite* Dositheos included the three other synodical volumes from 1341, 1347, and 1350 that decreed a judgment in the favor of Palamas and the Hesychasts.

The text of the *Hagiorite* began by equating divine teachings with ‘the Mysteries’ and the schema, and contrasting the unbelieving Jews of the Old Testament to the act of believing and confessing according to “the mystery of the Evangelical life”:

Teachings...were at one time the mysteries of the Mosaic Law...The good things promised to the saints in the world to come, however, are mysteries of the Evangelical life... Just as the Jew of ancient times would not have reverently listened to the prophets who said that God’s Word and Spirit were co-eternal and preexistent, but would have thought that he was hearing opinions and voices forbidden by piety and opposed to the voice confessed with piety, namely the Lord who said, ‘The Lord your God is one.’ Likewise, someone who had not listened reverently would feel today regarding the mysteries of the Spirit...⁴⁰⁴

The *Hagiorite* exemplified the pattern of explication—divine teachings, mysteries, and the unbelieving Jews. It was paradigmatic in a similar fashion to the axiom associated with the Trinitarian schema and reiterated by the text: “divinity in three persons, a single simple nature, non-composite, uncreated, invisible and incomprehensible.” Regarding the act of believing and the imperative to confess, the text used the familiar example of disbelieving Jews and the dialectic between ‘God and spirit’

in the Old Testament to compare the dialectic between ‘God and energy’ in the revelation of the New Testament. Thus, to reject the distinction between “the uncreated essence or nature of God and His uncreated energy” was to act as an unbelieving Jew when confronted with the divine teaching and schema that God’s essence and energy were one.

The text continued by addressing the issue of initiation into ‘the Mysteries.’ Just as Dositheos had stated that the uninitiated and unbaptized were not worthy of partaking in the Eucharist at the *Corpus Christi* festival, likewise the *Hagiorite* contended that those who were worthy to be called saints were also “...worthy of mystical revelations in the Spirit.” The text not only described the ecstatic experience of saints—to which the revelations of the Apostle Paul and author of the majority of New Testament epistles could be added—but also the students or disciples of these saints. For example, the text described the monastic life—its renunciation of worldly pleasures of the flesh—and their “...submission to those who have arrived at maturity in Christ.” By submission to their spiritual master, the text asserted, “... [monks] have entered into God by means of that mystical union with Him that transcends even the mind (*nous*) and have been *initiated* into what is beyond the mind (*nous*).” The laity were also included, although their initiation did not result in a confirmation by personal experience but by belief and their willingness to learn: “Some are initiated into these things by the experience itself...others through their reverence for such men, their trust in them, and devotion.”⁴⁰⁵

This explanation of the initiatory processes—experience, discipleship, trust, and learning—was reiterated but with a greater emphasis on the relationship between the disciplined student and the experienced teacher. After the text warned against falsely accusing the Hesychasts of heresy and *di-theism* (two-gods), and while calling its

accusers to repentance, the text asserted: “But, whoever believes in and is persuaded by and agrees with the saints...this person will not reject what the saints have clearly said merely because he is ignorant of it. Let him rather, as not knowing the manner of the mystery, not think it unworthy of himself to ask and learn from those who do know.”⁴⁰⁶

This was an invitation into the mystery of piety addressed to its audience, exhorting its listeners to “...put aside his own opinion, let him learn from those who are experienced or who have been taught by those with experience...” Martin Luther echoed such sentiments when he responded in his letter of instruction to the Swabian Peasants’ *Twelve Articles* (1525) by calling them to repentance (i.e., change their mind), to learn, and be enlightened by God.

It is within the context of initiation that explains the text’s emphasis on learning and the need for instruction. In the *Triads*, Palamas’ most extensive refutation against Barlaam and composed as a dialogue between a spiritual master and an inquiring student, he quoted Basil ‘the Great’ in order to categorize Barlaam as a worldly scholar and distinct from spiritual teachers: “For such men, sharpened to controversy by dialectic, do not accept the simplicity of the spiritual doctrine...aided by the persuasive arguments of sophistry.”⁴⁰⁷ Palamas added emphatically, “Such indeed are those who, without being spiritual themselves, consider themselves fit to decide and teach spiritual matters!” This was Palamas’ emphatic retort when Barlaam suggested that perhaps the hesychasts had a vision of angels and not divine light: “But you [Barlaam], who have not been initiated...you class the contemplators of God with Balaam’s ass, which also is said to have seen an angel!”⁴⁰⁸

Palamas, of course, engaged quite extensively with Barlaam's arguments; however, he foresaw the fundamental ground of disagreement between them, which Luther would echo in reply to Bucer: "...our spirit has nothing common with your spirit...we are not of the same spirit..."⁴⁰⁹ In Palamas' first public correspondence with Barlaam he quickly acknowledged the divide separating their line of argumentation and preventing any resolution. He broached the distinction between the uninitiated and experienced teachers with a particularly Greek construction of a rhetorical question, asking:

If mathematicians do not have to answer a person who is totally ignorant of geometry and another ignorant of harmony participating in a discourse dealing with statements about geometry or music, while he clearly does not adhere to the principles of geometry or music—although they both seek the principles themselves, we are much more entitled not to answer or discuss with anyone or reasoning syllogistically about the properties of God who is not employing the premises from theology?⁴¹⁰

In the above quotation from Palamas he argued that a mutual understanding was precluded because Barlaam was neither adhering to "the principles" nor employing the same "premises." They could make no head way in their debate.

Hakan Gunnarsson's in-depth study of the debate between Barlaam and Palamas rightly pinpointed that "[t]he nature of illumination is perhaps the most important issue in the dispute... as far the discussion about the alleged experiences of the hesychastic monks is concerned."⁴¹¹ Furthermore, his definition of 'illumination' overlays the same

concerns regarding the Eucharist and the debate between Luther and Zwingli, when he clarified, “I use the word ‘illumination’ . . . [to] describe the more or less transcendent encounter or interaction between the divine and man. It does not denote only the experience of light.” The same definition could apply to the issue of finite man’s encounter with the divine Eucharist and the debates over its ‘real’ presence and its manner of transubstantiation—the heart of the matter was a participatory (i.e., in thought, word, and deed) encounter with divinity.

A critical syllogism from Barlaam, which the *Targa* later echoed, stated: “Every perceptible illumination is deceptive [i.e., created]; the light on Tabor was perceptible; hence the light on Tabor was deceptive [i.e., created].”⁴¹² Palamas retorted: “How did the first of martyrs [i.e., Stephen] see these divine things, if not intellectually, nor perceptually . . . not by analogy? I shall say to you openly: spiritually . . .”⁴¹³ Palamas’ appeal to the ‘spiritual’ presence of divine light or a ‘spiritual’ encounter with the divine seems quite similar to Zwingli’s stance asserting a ‘spiritual’ presence of the divine within the Eucharist. However, it was Luther who sought apodictically to demonstrate the mystical realism of the divine presence—namely, that the Christ was ‘really’ present within the bread (body) and wine (blood). Likewise, Palamas also employed strategies of mystification, paradoxes, and aporetic questions to demonstrate the spiritual ‘reality’ of divine light. Take for example another quintessential thought from Palamas when he asked, “Why could it not be that this light was invisible, inaudible, incomprehensible, but *still* seen?”⁴¹⁴ The dialectic between the body (i.e., physical) and locating its spiritual properties or heavenly light was a perennial tension inherent within the act of believing and the idea of the schema which sought to reconcile it.

Concerning the light of Tabor the *Hagiorite* rejected the argument that the light was "...a phantasm, a sort of symbol...that had no real existence that did not transcend thought..." The text employed the apophatic and appealed to the saints, who "...in their hymns and writings, [they] address it as unspeakable, uncreated, eternal, timeless, unapproachable, immense, infinite, boundless, transcending the vision of men and of angels...the glory of God, of Christ, of the Spirit, ray of divinity, and other similar things."⁴¹⁵ In its rebuttal concerning the transfiguration of Jesus on Mt. Tabor the *Hagiorite* mirrored the debates on the Eucharist and the transubstantiation of its elements (i.e., the bread and wine into the body and blood):

...they hold that the flesh of Christ was glorified at the instant of His conception, and that they glory of His divinity became in consequence the glory as well of his body. But...this glory was not made manifest in His visible body. Thus, in His transfiguration, it was not that He took of something that He was not before, nor that He was changed [*metabollomenos*] into something else, but that He then appeared to His disciples as He truly was, opening their eyes and giving them to see who before were blind.⁴¹⁶

Yet, even the appeal to the 'spiritual' mind (*nous*), which both Dositheos and Symeon's fictional bishop described as the divine faculty within finite man, faced the same dialectical difficulty of locating its earthly presence:

Whoever affirms that they are Messalians [i.e., heretics] who say that the *nous* is located in the heart or the head, let this person know that he is inveighing against the saints. While the great Athanasius says that the reasoning faculty is in the

head, Macarius... holds that the activity of the mind [*nous*] is to be found in the heart. With these two practically all the saints concur. What the divine Gregory of Nyssa says, that the intellect is within the body in as much as it is joined to it. Since they were speaking about different aspects of the matter, they differ with him scarcely at all.⁴¹⁷

The *Hagiorite* then compared the location of the mind (*nous*)—to be more specific: the light of the mind (*nous*)—with the incarnation of the Christ, which it could also be successfully argued had parallels with the miraculous Eucharist:

Nor, indeed, does he who says that God is not confined to a place in that He is bodiless differ with him who also says the Word [*logos*] of God entered once into a spotless virgin womb in order that they be united, beyond speech, with our substance on account of His ineffable love for mankind.⁴¹⁸

Finally, concerning illumination the *Hagiorite* defended its existence or its spiritual reality with apophatic formulas, such as "... [it is] a supernatural and inexpressible illumination and divine activity which is seen invisibly by those made worthy of it and comprehended incomprehensibly..." The *Hagiorite*, however, emphasized the necessity for an 'enlightened' understanding of the heavenly reality, reiterating the imperative to "...put aside his own opinion, let him learn from those who are experienced or who have been taught by those with experience that the grace or divinity is not related to anything else whatsoever..."⁴¹⁹

What we saw in the sequels to Obolensky's *Byzantine Commonwealth* and Kitromilides' *Orthodox Commonwealth* was Dositheos' effort to inspire an Athonite

Commonwealth grounded in the creedal tradition. It began with Dositheos' response to the Jesuit *Targa* with the publications of collected works in *Agape* and *Reconciliation* that defended Koressio's orthodoxy and the hesychast experience of divine light. The chapter returned to Richard's *Targa* in the format of a dialogue where it rejected Greek claims of a miraculous light. Dositheos' publication of Gregory's *Faith*, alongside the Synodical decrees in favor of Palamas, reveals the precedent Gregory's formulation of the Holy Spirit's procession set for the later Palamite distinction between essence and energy, and Dositheos' keen confessional approach to hesychasm. The hesychast missions to the Balkans were followed by the historical context for Dositheos' creedal Athonite Commonwealth. The 'Great Debate' between Barlaam and Palamas was situated between the Zealots of Thessalonica and the Eucharist in order to emphasize the apoditic or demonstrative argument of Palamas against Barlaam's apophaticism. The chapter concluded with the *Hagriote* and the confessional importance it placed on initiation as a requirement for experiencing divine light.

Chapter VII

A Perennial Addition: the *Filioque*

As discussed in the previous chapter, Dositheos tied the Athonite Commonwealth to a creedal hesychasm. In this chapter Dositheos' understanding of a united Orthodox body is contrasted with his own 'creation of the West' through an examination of his historical narrative of the *filioque* and the arguments he set forth based on his sense of ecumenicity. The narrative is complicated by a discussion of Greek popes in Rome and Dositheos' defense of a purported eighth 'ecumenical' council in 1450 against union with the Latins. The chapter begins with Dositheos' publishing activities in Moldavia and Wallachia and concludes with Dositheos' complicated legacy and the *Philokalia*.

Patriarch Dositheos had arrived in Bucharest, Wallachia, after having made a round trip from Constantinople to Jerusalem. Dositheos knew well the prince of Wallachia then, Serban Cantacuzino (1678-1688), as did he also Prince Ducas II. By way of Dositheos' diplomatic contacts and close friendships with the Ottoman 'Great Interpreters' or Dragomans, Panayiotis Nikousios and his successor Alexander Mavrocordato, he offered the Danubian princes advice and information on the latest events. More importantly, as the patriarch of Jerusalem, Dositheos reassured them of their divine lineage among the former Byzantine Emperors. In return Prince Cantacuzino financially subsidized the Holy Places in Jerusalem, ensured his local monasteries and churches remained under obedience to the patriarchate of Constantinople, and also supported the rights of the Greek Orthodox to govern the Holy Places in opposition to the Catholic Franciscans and Armenians.

Dositheos remained in the Danubian Principalities for just under a year in 1680. In the spring he visited the capital city of Jassy, Moldavia, and then returned to Bucharest before his departure back to Constantinople. Besides advising Cantacuzino on international affairs, Dositheos kept in contact and sought the financial assistance of wealthy Greek communities in the diaspora (the Danubian Principalities and Transylvania) that had resulted from the immigration of Greek merchants and the development of Greek companies in most of the major cities since the fifteenth century. In particular Dositheos corresponded with the Greek community in Sibiu, Transylvania, but there were also Greek communities in Brasov, Cluj, and Alba Iulia. It was the Calvinist Prince Rakoczi I who had first given the Greek company in Sibiu official self-autonomy in 1636. In return for financially supporting the Holy Places of Jerusalem, Dositheos personally supervised and sent to the Greeks of Sibiu ministers from the Greek Brotherhood of Jerusalem, and equipped them with updated liturgical. In 1680, however, Dositheos had received a special request from them to support their fight against Calvinist propaganda and proselytism. The Romanian historian Ioan V. Dura noted their anticipation of his arrival, because they looked to Dositheos “as an authentic representative of Orthodoxy during his time.”⁴²⁰

While in Moldavia, Dositheos paid the famous monk and printer Metrophanes to make a Greek font for the establishment of the first dedicated Greek printing press in the diaspora. The former patriarch Cyril Loukaris had temporarily built a press in Constantinople’s Phanar Quarter in 1627, but the Ottomans prohibited the Greek Orthodox from publishing within the confines of Istanbul—the Danubian Principalities offered Dositheos the opportunity to contribute to the dissemination of Greek Orthodoxy

in the diaspora and the support of ecumenical Orthodoxy internationally. Dositheos' Greek press was completed around 1681, but printing began in 1682 from the monastery of Tsetatzouian, which the Moldavian Prince George Ducas had built and dedicated in 1670 in honor of the Holy Places of Jerusalem.⁴²¹

Dositheos would not print his own specifically anti-Calvinist work until 1690; instead, he printed a series of anti-Catholic works starting with the work of his predecessor to the patriarchate of Jerusalem, Nektarios' *Against the Papal Primacy* (1682). In the preface Dositheos explained, "...Those anti-*doxa* shall indeed burn, as clearly they have departed from the range of those in the East and went for the lower wisdom, through which the modern atheists of the west theologize. Now, to you personally...is casted most indeed—the battle of truth...we published [it] for God's glory and [its] usefulness for your faith."⁴²² Dositheos also dedicated the publication to Prince Ducas who helped finance the costs, writing commemoratively, "You indeed are as Elijah... [and] comparable to the rays of the sun for the preparation of a Greek press...for all orthodoxy being a certain light of the Gospel of Faith and of the Apostles and of the patriarchal Traditions of the Saints, [and] letters against all schismatics and heresies—a very useful weapon."⁴²³ Some other works included with Nektarios' polemical work were a short biography of him, a personal confession of faith by Metropolitan Nicomedios from 1464, a *Defense [Apologia] to the King* written by bishops and clergy to the Byzantine Emperor John Palaeologus against the Florentine Council (1445), and the personal confession of Joseph Archbishop of Constantinople. In addition were attached two smaller works against the Jesuits.⁴²⁴

One year later in 1691 Prince Doukas responded positively to Dositheos' request by letter for another publication from Jassy, although Dositheos himself was visiting the city of Adrianople at the time. Dositheos collected two fifteenth century works for the monk Metrophanes to supervise their publication: Symeon of Thessaloniki's *Against Heresies* and Mark of Ephesus' *Explanation on the Liturgical Office*. Dositheos' second preface, which was addressed to the readers, has been recognized for its eloquence and pithiness. In one important aspect Dositheos reflects the mystagogical theology of Symeon, and in another it reflects the heart of the matter within a confessor's rhetoric. Dositheos compared the use of 'the teaching' and 'the word [*logos*]' to hunting and fishing, while reminding his readers that Symeon's work was "... [a] synopsis of both Scripture and the Fathers." Dura provides a brief summary with an excerpt:

The teachings are according to the Patriarch [Dositheos] 'fish-hooks' because '...with words and testimonies of the Spirit man is taken from the bowels and raised unto the light of the knowledge of God [*Theo-gnosis*].' The teachings are called 'bowels' [by Dositheos] because '...not from [*ek*] outside wisdom and certain mythologies syllogized against the salvation of men, but esoterically [*en*] the teaching, containing the fullness of the holy Spirit, makes real the salvation of men...' ⁴²⁵

Dositheos had this publication translated into Slavonic by the Leichoudes brothers.

Political tensions and unrest among various regimes, the Ottomans, Polish, and Moldavian, prevented Dositheos from publishing again until 1685. This little known work was a liturgical service dedicated to the saints Serban and Vachu. The short

devotion was tersely entitled *In the Month of October: The Holy Martyrs Sergius and Bacchus*. Although it was published in Moldavia, the brief text also included a preface by Dositheos honoring Serban Canatacușino, the prince of Wallachia and reflecting back on his royal heritage. Dositheos wrote, "...as born of those ancient divinely respected kings, the greatest of the good having been chosen, and would want to be presented united with Solomon and his famous race [genos] following his majesty, radiance, having been decorated with and armed with many and other skills, of which the time shall appear from the edges of the earth..."⁴²⁶ Perhaps, it was because Transylvania already seemed by 1686 destined to be burden with the yoke of Habsburg occupation, whose military force—the Catholic Holy League—had defeated the Ottoman army and recaptured Buda, Hungary, that Dositheos delayed printing a specifically anti-Calvinist publication.

In 1690 under the new Wallachian Prince Constantine Brancoveanu (1688-1714), Dositheos published *A Manual against the schism of the Popes* by Maximos the Peloponnesian (1570-1630). In his personal letter to "orthodox readers," Dositheos denounced the publishing activities coming from Rome and their "...blasphemies against the Patriarchs and theologians of the eastern church... These Latins also say and write comparing us with other nations [ethi] and with the Jews."⁴²⁷

In Dositheos' preface to Maximos' work, he lamented the diminution and 'ignorance' of the Greek language among those in the diaspora, equating "...the loss of wisdom that would be almost forgotten and the Greek language with which it had always been to all the races [ta gene] a sign of great boasting." As Dura also noted on this preface, "[Dositheos] emphasizes the most necessary relationship of the Greek language

for the expression of Orthodox dogmas, writing that through it ‘...it is easy to write on each one whoever puts one’s hand to the writing about the mysterious and divine matters of our faith.’”⁴²⁸

Furthermore, Dositheos also explained his intention to translate the sources into demotic Greek “...for simple folks, those who want to proceed into the differences which the Eastern Church has with the West, we will help our race [*genos*] beginning first from the start, namely the monarchy of the Pope, and following each [article] through the difference which the orthodox have with those heterodox and modernist Latins.”⁴²⁹ The work of Maximos demonstrates just what Dositheos meant in three points: 1. Concerning the rule of the Pope; 2. Concerning the addition (*protheke*) or *filioque*; 3. Concerning the change (*metabolis*) indeed the transubstantiation (*metousioseos*) of the mysteries. This was Dositheos’ preferred method for dealing with Catholic arguments and especially Jesuits. Russell reminds us that although Dositheos might have felt prepared in 1671 to debate the Jesuits, by the latter part of the century Dositheos stuck to confessing, “As the Apostles taught, as the Fathers commented, as the Synods defined and confirmed, that is what we believe and we do not accept any other discussions on the faith.”⁴³⁰ In the public sphere Jesuits dominated the art of conversion.

Dositheos was concerned for upholding the importance of the Greek language among the Orthodox Commonwealth. For example, at the ordination of the new Transylvanian Metropolitan Athanasios in 1698, for which he traveled to Bucharest, Dositheos insisted that he sign twenty-two guidelines for ministering to the Orthodox Romanians. Besides conducting the Divine Liturgy in an ‘orthodox’ manner, Dositheos also ordered that the reading of the sacred scriptures should be done in Romanian or

Slavonic; in addition, the reading of the Holy Gospel, Dositheos asserted, should be in Romanian or Slavonic. For the other parts of the Liturgy Dositheos wanted Athanasios to use the Slavonic or Greek. He explained that his insistence on the use of a foreign language, unknown by the Orthodox Romanians in Transylvania, was for the protection of “the dogmas, the mysteries, and the traditions of the Orthodox Church.” In addition, he informed Athanasios about his plans to have Mogila’s *Confession* (1642) printed and translated into Romanian, and suggested to him that “...if there exists certain words or meanings which are untranslatable from the Romanian text, your archbishop will seek a solution from the prototype, namely the Greek.”⁴³¹

Some scholars have criticized Dositheos’ reluctance to provide the Orthodox Romanians with a Divine Liturgy and texts in their own language. Dennis Deletant had pointed to this common sentiment among Romanians, which became more prevalent towards the latter half of the seventeenth century; they suspected that “...the use of a foreign language in the church served only to foster ignorance on the part of [Romanian] priest and parishioners as to the true meaning and significance of worship...”⁴³² Dura was sympathetic to Dositheos’ obduracy on this issue since he claimed it was necessary to prevent the dissimulation of Orthodox dogma, which was a frequent consequence of fierce proselytism by Transylvanian’s Calvinists—and Dositheos was quite familiar with that polemical arena. Indeed, Dositheos wanted them to have the original manuals or Greek prototype for editorial reference and any catechetical questions or public inquiries. That was the ideal.

From a much broader perspective Steven Runciman approached the issue of Hellenization or the transference of Greek heritage, language, and education into the

Danubian Principalities. In particular Runciman noted that in the latter half of the seventeenth century their political control became more prominent, especially during the period of the Phanariot. Most importantly, however, when Runciman addressed ‘the language of the liturgy’ in the Principalities and its leadership through a narrow upper class of Greek educators, schools, and seminaries—in contrast to the Romanian lower classes—he asserted:

This did not represent a crude exploitation of the natives. Rather, it was the voluntary work of the native Church in order to secure the support of Greek learning and Phanariot money and influence and to strengthen itself against Latin missionaries operating from the Habsburg dominions and from Poland. The Greek academies at Bucharest and Jassy were established not for racial purposes but in the general interest of Orthodoxy.⁴³³

It should not be overlooked that Greek education—which was *de facto* religious (the mystery of piety and initiation) and ecclesiastical (the office of teacher)—was an avenue for social advancement for some chosen few. Panchenko echoed Runciman’s evaluation of Hellenization. Panchenko stated that although the Melkites “were barred from having an active role in history and were transformed from the subject to the object of policy,” they received “[c]onstant financial investment, cultural cooperation, and a replenishment of human resources...”⁴³⁴ Among these charitable activities Panchenko celebrated was Dositheos’ establishment of schools in Palestine for the learning of Arabic and Greek literature in 1706. Similar to the educational pursuits practiced in many Jesuit schools, however, Panchenko admits that the “...Greek texts and hymnography were learned by heart, without understanding the meaning of the words.” These were not the

violent pacification techniques that squelched rebellions and protests, but they did circumscribe internal questions, inquiry, and examinations of what was real (i.e., the Eucharist).

Nobody during this unprecedented period of crisis in Eastern Orthodoxy wanted to present an inclusive sense of ‘Greekness’ and an all embracing and universal vision of ‘Greek Orthodoxy’ more than Dositheos, the patriarch of the Holy City of Jerusalem—the center and birthplace of the first confession of faith by the Apostle Peter and carried on through the Apostle Paul, the converted. Nonetheless, he faced the task of maintaining the image of one, universal Orthodox unity against an international examination which tested the people’s trust and fomented suspicions toward their leadership, local and abroad.

Dositheos himself became more aware of this crisis—which would be better contextualized as an ecumenical crisis—as the international discourse laid bare in concise form the articulation and fundamentals of belief. The questionable piety of its leadership might give rise to further suspicions and uncertainties among the people about orthodoxies, idolatries, and dislocated unity. Dositheos fought to have Mogila’s confession of faith universally accepted as an authentic representation of the Orthodox Church, but he was well aware of the divisions already present among the competing Orthodox ‘schools of thought.’ The attachment of his own *Confession* (1672) to the *Manual against the Calvinist Madness* (1690) was in every sense the *Shield of Orthodoxy*—as well as a parry and riposte. Norman Russell noted Dositheos’ significant change of direction in the context of his increasing distrust of the Kiev Academy and his own Greek missionaries, the Leichoudes brothers. Russell provides the testimony written

by Dositheos himself in response to the Russian Tsar Peter the Great's request "...for suitable Greeks to be appointed to Azov and other Episcopal sees." Dositheos answered:

Your Majesty is never to make a Greek, Serb or Ukrainian metropolitan or patriarch, but only Muscovites [...] however many faults they may have, however uneducated they may be [...] It is important, most pious lord [...] that a foreigner should not be brought to your great Episcopal throne and that Your Majesty should not send a Greek to Azov.⁴³⁵

Although Russell does not elaborate more on this text's open admittance to the crisis of Greek Orthodoxy and ecumenicity, it was nothing less than Dositheos' own concession to examination within an international pluralism. The victory of the people's indigenous or local Orthodoxy—with its own capital—always resulted in the handing over or the transference of the office of teacher to its own local confessors and orthodox witnesses. This was Russell's keen observation and targeting of the prevailing problem, writing, "[Dositheos] suggests that the tsar should send young Muscovites to him and he would train them for office himself."⁴³⁶ This was a last ditch effort—an ecumenical decision—a kind of 'necessary' charity from Dositheos in order to retain Greek influence within the office of the teacher.

When Dositheos arrived in Wallachia there were four other presses already publishing works in Romanian, Slavonic, and Arabic. In the preface to his first publication, Maximos Peloponnesios's *Manual Against the Schismatic Papacy: Five Differences* (1690),⁴³⁷ Dositheos expressed his dismay at the state of Greek publishing there, writing, "... [there is] so much illiteracy [*amathian*] and deprivation of wisdom

that even the Greek language was almost lost, with which it had always boasted and paraded among all the races [*ta gene*].” Dositheos consciously chose to write in the common (*koine*) Greek “for the simple.” Quoting Dositheos’ own words, Dura also suggested that the commoner’s language also had the greater idealistic purpose and mission “...to save untouched ‘the race and Eastern Church’ from the attacks by innovative heterodoxies ‘...and indeed by those apostatizing from the east to the western church...’”⁴³⁸ There were pedagogical advantages that Dositheos foresaw with the use of simple language. Dositheos wrote, “...as much as they desire, it is able to assist our race [*to genos*] in the differences which the Eastern Church has with the west, in the dogmas...beginning first from the principle, namely Papal primacy, and following through the differences which the orthodox have with the heterodox and the Latin innovators.”⁴³⁹

Dositheos published two more works in Wallachia: Meletios Syrigos’ refutation of the reputed Calvinist confession of faith by Loukaris, entitled *Against the Calvinist chapters and questions of Cyril Loukaris* (1690). Dositheos used Syrigos’ full title “Both the Teacher and Chancellor of the Great Church in Constantinople.” And, Dositheos’ own *A Manual against the Calvinist Madness*, which contained a copy of the *Shield of Orthodoxy* and his *Confession of Faith* from 1672. Dura keenly noted that this later edition replaced the council as agent with its “president and author” Dositheos. And, in the opening address of his *Confession* (1672), Dositheos represented “the Greeks” and “the Eastern Church” to those who “...ask and inquire.”⁴⁴⁰ Perhaps, Dositheos felt that on the frontiers of the Orthodox Commonwealth even the patriarch of Jerusalem was an equal among many confessors and contenders for the faith. The council of Jerusalem

(1672) was only attended by local clergy and by no measure was it ecumenical, and for this reason the council is sometimes referred to by its local designation, the Bethlehem Synod.

Dositheos also managed to reprint another copy of Mogila's *Confession* (1640) in 1690, along with a small collection of works on *The Three Greatest Virtues: Faith, Hope, and Love*, before returning to his press in Moldavia to print the first book of his trilogy: *Reconciliation* (1694), followed by *Love* (1698) and *Joy* (1705).

Ostensibly, as Dositheos informed his readers in Moldavia, the works collected in the volume of *Reconciliation* provided evidence that refuted the *Manual on the Procession of the Holy Spirit* by Leo Allatios, the pro-union and western educated scholar. Allatios had argued that the Latin addition to the *Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed* (381), the *filioque* was an acceptable formula and correctly expressed and piously professed the procession of the Holy Spirit. Dositheos, being versed in the schema, responded with the well worn argument that explicated the difference between the genitive causal preposition 'from' (*ek*) and the dative instrumental preposition 'through' (*dia*). The latter, Dositheos stated, expressed the exoteric (*ekoteras*) and communicative (*metadotikis*) procession of the Holy Spirit—that is, namely, the manifestation (*emphasasthai*)—through (*dia*) the Son. In contrast, the Latin formula (*ek*), according to Dositheos, incorrectly assigned two primary causes to the Holy Spirit (i.e., the Father and the Son), when the schema required one source—from the Father.⁴⁴¹

While Dositheos pointed to Allatios and his *Manual* as the immediate opponent targeted by his collection of works in *Reconciliation*, Dositheos had a broader project in

mind. Dositheos did not elaborate on the theological principles arguing against the Latin formula; instead, he focused on the fact that the *filioque* was an addition to the ecumenical creed of 381, the *Nicene-Constantinopolitan Confession*. Thus, Dositheos' argument was a matter of historical record. There could be no compromise on the interpretation of the formula, as Allatios desired. Dositheos called for repentance at the conclusion of his preface and for a return to the schema, as he wrote, "...one flock, shepherded by one Lord our Christ Jesus...the only, highest, true, sinless, and immortal head of the catholic church."⁴⁴²

In the preface of *Reconciliation* Dositheos addressed the readers, his clerical 'brothers', by appealing to the equality of all the patriarchates when synodically defining the terms of 'the Divine Symbol.' He hearkened to an ideal time of "...peace and calm assisted and prepared by the bishops, the eponymous-Christ, combined *symphonia* and harmony together with the honey of Christ's mouth..." The period Dositheos imagined could certainly reference the early church prior to the fourth century, but Dositheos was pointing to the creedal tradition. He stated, "Indeed, there was [a time] when the ancient Greeks [*Hellenes*] and Latins protected peace among the seven synods [i.e., the Ecumenical Councils 325-787], by standing as one in the same terms, and conversing through one another with the same-mind [*homonoiian*] in Christ." Dositheos introduced the "alien," "foreign," and famous *filioque* scandal into this idyllic narrative, and the disturbance arose from western France (Gaul). "But immediately after the seventh synod [787]," Dositheos explained, "a certain [synod] in France of God-haters and sinisters dared to advance certain [things] according to a digression from the Symbol of Faith, for they added the expression 'and from [*ek*] the Son."⁴⁴³ Dositheos made clear in his

History of the Jerusalem Patriarchate that he was referencing the synod of 794 held in Frankfurt and ordered by the king of the Franks, Charlemagne the Great (768-814). It was attended by western delegates including legates sent by Pope Adrian I (772-795).⁴⁴⁴

Dositheos emphasized his main point that the *filioque* was an addition to the creed, but he also weaved together historical events into the origins of contemporary arguments for the purposes of framing. For example, on the French Synod of 794 that Dositheos vaguely referred to in his preface, he began chapter three on “The Frankfurt Synod” by using evidence from his ‘enemy’s enemy.’ He wrote, “Indeed, the Calvinists say that the King of the Franks at the time, Charles the Great, was opposed to the worship of icons [and] ordered a Synod of certain French Bishops, Italians, and other places...” Dositheos wrote reflecting on the relatively recent discovery of *Charles’ Books (Libri Carolini)* in the sixteenth century, and employed by Calvinists against the adoration of images. Dositheos referred to the *Libri Carolini* as “The Book against Icons” but preferred to use the Greek transliteration for *Capitulare*. More importantly, for Dositheos’ purposes he viewed *Libri Carolini* as “...containing the acts of the synod under Charles in Frankfurt.” Those acts and decrees had rejected the seventh Ecumenical Council and added the *filioque*, which Pope Adrian I also rejected.⁴⁴⁵

Dositheos concluded chapter three on “The Frankfurt Synod (794)” by turning to the Calvinist and Lutherans with a critique that also indirectly demonstrates the mutable essence of symbols, icons, and formulas. He wrote, “Indeed, if also the Lutherans do not honor the icons by worshipping [*proskenountes*] but [only] out of pious praise, [than] it is clearly impious for they close the way of piety, and seek from each other in order to be certain in their knowledge, fighting not only the Church, but also themselves in the same

evil way.”⁴⁴⁶ Dositheos employed the distinction decreed at the seventh Ecumenical Council (787) on the ‘worship’ of images: the worship (*proskenesis*) given toward icons, relics, and created things was permitted in honor of its prototype (i.e., that which the image signifies or represents); however, worship (*latreia*) could only be given to God alone, which the historian Philip Schaff concisely explained “...cut off all possibility for idolatry, Mariolatry, iconolatry, or another ‘latry’ except ‘theo-latry.’”⁴⁴⁷ This nuanced double-meaning was absorbed and obfuscated in the Latin term *adoratio*, the German *anbetung*, and the English ‘worship’—which made a certain strain of western iconoclasm respond to the eastern worship of icons in much the same way the Swiss Reformers protested the German adoration of the Eucharist.

* * *

In Yannaras’ chapter on “The Creation of the West,” between the barbarian migrations of the fourth and sixth centuries and “...a secularized ‘religionization’ of the Church life, emphasizing individual conviction against experiential participation in the Church as truth” in the ninth century, Yannaras situates the Toledo synod of 589 as the critical intersection of two historical forces: the western conversion of the German tribes and the addition of the *filioque*. Yannaras described the barbarian conversions rather tersely.⁴⁴⁸ In general, Yannaras asserted, the converted responded to both Latin and Greek missionaries with joy and “...imitate[d] and adopt[ed] the civilization of the Christian world.” After their conversion they were initiated and entered into “...a new Christian civilization,” according to Yannaras.⁴⁴⁹

Yannaras' narrative of the *filioque* begins among the German migrants who were converted by "Arian Greek prisoners...still occupying the lands between the Danube and the Carpathians...and later the vandels of Spain took their Arianism from them." In the fifth century, however, the previous assimilation of German migrants into a new Christian civilization was slightly inverted by the Frankish victory over Gaul and their appropriation of "...the culture of the peoples they ruled," according to Yannaras. What's most striking about this narrative is Yannaras' explanation of the Frank's conversion from heresy to orthodoxy. Yannaras stated, "Frankish conquests or intermarriage gradually converted the German Arians to the orthodox faith. But the orthodoxy of the Franks did not survive for more than a hundred years."⁴⁵⁰ This type of 'organic' conversion might reflect Yannaras' distinction between individual conviction and experiential participation in the faith through marriage, as quoted above.

Yannaras then transitioned to the moment of schism between western and eastern Christianity or 'the Creation of the West' which he located in the acts and decrees of the Spanish Synod of 589 in Toledo. Yannaras explained its historical significance, writing, "The council of Toledo of 589 condemned Arianism but added the *Filioque* to the Creed...To the orthodox [i.e., Latins] they were simplifying and schematizing the Holy Trinity and by the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed marked off Western Christianity from the East."⁴⁵¹ What evolved from the *Western Confession* of 589 involved religion and the state. As Yannaras asserted, "A national form of Christianity assisted the Franks' political ambitions, especially after 800 when Charles the Great (Charlemagne) became king." According to Yannaras the West had become a separate nation from Greek

Byzantium; Dositheos thought the same but within the Greek creedal tradition—both of them civilized.

From here, at the turn into the ninth century, Dositheos continued his preface with Pope John VIII and Patriarch Photius of the ninth century and ‘the Great Schism’ of the eleventh century in 1054, while Yannaras turned from the historical causal to a structural analysis of the new Latin ‘ecclesial framework.’ Nonetheless, both Dositheos and Yannaras made the creedal addition a center piece of their Western critique.

Before turning to Patriarch Photios and Pope John VIII, Dositheos left his readers with the famous image of Pope Leo III’s symbolic protest against the *filioque* and Charlemagne. Dositheos reiterated the historical report based on Latin witnesses (i.e., Peter Lombard and Baronius) and Eastern (i.e., Euthymius Zigabenus’ *Panoplian*): “But [Leo] ordered a shield in western copper to be written with silver letters the Symbol of the second Council [i.e., 381], [for it] to be emblemized on the temple of St. Paul so that the same-mind [*homonoiia*] might be saved in the church.” Yannaras also appealed to this same report about Leo against the ‘Frankish innovation.’⁴⁵²

In his preface Dositheos introduced Patriarch Photius and the cause of the Eastern Synod of Constantinople in 879 by rightly pointing to competition between East and West over the converted Bulgarian Slavs. Dositheos wrote, “...under [the Eastern Emperor and Empress] Michael and Theodoras certain Latin priests taught and from the Son [i.e., the *filioque*] in Bulgaria.” Dositheos emphasized that the Roman Pope at the time, Pope John VIII (872-882), sent legates to this Eastern Synod (879) and confirmed both the legitimacy of Photius’ election to the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate and the

unaltered *Ecumenical Creed* (381). Dositheos again enlisted the defense of Latin witnesses testifying that the *filioque* was an addition.

Dositheos concluded his analysis of the *filioque* with Patriarch Photios because, as he stated, “After Pope John [VIII] the Papacy had become succeedingly evil and politically unlawful, and clearly having murderous thoughts so that they overthrew one another.” All that was left for Dositheos to demonstrate, according to the confessional tradition, was a call to public repentance, the performance of an *apologia*, and the coaxing of a confession from the Latins. Dositheos made his final argument:

...not [wanting] to be corrected, having been called to a defense [*apologia*], and not submitting, they were cast out of communion [*koinonia*] with the holy church in the year 1052 under Emperor Constantine ‘the Lone-Fighter’. But they, wanting to set a good demonstration and not being able to from scripture nor from synods and neither from the Fathers nor from [their] scholastic manuals (indeed, in which they rejoice), took a stand on this: They said that they have general authority [*exousia*] under the Catholic Church and are the Chief Vicars of Christ, and this most infallibly so that if even the entire *Ecumene* decided against the opinion of the Pope, the Pope’s opinion would rule, and not the *Ecumene*.⁴⁵³

Dositheos devoted three-fourths of his preface to emphasize that the *filioque* was an addition to the *Ecumenical Creed* (381). In the collected texts of *Reconciliation* Dositheos included some that elaborated on the third article of the creed concerning the Holy Spirit; and thereby he provided a more in depth response to Leo Allitios’ *Manual*. Yet, from Dositheos’ perspective, the addition of the *filioque* to such a significant and

universal creed subordinated all other theological arguments to the primary cause of schism within the creedal tradition. Again, Dositheos' *History of the Jerusalem Patriarchate* reiterated the significance of this alteration by entitling book eight "Concerning the addition by the Latins to the Symbol." The first paragraph ends on the importance of confessional orthodoxy over and above all else when discussing authority (*exousia*):

Thus, Symeon of Thessaloniki in his *Dialogue Against the Heresies* says, 'Rome is first and the highest (namely, according to order) when it is, however, orthodox. But, because an innovation arose and an addition introduced to the common Symbol, [they are] not apostolic, neither first nor a father, but are destroyers of the Apostles and Fathers and measurably an enemy, and an opponent of the common catholic Church.'⁴⁵⁴

Afterwards, Dositheos continued with the Great Schism of 1052 and advanced to Pope Leo IX and the Latin problems with simony and anabaptism—to which, Dositheos added a list of authoritative witnesses (*martyria*), and the first testified that the *filioque* was an addition.

The last quarter of Dositheos' preface to *Reconciliation* addressed the attempted union between Latins and Greeks in the fifteenth century, which took place at the famous western councils of Ferrara-Florence (1438-1445) and was attended by the Byzantine Emperor John VIII Palaiologos (1425-1448) and Patriarch Joseph II of Constantinople (1416-1439). In his preface Dositheos noted that the roots of this pro-union council began

with the arrival of certain Roman presbyters to Constantinople during the reign of Emperor Manuel Palaiologos (1391-1425)—they were “...seeking a dialectic.”

The texts Dositheos collected for *Reconciliation* all centered on the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438-1445) and reflect the Greek Church’s eventual rejection of that synod’s declaration of union. The defeat over the Greek pro-union party is often recounted as a victory of the orthodox people (i.e., the laity) against their church leaders whom, they decried, had betrayed their faith and Empire; however, there were also two party leaders who protested the decision at council and at home in the East, the brothers Eugenikos.

Dositheos included nine collections, the first of which was an anonymous fifteenth century discourse *Against the Latins* that Dositheos also valued for its historical reporting on the Council of Ferrara-Florence. The second, *A Word Refuting the Blasphemy and lies of the decree in Florence*, was written by John Eugenikos who attended the council and became well known for his anti-union stance. He held the official title ‘Guardian of the Law’ under the Byzantine Emperor John VIII, and Eugenikos was the brother of the famous anti-unionist Metropolitan of Ephesus, Mark Eugenikos (1391-1445) who also attended and refused to sign the decree. The only other text from Dositheos’ collection related to historical records on the council was an *Apologia* by “...Hierarchs, Governors, and Clergy who gathered under [Emperor] John VIII Palaiologos” against the Union and delivered in 1443.”

Dositheos had added to the first anonymous text, *Against the Latins*, a subtle editorial imprint: *The Acts and Decrees of the Constantinopolitan Synod of 1450*

purportedly held in the renowned Hagia Sophia. Dura noticed that Dositheos interrupted the pagination of the anonymous text (i.e., pages 206-273) by attaching the *Acts and Decrees* (1450) at the end and numbering it 210-248 to coincide with the first mention of the Synod in the anonymous text. The importance of this Constantinopolitan Synod (1450) to Dositheos, although dimly, can most clearly be seen by his chosen designator for it: the eighth Ecumenical Council. Dositheos reiterated the decisions of this Synod (1450) against union, the *filioque*, and other matters at the end of *Reconciliation* (i.e., pages 457-521).⁴⁵⁵

On the one hand, the addition of the *Acts and Decrees* (1450) was Dositheos' response to Leo Allatios' ecclesiastical history, entitled *On the Eastern Church and the East's Perpetual Consensus*, in which Allatios included a copy of the *Acts and Decrees* (1450) in order to debunk its historical authenticity. On the other hand, the significance of the eighth Ecumenical Council filled a place in Dositheos ecclesiastical narrative of the eastern creeds and its historical, ecumenical, and 'universal' Church. Certainly, Dositheos wanted to prove the *Acts and Decrees* true in order to demonstrate that the Eastern Church ecumenically and synodically rejected the union of Florence. Without being informed by Dositheos' own ecclesiastical narrative, however, this fact misses Dositheos' more encompassing project and enterprise for his Greek printing presses in the Danubian Principalities.

On the issue of the authenticity of the Synod and its *Acts and Decrees* (1450) there has been what must be called a 'confessional' bias among historians. The famous historian Edward Gibbon gave a sobering and persuasive analysis of the situation in his controversial *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*:

Allatius gave an account of the ‘Acts’ of this Synod, and condemned them as spurious, on account of some obvious blunders which appeared in their Title...but in the Title, in [Dositheos’] edition, the blunders were corrected..But, quite apart from the title, the document is marked by anachronisms and blunders which have been recently exposed by Papaioannu... The Synod of 1450 was invented and the Acts forged probably not later than the beginning of the 17th century. One of the anachronisms which the unknown forger committed was making Marcus of Ephesus take part in the Synod. But Marcus had died before 1448.⁴⁵⁶

Dositheos addressed the Synod (1450) and its contended historical existence in one paragraph from book ten of his *History of the Jerusalem Patriarchate*.

Chapter one of book ten begins with Pope Adrian’s defense of the seventh Ecumenical Council and the narrative continues until chapter nine, where Dositheos ended with the Synod (1450); afterwards, the rest of book ten consists of a mixture of refutations and catechetical instruction. Dositheos wrote, “The last synod in Constantinople was completed in the holy Sophia after the final Latin-thinking [Emperor] John VIII Palaiologus...and the final agreeing with orthodox dogma under his orthodox brother Emperor Constantine [Palaiologus].” Dositheos laid the necessary foundation of an orthodox Emperor and an orthodox Synod, and then addressed the accusations of the Latins challenging the Synod’s existence. Dositheos explained, “The epigraph of the acts of this Synod, which is also most true, were presented in a copy to us, which also was printed by us—but they [i.e., the Latins] also have a copy of the epigraph.” Dositheos had a more difficult obstacle explaining why many “Greek teachers in the West” during that time had not mentioned the Synod (1450).⁴⁵⁷

Dositheos resolved the problem with an astute observation on the process of writing an ecclesiastical history, stating: “But it is said that this happened in ancient [times] with many synods, for example those against Samosatos and against Navatus, and many under Constantine the Great, and in Gaza, Laodecia and Antioch, and many others...It is not necessary to make a bunch of noise because [a] Synod was not memorialized by some ancient historian; for even Anastasios of Jerusalem was mentioned among those at the Synod of Trullo (692),⁴⁵⁸ but not one historian or even in the codex of a certain Diptych was he memorialized.”⁴⁵⁹ Dositheos was referring to the mistake in *The Great Synaxaristes*, a collection of hagiographies and the calendar days devoted to their memory, which confused the commemoration in February of Anastasios the Patriarch of Jerusalem (d. 706) for the iconoclast Patriarch Anastasios of Constantinople (730-754).

Although most modern historians reject the account of the Synod (1450) as spurious, and Dositheos himself did not seem all that confident about its validity, the idea of an eighth Ecumenical Council ‘officially’ denouncing union with the West helped sustain the historical continuity of the eastern creedal tradition.⁴⁶⁰ More importantly, however, the fact that this Synod (1450) supposedly took place under Constantine XI Palaiologus, the last Byzantine Emperor, supported Dositheos’ project for a universal confessional identity—in which the orthodox people, the Church, and the Emperor (*Basileus*) form one ‘orthodox’ race—and paradoxically presaged the emergence of early nationalism. The Synod of 1484 did ‘officially’ decree against the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438-1445), but this occurred after the fall of Constantinople in 1453 and without the presence of a King (capitalized).

Dositheos ended his preface to the readers in *Reconciliation* by concluding, “To him [Christ] be the glory and the state, the honor and worship thus to the Father and to the holy spirit in eternity forever amen.” The image of a ‘state’ that Dositheos projected was the idea of a commonwealth of “Christian races” (*genous*), each perhaps with its own king or prince. The nameless and nondescript ‘state’ represented no one, but within it those who prayed ‘the Great Ektenia’ (i.e., litany) in the sanctuary, in the lavra, and in the home were all ‘Orthodox’ Christians. Yet, as with any temporal order or earthly city, the state and its inhabitants possessed a history—and like any people, its historical narrative was a contentious matter between those who claimed to represent its lineage, defend its heritage, and confess its name. In the realm of ideas and collective memory, the era of the Ecumenical Councils (325-787) was an appealing aspect of the creedal tradition, but in reality discord always accompanied moments of concord.

Dositheos was defending this ‘Orthodox’ heritage when he condemned the Latins for adding the ‘French innovation’ to the *Creed* (381). That the West had betrayed this heritage was Dositheos’ closing argument to his preface, “For they have exhumed from their memories their own Popes, being their own grave-robbers, and killing and cutting off [their] own heads and hands [from] the ancients, and casting off their remnants, as if they were thieves and traitors of the father-land [*patridos*]...” Dositheos noted the famous example of Pope Formosus (891-896) whose body was exhumed and put on trial in the Cadaver Synod of 897 in order to face charges by Pope John VIII (872-882). The corpse of Pope Formosus received a judgment of *Damnatio Memoriae* (The Condemnation of Memory)—never to be remembered or memorialized. Although Dositheos does not express it here, there are hints from his ecclesiastical narrative,

however, that Dositheos is actually referring to a period shortly prior to the ‘French addition,’ during Adrian’s Patriarchate (772-795) and before the seventh Ecumenical Council (787). The West’s betrayal of its heritage, Dositheos implied, was a process of impiety; and the example of the Cadaver Synod (897) was the end result of such ‘atheism.’

When Dositheos introduced the individual authors and texts of *Reconciliation* in his preface, he also used a variation on the term heritage (*patridos*). Dositheos stated that the later innovations of the Latins, namely the events dealing with the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438-144) which were the focus of the volume, were defeated by “...the holy scripture and the patrimonial faith [*patroparadoto pisti*].” In book six of Dositheos’ *History of the Jerusalem Patriarchate*, after discussing the tumultuous sixth Ecumenical Council (680/681), the disputed Canons of the Synod of Trullo (692), and the issue of anabaptism, Dositheos began to apply a schema under the banner of one Emperor, one Church, and one people to the idea of a universal heritage.

Dositheos devoted chapter sixteen of book six to “Concerning certain Popes of Rome who came from the Greeks and Syrians, as [if] hastening to subject the Church of Rome, and furthermore against the sycophant papists those Greeks became Popes.” The larger context here was the period after Emperor Justinian’s (527-565) reconquest of Italy from the nomadic German tribe of Ostrogoths in the first campaign (535-540) and the subsequent reestablishment of imperial authority over elections to the Roman Papacy. After Emperor Justinian’s personal and unilateral appointments, from Pope Vigilius (537-555) to Pope Zachary (741-752), the majority of Popes came from eastern Byzantium. Andrew Ekonomou in *Byzantine Rome and the Greek Popes* described the emergence of

a Greek renaissance during this period due to the influx of migrating Greek people and ‘Hellenic’ influence on art, monasticism and “...the rhetoric of doctrinal debate.”⁴⁶¹ Ekonomou’s secondary thesis “...maintains that papal Rome was always a loyal subject of the Roman [Byzantine] Empire. Even in the time of Pope Zachary (741-52), ‘the *Imperium Romanum Christianum*, like the Trinity, was still one and undivided.’”⁴⁶² Although some question the extent of Greek influence on ‘Byzantine Rome,’ such as Thomas Noble who retorted with an overtone accusing them of ‘Latin-thinking’: “All [Greek Popes] were born in the West...All served for years, sometimes ten, twenty, or more, in the Roman clergy before becoming pope.” Noble then concluded his critique of Ekonomou with an aporetic question: “In what sense can they be called ‘Greek’ or ‘Eastern’? They resolutely rejected one Byzantine policy after another.”⁴⁶³ And, Yannaras might answer approvingly and silently with a nod: None. In contrast to this last statement Dositheos found evidence for affirming one *Imperium Romanum Christianum* and one King precisely because the Greek Popes rejected Byzantine policy.

Dositheos began with a list of ‘Byzantine Popes’ whose origins were Greek and Syrian. It should be noted that Dositheos’ list is neither complete nor free from error. He wrote, “After the death of Pope John V (685-686) another John of the Greek race [*Hellene to genos*] was received. Thus, [Pope] Benedict (684-685) and John were of the Syrian race, Pope Conon (686-687) of Thrace, Pope Sergius I (687-701), John V and John VI were Greek [*Hellene*]. [Pope] Sisinnius (708) of Syria, Pope Zachary (741-752) a Greek [*Hellene*], Roman only were the two Gregories...”⁴⁶⁴ The inclusion of Popes from Syrian origin bolstered Dositheos’ argument in favor of an image of Christian races united under one ‘Orthodox race’ or an Orthodox Commonwealth united under one

Emperor. Furthermore, as Dositheos explained, he began his list with Pope Benedict II and John V because Emperor Constantine IV (668-685) gave Benedict the right to fulfill a Papal vacancy and relinquished thereafter the imperial Byzantine authority over Rome's ecclesiastical elections. Dositheos briefly explained, "Through an Imperial decree [Constantine IV] gave the authority for the election, namely to the Synod in Rome and the people of Rome to choose and seat the Pope, whomever they voted for without asking the state Emperor or the Exarch in Italy at the time..." Dositheos was highlighting a more democratic order for ecclesiastical elections seceded to the city of Rome during the period of 'Byzantine Popes.'⁴⁶⁵

Dositheos made an argument for a shared heritage in response to Catholic Spondanus, who published a synopsis in 1647 of Baronius' famous two volume set *Ecclesiastical Annals* (1607), which argued that—as Dositheos wrote, "...the Greeks desired the [office] of the Papacy." In contrast to Noble's interpretation, Spondanus asserted that Pope John VII (705-707) rejected Emperor Justinian II's command for Rome to subscribe to the Canons of Trullo (692) because 'the Greek Pope' secretly "...hastened to subject the Church of Rome to the Greeks." Spondanus had implied that the subjugation of Papal Primacy was an ancient goal of the Greek Church.

Dositheos attacked Spondanus' generalization of 'the Greek Papacy' for not specifying "which Greeks sought to become Popes" for the purpose of subjecting Rome. In addition, Dositheos barbed Spondanus with a familiar accusation: "...if this happened, was it not paradoxical? For whoever becomes a Pope in Rome, even unto today, desires all the Latin branches, and indeed by simony."⁴⁶⁶ Concerning the example of Pope John VII, Dositheos denied that he rejected the Canons of Trullo; nevertheless, Dositheos

argued, later Popes and the seventh Ecumenical Council (787) approved the Canons. He then questioned Spondanus' historical evidence by asking for a specific command given by 'the Greek Popes' that demonstrated their subversive desires. He also questioned Spondanus' 'reasoned' syllogism from the hypothetical in view, namely the example of Pope John VII's obstinacy towards Emperor Justinian II (685-695, 705-711), by rhetorically asking how that did not in fact strengthen the position of Rome against the Greeks. He also made a play on the word 'Roman' and 'Greek' asking, "Therefore, which of these [Greek Popes] desired the command to make the Roman Church into the Romans?"⁴⁶⁷

Dositheos concluded with a schema. After repeating Spondanus' assertion that Rome could "...no longer think or act for itself" during the period of 'the Greek Papacy,' Dositheos answered: "We say that this indeed was foreign to the Church of Rome [and] lawless and impious; [namely,] not wanting to think of the Popes and their Election [as] things of the catholic Church, but [as] things of the Roman—to speak in this manner is schismatic and excommunicable."⁴⁶⁸ Dositheos implied Spondanus' complaint betrayed the imperative to have one-mind (*omonoia*) and one-voice (*omophonia*), denied the whole for the self, and distinguished the indistinguishable for individual interest. Dositheos 'the Confessor' blamed the West with, nationalism might be a word too modern, but 'balkanization' too anachronistic—the traditional creedal charge of being a schismatic.

Dositheos was not, however, under the impression that the Emperor was a guarantor of orthodoxy; rather, like the office of the Papacy, when the Emperor spoke in concert with, as Dositheos stated, the "...orthodox communion" was the Emperor

speaking *orthodoxy*. The symbol of the Emperor was more significant than the impiety of individual rulers. Dositheos used the example of Pope Gregory II's defense of iconography against the iconoclast Emperor Leo III (717-741) in order to expand on the ideal image of an Emperor's role in the state's affairs with the 'one' church. Dositheos quoted Pope Gregory's thesis that "...it is not necessary for the Emperor to judge [things] concerning the faith and to innovate on those ancient dogmas which the holy fathers dogmatized."⁴⁶⁹ Dositheos then elaborated on several points of contention with his contemporary opponents, but importantly in chapter nineteen of book six he directly answered the question addressed in the chapter's subtitle: "What is the Emperor and what is the Pope in both politics and ecclesiastics?"⁴⁷⁰ As Dositheos' subtitle for this catechetical domain already suggests, the question itself presented an unavoidable dialectic between two kingdoms, which Martin Luther himself could not evade—nonetheless, both confessors agreed they ideally worked in symphony, synergistically.

Dositheos explained that "...the Emperor is called in the word of eulogy [*logo egkomiou*] [to be] the head of Christians, and the orthodox Emperors and Hierarchs, [and] in symphony [*symphonountas*] with the Hierarchs working on behalf of piety [or religion, *eusebeias*]." He continued later on regarding the Emperor and ecclesiastical councils, stating concisely with one sentence in point number seven, "Without the Emperor, Ecumenical Synods cannot be pious." On the difference between church and state authority Dositheos wrote in chiasmatic: "The Emperor is called the Roman Emperor of Constantinople, and hence it was not [on] the Pope's authority... [and] those things of the ecclesiastical Hierarchs are also not the Emperors'." Dositheos continued by criticizing the Papacy's usurpation of state power, reiterating that the ancient "...Papacy then had

neither little soldiers nor other political strength...the Hierarchs and Emperors speak for the orthodox Empire (*Basileis*), as the Ecumenical Councils have said.” By appealing to a liturgical eulogy Dositheos was describing the ‘not-so-mysterious’ piety attributed with the Ecumenical Councils, especially the synods under Constantine the Great, which concerned the horizontal plane and pious order of governance, rulers, and temporal authority. In such an external order, Dositheos repeatedly emphasized, it was the Emperor who gave the official call for an Ecumenical Council, as was clear from the historical precedent set at Nicaea (325) and Constantinople (381). Not only was this an argument based on temporal or external piety, Dositheos also considered ‘the call’ from the Emperor a practical matter.⁴⁷¹ On a side note, the pace of communications and travel by land and sea had advanced quite quickly by the late-seventeenth century.⁴⁷²

In book ten, after Dositheos’ ecclesiastical narrative turned to reflect more its concomitant catechetical character than historical, Dositheos tackled the question “What is an Ecumenical Synod? How many things we should think about it, and how many causes for which only orthodox Emperors of the *Ecumene* assemble the Synods?” Dositheos cited the ecclesiastical historian Socrates and appealed to the fourteenth century Byzantine jurist from Thessaloniki, Matthew Vlastares, to frame the historical moments when both the temporal and spiritual acted as one in an ecumenical synod. Vlastares formulated a definition equivalent to the *Imperium Romanum Christianum*, writing, “They are given the name Ecumenical Synods because the one ruling [over] the Roman Empire of the *Ecumene* calls by command all the bishops from different areas of the *Ecumene* into one place.” Of the principles Dositheos derived from this historical framework he emphatically reasserted the significant chief principle: “...the Emperor

invites, and the Patriarchs are sent...” He casted aside any semantic arguments based on etymological nuances, like he had experienced with the term *transubstantiation*, by asserting that the ‘call’ was an imperative given by the Emperor. He then listed a number of synonyms.⁴⁷³

On practical matters pertaining to ecumenical councils or “The causes through which the orthodox Emperor [*Basileus*] alone assembles it,” as Dositheos entitled it, he might have considered a more ‘scientific’ or ‘modern’ term for the concept of race (*genos*) by choosing to describe the principalities, divisions, and inhabitants of the *Ecumene* with the adjective ‘ethnic’ (*ethnos*). The nearest Latin equivalent was the term ‘nation,’ meaning the location from which one was begotten. Dositheos wrote, “First [Cause], to lead from different ethnicities [*ethnoi*] of men into one place of the ethnic [*ethnikos*] kingdom in order to establish an Ecumenical Council is equally dangerous and thus impossible.” Dositheos and Luther shared the same fear of political warfare and peasant mobs that most diplomats of the early modern period associated with travel. “Second [Cause],” Dositheos continued, “The Emperor is able with the ordained law of the elder’s to lead those bishoprics from foreign ethnicities into the place of his kingdom.” Again, Dositheos’ diplomatic concerns reveal his experience with charity campaigns on behalf of Jerusalem’s Holy Places and the great expenditures required for one commission, mission, and conference.⁴⁷⁴ Moreover, by the later-half of the seventeenth century the application of *genos* and *ethnos* in practice made distinct the ideally indistinguishable.

His third cause expanded on the second by pointing out that only the Emperor possessed such means of transportation and ministers of the state to assist for safe

passage, considering more practical matters of naval and ground travel. He cited the third book of Eusebius biographic narrative on the *Life of Constantine*, from which most of his readers would have heard about the brief *Pax Romana* when Constantine personally financed the Ecumenical Council with "...an ample supply of horses for their transport." For the elite class of literate diplomats, state and ecclesiastical, the sense of the first chapter from Eusebius might have seemed prescriptive: "They [i.e., the Others] committed countless murders, that they might plunder or confiscate the wealth of their victims; while throughout the reign of Constantine the sword of justice hung idle everywhere, and both people and municipal magistrates in every province were governed rather by paternal authority than by an constraining."⁴⁷⁵ This third cause supported, naturally, any diplomat's interest in peaceful travel.

Yet, these same practical concerns also reflected the symbolic in terms of leading all nations into the Emperor's kingdom and safe passage through the city's fortified walls. It was both an idyllic scene and evidentially proven practical concern. After reiterating that "only the Emperor gathers the Ecumenical Council," Dositheos' last point on causation ended with three *apophatic* denials on the source of ecumenical councils, and one *apodictic*: "Sixth [cause], that neither the Patriarch nor Pope had this authority [*exousia*] to gather the bishops from everywhere into one place [*eis en*], neither from the scripture nor from the canons nor from custom, but only the Emperor [*monos Basileus*]." Dositheos might have termed this schema, based on such practical matters, an external piety that obeyed an increasingly non-mysterious, less enchanting temporal order in the late seventeenth century.⁴⁷⁶

Draped over the temporal elements, however, an internal piety valued Emperor Constantine so much that this transferred the imperial office as a symbol of the *Ecumene* into a miraculous moment of peace and unity—transparently veiled in time and space. This symbolic reverence could be equated with a certain cultic ‘mystery of the Father,’ which Dositheos captured in his criticism of western iconography: “Third, the Father is not to be investigated [or historicized, *historeitai*]; hence, they do evil whosoever paint the Father as being old.”⁴⁷⁷ Individual Emperors, of course, were iconographized for practical purposes. Furthermore, Dositheos equated the people’s response to the Emperor’s command or call with a piety leading to a certain mystery of the temporal peace “...for those in his kingdom through the call,” and the way of the sword for “...those Heretics persuaded by fear...” In this sense Dositheos put the figure of the Emperor at the center of the temporal and spiritual dialectic and “...in each of the bishoprics [i.e., provinces and jurisdictions], [each] remaining within its borders, [thus] the ecumenical assembly comes to be.”⁴⁷⁸ It was a democratic and practical schema, theoretically, piously, *orthodoxly*.⁴⁷⁹

Dositheos devoted chapter five of book seven to the issue of Charlemagne’s coronation by Pope Leo III in 800 and introduced the division of the one Christian Empire into the Greek East and the Latin West, who marched under the insignia of a new Frankish King and a banner inscribed with the new ‘French anthem’: *Filioque*. In this chapter Dositheos was not too concerned with historical details involved with Charlemagne’s coronation; rather, he focused on the transgression of ultimate principles. Thus, he began, “[Pope] Adrian, who was at the Synod [787], passed away and Leo III became Pope. He was praised as being orthodox, but nonetheless fell into human desires,

which he began perhaps otherwise and through another way but ended in an incurable evil.” Leo’s personal demise, Dositheos suggested, resulted from unconscious alienation. Dositheos explained that Rome had entered “into the authority [*exousia*] of the Franks...so that [Charlemagne] was to be called the Emperor of the West...” Dositheos briefly noted some reputed opposition from the laity to Pope Leo’s announcement upon returning to Rome, but “... because Charles silenced those who remained [opponents], Leo acted together with the tyrannical opinion of Charles and crowned him...as Emperor [*Basileus*] of the West.” Dositheos objected to the coronation’s usurpation of Emperor and the universalism it symbolized, he preferred to use “Kings [*Regas*] of the West.”⁴⁸⁰

From this schism Dositheos asserted two consequences resulted: First, “...the disappearance of the race [*genos*] of orthodox Christians as [if] a common plague within the ecumenical Church.” Second, “...the Pope desired to become the Emperor of Emperors [*Autokratoras Autokrator*].”⁴⁸¹ Further on Dositheos explained that this latter point was the source from which the Papacy claimed to be above judgment and correction, and he juxtaposed the “Emperor of the Emperors” with the West’s “the lie [upon] a lie” that claimed to defend their “...empty authority (*exousia*).” For example, Dositheos stated, “Many historians say that not the pope but the people of Rome voted Charles the Emperor [*Autokratora*], [but] these are thought because the Papists report to Leo to say that so that the first throne [i.e., the Papal Office] is not judged.”⁴⁸² Yet, in this chapter Dositheos was not only concerned with the convolution of histories, testimonies, and reports, but with the general principles and meta-historical changes which resulted from the Papacy *believing* “...they had the authority [*exousia*] to transubstantiate

[*metaballen*] the Emperor [*Basileus*] of the Greeks [*Hellenes*] to the Franks...” Dositheos gave the issue a historical framework and asked:

...this expression TRANSUBSTANTIATION [*e phone METABOLI*] condemns the Papacy as liars. For, if the Popes changed [*metabalon*] the Emperor of the Greeks to the Franks, it would be necessary for the Greeks not to have it [in the first place] but the Franks first, and later the German Emperors followed customarily. And, these Popes had written that they also had the Imperial [throne] of the Constantinopolitan Empire [*Constantinoupoleos Basileis Autokratoras*] and indeed they themselves were greater? ...if it is possible for the Pope to change [*metaballein*] the Emperor, may I transubstantiate [*metaballeto*] now the Emperor of the Germans into another?⁴⁸³

Dositheos summarized the accumulative history of these temporal and spiritual “...symphonies [*symphoniai*] between the coronation and the oaths of Leo and Charles the Great” by rhetorically asking: “For so many wars and killings and evil [acts] had occurred among the nations [*ethne*] and the Kings [*Regas*] of the West—what further [details] should be reported?”⁴⁸⁴

A national symbol with a historical and religious meaning shares a mysterious connection between the temporal and spiritual elements that constitute a bond of unity among the people, its clergy, and leaders. It is best understood and evident in the importance ascribed to the swearing of oaths, and in particular the oath sworn by the people’s representative. In the Church the ritual of baptismal confession reflects the signification of oaths, but especially the prohibition against re-baptism or anabaptism—as

the *Targa* warned. Dositheos explained, “Charles swore (the Papists say) this oath: In the name of Christ, I Charles the Emperor promise before God and St. Peter to defend unceasingly and to fight on behalf of the holy Roman Church in every need and necessity.” Within a sworn oath words mattered. Dositheos pounced on the nuance in Charlemagne’s confession, stating, “As if he said to help not the universal [*catholike*] Church, but the Roman—namely, to help the Pope of Rome....”⁴⁸⁵

Although it was practically ritualistic and likely inaudible to awaiting crowds beyond the narthex where it manifestly took place, Dositheos expressed profound consequences of an oath sworn. There was an archaic time when rhetoric itself like an oath had a mystical power over life and death—they believed.

The final state of the West, Dositheos wrote, “...had become tyrannical to the universal Church, misinterpreting the scripture, changing [*metaballein*] the common faith, nullifying the Decrees of Synods, spurning the interpretation of the saints, modifying the ethos of the Church, renouncing ancestral fasts [and feasts]...” To understand how such transgressions derived from a single oath would require an extensive catechesis for the uninitiated, an education theoretical and practical. Dositheos expressed its more rarified effects concisely, stating, “...they investigated things unknown even to the Angels, theologized [according] to Aristotle, changed [*metaballein*] the Mysteries, synchronized things unsynchronous, considered brothers as slaves [or workers *doulous* in the New Testament and ‘hewers of wood and drawers of water in the Old], modified the seasons and times [i.e., the Gregorian Calendar], and introduced into the Church myths as dogma...” The West, as Dositheos had argued, rendered not only a

temporal schism, but also divorced its people from their common metaphysical and temporal heritage.⁴⁸⁶

Conspicuously missing from the volume of *Reconciliation* was a preface devoted to the prince of Moldavia where Dositheos had it published in 1692. On the one hand, this was due to the instability of Moldavia during the turbulent last decade of the seventeenth century and because both the prince of Wallachia, Constantin Brancoveanu (1688-1714) and the Grand Dragoman Nicholas Mavrocordatos (1670-1730) were opponents of the ruling Cantacuzino family in Moldavia. On the other hand, Dositheos wanted to focus the attention on Constantinople and the idea of its ecumenical patriarchate. Besides his preface to the Christian race, Dositheos dedicated the first preface of *Reconciliation* to “The most blessed and holy and most divine master and the present Patriarch of Constantinople Dionysius IV [1671-1694, intermittently].” Together with his call for the West to repent, Dositheos invited his audience to enter the city gates through the door, a door which Dositheos symbolically compared to the patriarchate of Constantinople.

Dositheos combined the metaphor of the door with the role of the shepherd, and warned:

For those from elsewhere come through the door into the worthy Patriarchate of the area, neither by violence nor by dynasty, neither by evil nor a certain kind of art, nor by way of correspondence can they ascend to the shepherd, but through a call [i.e., invitation] by the common custom, the canonical synods, the assembly of the most God-loving clergy, and by almost all of the holy clergy, and the

Christ-loving people of the Imperial city—hence the canonical being the vote, the door-keeper opens and is filled with much grace from which enables [the door-keeper], as a prudent manager of a household [*economos*] of the master' sheep through the savior's care according to the imitation of the Lord, to lead them in and out—not by deceptive words, but by the power of the holy spirit.⁴⁸⁷

In addition to the patriarchal door and the city gates of Constantinople, Dositheos continued the metaphor by also describing the armory, military units, and the defensive shield with which the door-keeper guarded the entryway. He pointed to the confession of faith, writing, “You are the door of the knights, guarding those apostolic dogmas, clean from alien [contaminations]—hence that famous man Panayiotis [Nikousios] the Great Interpreter (1669-1673) [and diplomat] was urged to print the Orthodox Confession, through which the loose mouths of our sycophant enemies was fenced in.”⁴⁸⁸

* * *

Dositheos passed away in 1707 and bequeathed the patriarchate of Jerusalem to Chrysanthos Notaras (1663-1731). To the Greek fraternity and Arab Orthodox residents in Jerusalem and Palestine Dositheos bestowed his twelve volume set *History of the Jerusalem Patriarchate*, to which Chrysanthos contributed a biography of Dositheos and published in 1715. For the Greek diaspora, Slavic, and Romanian Orthodox inhabitants in and around the Danubian Principalities and Transylvania Dositheos entrusted his printing press through which the hesychast tradition bloomed from the publications of works by

Symeon the New Theologian (949-1022), Gregory of Cyprus, and Gregory Palamas (1296-1359. In his reply to the West he left his answer in the form of a *Confession* (1672). Regarding the former, Dositheos was excluded from the lineage and legacy of the hesychast tradition, and in the latter so-called 'western influences' have made his orthodox authenticity suspect.

Although Dositheos neither studied abroad nor expressed sympathies toward the West, he was educated and lived during a period famously portrayed as a 'Babylonian Captivity,' and therefore, so-called 'western influences' were practically inescapable. At one time, even Mt. Athos hosted a Jesuit academy. This is the 'captive' context in which Yannaras criticized Dositheos and his *Confession* (1672) as "...the involuntary alienation of Orthodox theologians in the modern period."⁴⁸⁹ As to whether Dositheos himself suffered alienation, Yannaras presented compelling evidence: Dositheos thought the giving of indulgences an Eastern orthodox custom and tradition.⁴⁹⁰ Martin Luther made indulgences a focus of popular protest in the sixteenth century, but in the seventeenth there was still a lucrative market for them. As to Dositheos' *Confession*, Yannaras objected that all 17th century confessions "...ignored the catholicity and experiential priority of the Eucharist."⁴⁹¹ Here, the evidence is not so definitive.

To clarify Yannaras' position, it would be best to begin, as he did, with Loukaris and Korydalleus; his historical argument, however, is summarized as follows: "The fourteenth-century hesychast controversy contrasts Orthodoxy and the West as experience against abstract religious 'conviction.'⁴⁹² Yannaras' philosophical argument contrasts Aristotelian apophatism with the West's penchant for 'correct thinking.' In answer to the perennial aporetic quandary 'what is real' Yannaras juxtaposed Palamite

empiricism (i.e., participation in God's energies) with the Western *intellectus*, "[w]hen the truth about reality is reduced to an intellectual idea and its correct definition..."⁴⁹³

Finally, in terms of what one believes Yannaras explained that the West equated *logos* with 'concept' or 'idea' and relied on a 'correct-*argumentatio*' for verifying one's beliefs.

For the Orthodox, however, Yannaras concluded:

“[Words, names, concepts] are only symbols [*symbola*] which bring together [*synballousi*] or coordinate individual experiences, inviting them to an experiential participation in the common *logos* of the experiences.”⁴⁹⁴

Thus, the difference might be expressed as believing from experience versus believing by thinking. However, Yannaras goes further than that: believing *is* participating in the *logos* through the Eucharist.⁴⁹⁵ In other words, it was a sort of orthodox believing that draws practically all people together in an ephemeral moment and miraculous liminal location.

Although Dositheos and Yannaras begin their narratives of 'the creation of the West' in roughly corresponding time periods and historical markers (conversion, the *filioque*, and the Emperor), their diachronic dialogue leads us back to the Eucharist table and the location of the Christ's 'real presence' in the bread and wine. At this point, the German Luther might ask how one participates in the hearing of the word (*logos*), and another is converted by the preaching of it, if that does not constitute participation? The Swiss Zwingli would probably object that participation in the *logos* happens through a spiritual experience—but conviction, correct (*orthē*) belief, and faith are required—not through a perfunctory ritual performance.⁴⁹⁶ Dositheos might, of course, agree with Yannaras' position, but formally approve of the word (*logos*) transubstantiation (to which

Yannaras would separate himself from Dositheos and step to the other side of the table to make some distance); otherwise, Dositheos always appealed to mystery and preferred to remain silent (*hesychia*). A Greek audience might point to section B, paragraph 2 of the Epidaurus Constitution and ask Yannaras how belief in Christ (*Logos*) according to that document is “... a mode of life rather than a place[?]”⁴⁹⁷ In the West, the entire debate might be simplified into a headline as the difference between *quae* and *qua*: the faith which one believes (*fides quae creditor*) or the faith by which one believes (*fides qua creditor*).⁴⁹⁸

In 1754, almost a half-century after Dositheos’ passing, there occurred on Mt. Athos a large protest of monks denouncing the practice of observing memorial services on Sunday instead of Saturday. The protesting monks considered the ‘modern’ change to be a result of western influences and the overall alienation of Athonites from their Orthodox spiritual roots. This traditionalist movement came to be known as the Kollyvades, named after the *kollyva* (boiled wheat and sugar) eaten after the memorial service. In addition to insisting on the correct observance of the memorial, they argued that frequent, quotidian communion should be the order and common *praxis* of Athonites and not a rare, extraordinary occasion. This latter issue incited fervent counter-protests from other Athonites and counter-measures by the patriarchate of Constantinople that were sometimes physically violent and involved public book burnings. Eventually, the Kollyvades won them both over: the memorial services were celebrated on Saturdays and frequent communion confirmed by a Constantinopolitan council in 1819. The famous leaders of this protest movement were: Neophytos Kafsokalyvitis (1713-1784), Athanasios Parios (1722-1813), Makarios Notaras (1731-1805), and Nicodemos

Kallivroutes (1749-1809). The latter two figures were inspired to collect and edit manuscripts by Gregory of Sinai, Gregory Palamas, Symeon the New Theologian and other hesychasts. In 1782 these collections were later published from Venice, Italy, as the *Philokalia*. For about a century prior to its publication, hesychasm on Mt. Athos laid dormant.⁴⁹⁹

In the Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia, however, hesychasm remained the spiritual center of its Romanian people, their practice, education, and vision. Before Gregory Palamas guarded its creedal and formal doctrine at council in the fourteenth century, hesychasm had long sustained the devotional life of hermetic monks and coenobitic monasteries on Mt. Athos, located on one peninsula of three in northeastern Greece. In the fourteenth century Palamas' elder Gregory of Sinai (d. 1346) established a monastic village in the forested mountains of Paroria, Bulgaria. His fame and reputation preceded his arrival there and drew audiences and disciples to him from all parts of the Byzantine Commonwealth. Two of Gregory's pupils, Theodosius of Trnovo and the patriarch of Constantinople Kallistos (and Theodosius' biographer), later made the monastery of Kilifarevo in northern Bulgaria a center of hesychastic education, missions, and manuscript editing, publishing, and translating in Slavonic. Under the literary reforms taking by Ethymius of Trnovo a third generation of hesychast at Kilifarevo sought to calibrate the Slavic translations with the original Greek. From this 'Trnovo School' of hesychasm the missionary activities overflowed in all directions throughout the Balkans and into Ukraine and Russia.

In the above narrative of the hesychast international the Romanians prefer to make the distinction that hesychasm in the Principalities and Transylvania arose

independent of the Bulgarian school and came directly from Mt. Athos *via* Nikodimos of Tismana (1320-1406) and his disciples. It was he after all who established the famous monasteries of Tismana in Wallachia and Neamt in Moldavia among many other monasteries there and in Transylvania. Romanian princes, like their Bulgarian, Serbian, and Slavic neighbors, participated in the commerce of philanthropy and royal competition for national prestige through the patronage of monasteries on Athos. Yet, it was only the Romanians within the Athonite Commonwealth who never acquired a representative monastery on Athos. They came closest with the 'lavra of Wallachia' at Koutloumousiou monastery; however, it was under Greek leadership on Athos, and the latter were adamant it stay that way. Nonetheless, Romanian donations to the mountain remained generous, especially to the Vatopedi monastery.

The spirit of hesychasm abided abroad in Romania for the following centuries, but on Mt. Athos at the behest of the famous Vatopaidi monastery the Athonite academy was founded, and its faculty and students inspired a hesychast renaissance in the second half of the eighteenth century.

Although Dositheos was excluded from the memorialized lineage and list of hesychast revivalists, his diplomatic activities were mirrored by Kaisarios Dapontes (1714-1784) in Romania and his rhetorical eloquence by Kosmas of Aetolia (1714-1779). Dapontes political connections with Romanian princes and the Phanar of Constantinople contributed to his successful charitable campaigns on behalf of Athos; moreover, while Dapontes wrote and published several religious and secular works, it was Dositheos who first republished the original Greek hesychast works in Romania during the last quarter of the seventeenth century. Kosmas was a student of the Athonite academy whose

charismatic preaching gained him fame in Constantinople, Greece, and the Balkans. His missionary fervor was enflamed by wide spread conversions of Orthodox people to Islam. The solution emphasized by Kosmos was a familiar refrain. Referencing, not Moses' imperative to speech (*logos*), but Moses' years of education in the *logos*, Kosmas exclaimed:

...learn Greek because our Church uses Greek. And if you don't learn Greek, my brethren, you can't understand what our Church confesses. It is better, my brother, for you to have a Greek school in your village rather than fountains and rivers, for when your child becomes educated, he is then a human being. The school opens churches; the school opens monasteries....

And, concerning the nations and secular learning, Kosmas repeated:

...This is why you must establish Greek schools, so that people will be enlightened because by reading Greek I found that it enlightens and illuminates the mind of the student as the sun illuminates the earth.⁵⁰⁰

Kosmas reportedly performed many miracles and died a martyr in Albania.

In the second half of the eighteenth century the direction of hesychast outpouring from Athos to Romania and beyond reversed, so to speak, when the Ukrainian Paisy Velichkovsky first learned about it while visiting Moldavia and Wallachia. His Romanian elder Basil of Poiana Marului (1692-1767) composed the preface for hesychast authors such as Gregory of Sinai, and this inspired Paisy to reform Slavic translations based on the original Greek. He had access to Dositheos' publications in Moldavia and Wallachia, but thirsted and searched for more on Mt. Athos. At the time of Paisy's visit to Athos, the

contest between the Kollyvades and counter-protestors had erupted; therefore, in addition to the texts Pasios discovered himself, he also brought back to Moldavia the *Philokalia*. He translated the *Philokalia* into Slavonic and published it from Moscow in 1793 as *Dobrotolyubie*. The Muscovite and Venetian publications remained the only editions of the *Philokalia* until 1946 when Dumitru Staniloae published a Romanian translation from his home in Transylvania.

The first director of the new Athonite academy was Neophytos Kafsokalyvitis, one of the leading figures of the Kollyvades protests. He wrote the controversial work *On Frequent Communion*, which his colleagues Makarios Notaras and Nicodemos Kallivroutes edited and published along with the *Philokalia*. Its full title was: *The Philokalia of the Neptic [Neptikon] Saints gathered from our Holy God-bearing Fathers in which the mind [nous] is purified, illuminated, and perfected through the philosophy of astatic practice [praxis] and contemplation [theoria]*. One example of the prescripts in the *Philokalia* comes from the advice of Abba (Father) Philimon to a novice. After the Abba suggested that the novice repeat ‘the Jesus Prayer’ unceasingly while awake, she asked him how to guard against ‘vain fantasies’ during sleep.⁵⁰¹ He answered: “[R]ecite the holy Creed of the Orthodox faith before you fall asleep. For true belief in God is the source and guard of all blessings.”⁵⁰² One might have further asked what the difference between *praxis* and true belief is.

Perhaps, the *philokalic* bond between Markarios Notaras and Dositheos Scarpetos led to the latter’s misnomer and not just the happenstance of their common birthplace, although both families were merchants in Constantinople. Makarios was related to Dositheos’ patriarchal successor Chrysanthos Notaras. Makarios was

responsible for gathering the manuscripts of the *Philokalia*, soliciting funds for its productions, and petitioning the famous Mavrocordatos family for assistance with its publication in Venice. He also supported Nicodemus' other writings and ensured the publication of an updated and expanded edition of Dositheos' treasure, the works of Symeon the New Theologian.

In some ways Dositheos and Nicodemus lived very different lives. The former rose through the ecclesiastical ranks to become the patriarch of Jerusalem and traveled abroad; the later achieved the highest monastic rank of 'the Great Schema' and never left the holy mountain. In other ways, the two participated in one mission: the preservation of hesychasm within the Orthodox Commonwealth (Dositheos) and the Athonite Commonwealth (Nicodemus). Nicodemus also mirrored Dositheos' theological legacy that included accusations of 'western influences'. Nicodemus was a prolific writer, his most famous being the *Handbook of Spiritual Counsel*. A year before the turn of the nineteenth century, he also produced a collection of saints in the *Synaxaristis* and a collection of post-Byzantine martyrs in *New Martyrologium*. His other edited and translated collections, however, made him suspect: the Italian work *Unseen Warfare*; the Jesuit *Spiritual Exercises* by the famous Ignatius Loyola; and, the Athonite *A Manual of Confession*.

This last collection had entirely eastern sources; however, Nicodemus' 'scholastic' arrangement of the categories and terminologies eventually required explications by later apologists.⁵⁰³ Dositheos' reputed 'nephew' Patriarchate Chrysanthos also wrote a *Manual of Confession*, which Nicodemus highly recommended. There had been a certain pastoral market for confession manuals since the early seventeenth

century, when Nikephoros Paschaleus (1570-1650) published his in 1622 from Venice—the ‘crypto-Calvinist’ Patriarch Loukaris criticized it for being too Roman Catholic.⁵⁰⁴ Although Dositheos never published a confession manual of that type, Nicodemos too affirmed the practice of indulgences by even requesting one from Constantinople for himself.⁵⁰⁵ Apoplectically, Yannaras reiterated, “Yet Nikodemos was the editor of the *Philokalia*, the translator of Symeon the New Theologian, the writer who reminded the Orthodox of Gregory Palamas and his teaching.”⁵⁰⁶ Nicodemos and Dositheos shared spiritual legacies and similar orthodox accusations.

Conclusion

At the turn of the twentieth century a massive fifteen volume Catholic encyclopedia was published from New York in 1913. In the sixth volume, following an alphabetized entry for a city in the state of Montana called ‘Great Falls,’ Greece received generous attention by the editor and the subject was divided into seven sections: The first segment was entitled “The Land and the People” and the last part “The Church in Enslaved Greece.” In between that framing Dositheos was named within a “truculent school” and lineage of fiery, religious polemicists. This encyclopedic entry continued unexpectedly in a self-descriptive moment that might best be considered as an early post-modern revelation by confession:

I have not touched on the religious spirit of the Greek clergy, for as a rule it is sadly deficient; nor on its missions, for there are none; nor its present monastic life, confined to Athos and no more than a recitation of endless prayers interspersed with local intrigues. Other religious houses exist only in name; they are now, for the most part, farms managed by a so-called monk and supplying funds to Athos or elsewhere.⁵⁰⁷

The western chauvinism expressed above compares to Panchenko’s reflection on Palestinian Orthodox Arabs, as previously mentioned in the introduction of this dissertation. Panchenko wrote, “...they [i.e., the Orthodox Arabs of Palestine] are totally devoid of inner fortitude and firmness of belief or some inner core. They are susceptible to external pressure and willing to trade their beliefs and identity and these qualities grow from century to century.”⁵⁰⁸ These remarks on the Orthodox Greeks and the Orthodox

Arabs highlight the influence of historians on interpretations and recollections, their editions and translations of the past. Dositheos' *History of the Jerusalem Patriarchate* was no exception—he mostly ignored the Orthodox Arabs.

In Panchenko's concluding remarks on the Orthodox Arabs he contrasts their lack of "inner fortitude and firmness of belief or some inner core" with Dositheos who, according to Panchenko, had the inverse ability "...to sacrifice personal ambitions for the sake of abstract goals and values."⁵⁰⁹ For certain, if we overlook the practical subjugation of the indigenous Orthodox Arabs under the first and second Greek Peloponnesian dynasties in reality, then Dositheos exemplified abroad that missionary spirit, confessional imperative, and devotion to abstract deals. Yannaras, however, disagrees with Panchenko's appraisal of Dositheos' orthodox legacy and fidelity to the 'inner fortitude' and 'belief' of the Eastern Church. These two competing views on Dositheos are not surprising since Dositheos was a confessor.

In their public role confessors were on the diasporic frontier of shifting boundaries and the management of unity and diversity. The confessor served a mediatory role in the formulation of a collective unity of belief from the uncertain realities communities of believers encountered across vast deserts and the thresholds of many figurative doors, gates, and borders. A confessional imperative was not and cannot ever be satisfied from a lukewarm, center position. Confessional unity divides. Confessional identity unites. It appeals to the whole, while parsing words and meanings into mysteries of speech and rites of initiation, one might even say the rights of citizenship.

As a creedal historian Pelikan affirmed the significance of a close, intertextual reading, and perhaps theological interpretation of the creedal articles. More importantly, however, Pelikan emphasized that overall these articles “...cannot be understood *historically* without attention to the confessional principle [i.e., the *shema*] that dominates so much of Protestantism in the generation[s] beginning with the Reformation.”⁵¹⁰ This hermenutical approach to creedal articles applies to confessional identities of the past and the present and of the west and the east. It applies wherever a collective confession is given voice, and whenever a confessional identity becomes creedal to a people. Confessional identities are made up of articles of belief, and therefore, transcend borders. The *shema* was a way of monotheistic speaking that declared an identity to its listeners, while the schema was a way of seeing monotheistically the dialectic of the old and the new and of the body and the blood—as one. That exact moment of confessional unity is difficult to locate in the past and is impossible to predict, but the signs of its occurrence are: the martyrs of state persecution and their historians, the confession of survivors and their subscribers, the ministry of teachers and its students, the revolution of a people and her creed.

* * *

The confessional principle—the schematic call for unity—applies to Yannaras’ ‘the real Hellenism,’ but also to liberal, post-colonial perspectives such as Elias Bouboutsis proposes in his book *Singing in a Strange Land*. The scholars Yannaras, the conservative anti-western, and Bouboutsis, the progressive pro-western, are confessors

with a schema. Neither intentionally used the confessor's strategies, but they participated in the language of confessional identity; specifically, the language of the *shema* and the schema. When the subject is unity and collective identity, the language of confession and the principle of the schema apply. It is a habit of language and speech.

Elias Bouboutsis asserts a 'third way' to combine the dialectic with assistance from Nikos Kazantzakis' synthesis called 'the way of reconciliation.' It is a model of integration that Bouboutsis also bases on the modern work of psychologist John W. Berry and on the older "...Palamite vision of divine harmony in distinct energies and operations..."⁵¹¹ John W. Berry's model of integration seeks to avoid the pitfalls often associated with cultural encounters that lead to assimilation, marginalization, and separation. The first two responses from the subjugated class preclude self-identification, and the remaining category preserves identity while forsaking a relationship and social interaction with the dominate class. Integration, however, upholds both an inclusive identity and harmonious relationship. This integrationist model serves as the 'third way' for Bouboutsis' schema. As a consequence, Bouboutsis' 'third way' is conjoined with a "singularity of purpose" and "a singularity of faith and mission."⁵¹² His post-critical analysis too, therefore, resembles the role of the confessor, the strategy of mystification, and the authority of teachers.

Bouboutsis prefers the adjective cultural over national to designate and unify the various tributary forms of Eastern Orthodoxy: the Chalcedonians (i.e., the Coptic, Armenian, and Ethiopian), the Russians, the Balkans, and even the Greek 'Western Rite'. This cultural lens directs Bouboutsis from a defense of plurality and integration to a demonstrative argument that asserts the possibility for a transcultural *ethnogenesis*; the

historical existence of a meta-culture from two parent cultures; and, the transformative relationship of collective participation in one ‘peoplehood.’ His model of integration mirrors the modern work of Maria Todorova, whose narrative of Balkan history asserted the continuation of a post-Byzantine ‘transcultural synthesis,’ and sociologist Fernando Ortiz whose narrative of agency among the subjected class—in a supposed positive/negative ‘symphony’ with the dominate class—posits a “transcultural: organic unity.”⁵¹³

Their’s and Bouboutsis’ schemas necessitate that its *apodictic* or historical demonstration of this meta-culture points to a ‘peoplehood’ always in a state of transubstantiation—very real but not essentially. Such linguistic nuances lent themselves to strategic gambits in the confessor’s *ars dialectica*. Bouboutsis highlights the schema from the famous Greek literary Nikos Kazantzakis, who envisioned an inclusive identity for modern Hellenes and called on them to “...join together, mix, and [be] reconciled, creating the supreme miracle: harmony. All this must constitute the Greek miracle.”⁵¹⁴ In Kazantzakis’ essay entitled *Dilemmas of Neohellenic Culture*, he provides an illustration of dialogue between himself, who plays the role of the teacher, and an inquisitive student who sought the correct answer for solving the dialectical dilemma of unity and diversity. In response Kazantzakis pointed back to a golden age of pluralism, when the Greeks supposedly not only interacted harmoniously with others, but more importantly, he wrote, “...made the ancient Greeks the ancestor of all people and races...”⁵¹⁵ Like the honeybee and the choicest blooms of the garden this blending, asserted Kazantzakis, only improved the Greeks.

Bouboutsis interprets Kazantakis' psychoanalytic theory through a schema—as Kazantakis phrased it 'the way of reconciliation.' Bouboutsis explains the mystery for us:

[Kazantakis] identifies the Byzantine East 'with its direct connection to the mystical *ousia* of the cosmos' as the living, ineffable 'unconscious of the Neohellene.' The classical 'Greek spiritual intellect,' on the other hand, invariably sought to give form to that mystical essence, to render the unconscious somehow conscious. That cultural synthesis, he concludes here as elsewhere, has always been the real 'Greek miracle.'⁵¹⁶

This was Bouboutsis' vision of unit—the manna translated from the Aramaic meaning, 'What is'?

In closing Bouboutsis described the accompanying mission to Kazantakis' historical miracle, which consequently mirrors Bouboutsis' own vision of a "mission-oriented, diaspora Orthodox identity."⁵¹⁷ As with all schematic translations, old and new, the mission was catechetical and the *kerygma* (i.e., the preached word) was mystical. Quoting Kazantakis, Bouboutsis elaborates and states, "The challenge for Orthodox Greeks is 'to translate the enigmatic voice of the East into intelligible *logos*.'" Bouboutsis turned to the reader and summarized Kazantakis' confessional imperative. As his twenty-first century readers contemplated the European Union and the diaspora of Orthodox Greeks in the United States, Bouboutsis pointed not to Constantinople; rather, he echoed Kazantakis' "...[exhortative] chorus of those Ottoman and postcolonial voices that refuse to 'forget Jerusalem.'" While Bouboutsis exhorted his readers to remember Jerusalem, he repeated the mission to make intelligible the *logos* "...to realize pluralism and integration once again... to relive the 'Greek miracle' and to recover the

transnational pluralist, and integrative intercultural process...” Bouboutsis cleverly avoids essentialism with a mystical incarnation of the body—an ever present transubstantiative or changing peoplehood always in process.

Bouboutsis calls this “the intercultural imperative.” This mission pertains to the ministry of teachers, but to the readers Bouboutsis repeated St. Basil the Great’s pedagogical imperative (and echoed by Martin Luther to the Swabian Peasants): It was necessary for students to exhibit “... [an] openness in learning.”⁵¹⁸ The historic miracle and its ephemeral nature are less conspicuous without the advantage of a confessional analysis of identity that contextualizes the place of mystery and of authority.

Observe, for example, Bouboutsis’ apophatic explanation of a ‘prenationalistic identity’ as being “...neither Greek nor American, neither Slav nor Canadian, neither Arab nor Brazilian, but Orthodox...our primary identity is grounded not in ethnicity or nationality or citizenship or race or language but in communion—in the Orthodox faith and way of life.”⁵¹⁹ This is Bouboutsis’ vision of unity. This is Bouboutsis’ testament to ‘the real presence’ of blended identities throughout the historical record. Here, Bouboutsis concurs not only with modern ‘progressive’ historians and psychologists of intercultural piety and mission, but also with the ‘conservatism’ of Yannaras and the religious ‘fundamentalism’ of Dositheos—that this is a transubstantiated ‘blended’ identity and unified way of life. It was a monotheistic and schematic way of seeing, and a *shema* to be believed, confessed, and obeyed.

Dositheos echoes Bouboutsis' 'the third way' and Kazantazkis' 'the way of reconciliation' in the preface to Dositheos' book *Reconciliation*. Dositheos reminded his readers about the symbolic importance of Jerusalem, even though the preface was addressed and dedicated to Dionysius IV the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople (intermittently from 1671 to 1694). Like Bouboutsis and Kazantazkis, Dositheos was also concerned with a mission-oriented unity, and the sectarian climate he encountered on his sojourn throughout the Danubian Principalities required pointing beyond Constantinople to the Holy City of Jerusalem—the original, historic miracle.

Dositheos presents six points in his opening paragraph about the ecumenical or universal Church and the value of the bishop's office. The first point parallels the last by equating the "Shepherd of the sheep" with the person of Jesus, while the final point expounds on the first by concluding that the person of Jesus also symbolizes "the Door." Dositheos arrives at this syllogism by introducing the Old Testament Law and its ministers as "proto-typologies" (*prototypomene*) that shone brighter and clearer in the New Testament. He uses the examples of the person of Jacob and the person of Moses. These two shepherds (i.e., bishops), Dositheos explained, "...demonstrated that the good Lord was the Shepherd of the sheep, who also called himself the door."

Dositheos next provided the symbolic meaning of 'the Door' by locating it in Jerusalem. He wrote, "It is said that the door originally received its meaning from the Gates of Jerusalem. For the Holy City had the Ancient Door, the one shut up [i.e., the East Gate], the Knights Gate, the Gate of Refuse, the Armed-Guards Gate—and, the Fountain Gate, which was a type [or print image, *etypos*] of paradise in which God ordered the cherubim and the flaming sword encircling it to protect the way of the tree of

life.” During Dositheos’ era, the ‘Old City’ of Jerusalem was divided into four quarters: Muslim, Christian, Armenian, and Jewish. In the sixteenth century the Ottomans (under Suleiman the Magnificent) sealed up the world famous East Gate of Jerusalem; however, the East Gate was not—according to modern archeological evidence—the same door described in the New Testament book of Acts as “the Beautiful Gate” nor the door prophesized by Ezekiel in the Old Testament. Just as the ancient walls of Jerusalem had been rebuilt under Suleiman the Magnificent in the sixteenth century, the number and locations of Jerusalem’s ancient gates were equally malleable and susceptible to the properties and natural elements of history’s vagarious *essentia*.

Dositheos builds upon the ten gates described in the book of Nehemiah, chapter three, and in particular four gates: the East, the Knights, the Refuse Gate, and the Fountain Gate. The fifth Gate of Armed-Guards that Dositheos referenced was not one from Nehemiah’s list, but probably alluded to the Guarded Doors in the early church which prevented the uncatechized from participating in the Eucharist.

The second point concerned the divinity of Mary as the eternal virgin and mother of God. By referencing Mary and her pregnancy Dositheos alluded to the East Gate where the ‘Annunciation of Mary’ was thought to have historically and miraculously occurred. The remaining three gates—the Knights, the Refuse, and the Armed—were also emblematic of a spiritual meaning. Dositheos’ third point compared the apostles to the Gate of the Knights and the ‘Shield of Salvation’ which he explained, “... [was] the proclamation of the Gospel to all the nations [*ethni*] through the apostles.” His fourth point praised the martyrs “...who became the Refuse and a theater [or spectacle, *theatron*] to the world for their love of dogma, which they maintained indifferent until

death.” Finally, his fifth point provided the meaning behind the gate of Armed-Guards, “...which waging battle with eternal spiritual weapons, protected and shall protect the sheep from all who contrive against them.” Dositheos summarized his opening paragraph in his sixth point, which concluded that the schematic Christ “...is the chief Door, the Fountain Gate of those gates and doors everywhere.”

After providing the spiritual meaning of Jerusalem’s ancient doors, Dositheos returned to the image of the shepherd. He emphasizes the salvific necessity of a shepherd who can lead the sheep through the gate. Dositheos alludes to another ancient door of Jerusalem—the Gate of Sheep. He depicts a sense of initiation and belonging by focusing on the leading and entering “...through the Gate into the court of the sheep.” He points to the example of the Old Testament priesthood under Aaron “...to whom the Guard, namely the Holy Spirit, opened the contents of spiritual wisdom and revealed to him the mysteries and spoke through him.” Between the shepherd and the sheep was a phonograph playing, a person speaking, and a word (i.e., *logos*) leading.

It might be objected that between Bouboutsis’ modern schema and Dositheos’ confessional schema there exist great disparities in their liberal or conservative perspectives and their inclusive vision of Jerusalem. Nonetheless, in their application and approach to ecumenical unity they have more in common with Berry’s modern scientific study. As Bouboutsis notes, “Berry identifies religion and religious conversion as key variables...” Therefore, conversion, devotion, and the medium greatly affect which direction the diaspora community assumes—separation, marginalization, assimilation, and integration. Bouboutsis rightly asserts, agreeing with Berry’s clinical focus, that the first two important variables—conversion and devotion—are essentially pastoral

questions, and therefore, "...the media's acculturative influences should also be explored pastorally." Bouboutsis describes the mediative role of the confessor by stating: "...it is a pastoral question of guiding diaspora and convert faithful into enhanced Orthodox discernment and critical thought about those broadcast and Netcast stimuli."⁵²⁰

Considering the timelessness of Berry's variables—conversion, devotion, and media—the role of the confessor in the seventeenth century after almost two centuries of printing technologies, global reporting, and borderless proselytism, remains just as relevant in the postmodern era of media branding, internet connections, virtual identities, and a vast audience of youtube subscribers and facebook followers.

Observe Dositheos' own pastoral mode in this same preface from his book *Reconciliation*. After his introduction on the ancient doors of Jerusalem, the shepherd leading the sheep through the gate, and the Old Testament priesthood of Araon, Dositheos gives a word of advice and provides three images that underlie his pastoral concern. On the shepherd's voice calling to the sheep, Dositheos stated, "To have this [i.e., voice] it is necessary to speak as best possible a word of well-being and non-accusatory, by which he calls the sheep by name according to the example of the Lord." Dositheos was referring to the Biblical stories of the ministry of 'the angel of the Lord' and their intervention in Abraham's filicide by calling to him evocatively, "Abraham, Abraham"; the example of Samuel who heard the Lord speak to him "Samuel, Samuel" in the vocative voice; and, the famous Damascus story and conversion of the Apostle Paul on the roadway where he was suddenly engulfed by a divine light and heard a voice saying "Saul, Saul." These were the words of well-being and non-accusatory, a simple doublet for elocutionary effect.

Dositheos continued, “In the same way he leads the sheep in and out.” Dositheos referenced the Gospel of Luke 12:37, where Jesus told the parable of the blessed servants’ preparations and expectations for the master of the house to return. In response to his disciple Peter’s question ‘Lord, are you telling this parable for us or for all?’ Jesus answered with an aporetic or puzzling question, “Who then is the faithful and wise manager, whom his master will set over his household [*economos*]...” Dositheos pointed to the ministry of the manager in the maintenance of his master’s household. Dositheos used the word *economos*, which literally means ‘the inhabitants’ and from which derives the English word for ecumenical or universal (i.e., the inhabited world). Dositheos returned to the leading out of the sheep by the shepherd’s voice and explained the purpose of the ministry: “He leads [them] out to a vision causing the sheep to ascend to the highest [where] the good faithful rest.” Dositheos gave the example of Moses’ encounter with God on Mt. Sinai after leading the freed, formerly enslaved Hebrews out of Egypt.

Dositheos summarized from the book of Numbers with a schema, “The God of all said to Moses go up to the mountain and see the land which I myself shall give [to you] for occupation—for those able to see shall draw closer to the blessings from God.” From this mountain top, mission-oriented vision Dositheos turned to the famous example of Queen Sheba’s visit to King Solomon motivated by reports that he was the wisest king of the land. Specifically, Dositheos noted 1 Kings 10:3, which reported that: “Solomon answered all her questions; there was nothing hidden from the king that he could not explain to her.” It may seem as though Dositheos was repeating the significance for intellectual engagement with real-world questions, theories, and problems, but Dositheos

was in fact illustrating the juxtaposition between shepherd and sheep, master and servant, teacher and student, speaker and audience.

Dositheos' final image came from the New Testament example of Jesus being dutifully waited upon by Martha, which leads her to complain that her sister Mary was not being a good servant to Jesus and his disciples. While Martha actively served the house guests, her sister Mary sat dozing at Jesus' feet. Dositheos quoted, "For the Lord said, 'Martha, Martha' you are anxious and troubled about many things. Mary has chosen the good part, which shall not leave her." Dositheos explained, "This is the spiritual shepherd, whom God gave the apostles, and to those after them to make shepherds and teachers of his church." This was not so much a lauding of ecclesiastical authority (although that aspect cannot be excluded) as it was Dositheos' instructions on an efficient management of the master's house to its servants. For when Queen Sheba had become convinced, converted, "...and seen all the wisdom of Solomon..." it was in the form of beholding Solomon's "...house, the food of his table, the seating of his officials, and the attendance of his servants..." (1 Kings 10:1-8) that took her breath away in one vision and aporetic moment, as also described in Jospheus' *Antiquities of the Jews* 8:168-170.

Dositheos exhorted his readers that "They ought to lead the church by work⁵²¹ and speech [*logos*]" and concluded with a familiar image: "For to shepherd and to teach the Lord commanded, and after the divine washing, [the Lord] said, 'If you know these things, blessed are you if you do them.'" This last verse Dositheos quoted from John 13:17, after the "Lord and Teacher" Jesus had washed his disciples' feet and said, "Truly, truly, I say to you, a servant is not greater than his master..."

In the subsequent paragraph, Dositheos retraces the themes of his opening paragraph. After mentioning the importance of the patriarchate as a door, Dositheos writes, “Hence, the rule being by vote, the Guard-Door opens and much grace is filled, from which [he] is empowered as caretaker of the house of salvation for the lord’s sheep by right according to the imitation of the Lord, by leading them in and out not with deceptive words, but by the power of the holy spirit.” Dositheos continued with scriptural evidence from the Apostle Paul writing to the church of Corinthians: “My speech and many messages [or preaching, *kerygma*] do not persuade with the words of human wisdom, but in a demonstration [*apodeixei*] of the Spirit and power.” Besides Paul’s use of the word demonstration here, the word is used only two other times in the New Testament sources: once, concerning the *eschaton* and ‘the mystery of lawlessness’ in Thessalonians wherein Paul warns them “...not to be about quickly shaken in mind or alarmed, either by a spirit or a spoken word [*dia-logos*], or a letter seeming to be from us...Let no one deceive you in any way” (2:1-7). And, once during Paul’s trial before the Roman procurator Festus in the twenty-fourth chapter of Acts, the word was used to describe the accusations of the Jews against Paul. Although, as the text states “...since they [i.e., Jews] could not prove [*apodeixai*]” the criminal charges, the procurator Festus offered to change the location of the court trial from Caesarea to Jerusalem—but, Paul appealed to Caesar.

Dositheos returned to the image of Jerusalem, writing, “You, therefore, have been chrismated the ancient door, as the flaming sword protected the way of the tree of life.” Dositheos continued with another analogy concerning the Closed Gate (i.e., the East Gate) and Mary before arriving at the Gate of Knights. He explained, “You are the

Knights Gate, the dogma which the apostles maintained clear from adulteration.” There immediately followed Dositheos’ *Confession of Faith* (1672): “Hence, that all-famous and all-holy man the great Interpreter urged to be printed the Orthodox Confession.”

Dositheos closed his Preface to *Reconciliation* with the schema, the apophatic, and a mission-oriented vision of unity:

For the chief truth concerning the Trinity is that it alone is eternal—it is not received falsely, nor spoiled, neither modified, nor is it changed—likewise he has not been covered in an opened tomb, nor contained in a location. For it is a bubbling fountain-source—not from the garden of the [human] senses—but from the throne of the master or rather to say from the mouth of Christ. And it waters the face of the earth, bearing undefiled and undecaying fruit attached to the heavens—that is to say to the tree of life.

From this vision of an accessible heavenly paradise and its spiritual/earthly fruit, which Dositheos described with overtones of the Eucharistic ‘real presence,’ he turned to the historical present by, in a metaphoric sense, entering through a specific gate of Jerusalem carrying with him a spiritual gift from Mt. Athos—his *Reconciliation*. And he proclaimed:

Our [present] era is most divine because the Door of Armed-Guards has received the gift which is a weapon. For this weapon is not fleshly, but the power to tear down fortresses with God. Ascending to the highest mountains of Athos the raised high Voice strongly cries out: Give [this] book to those orthodox everywhere. On

the one hand, as a gift on behalf of the sustaining of piety; on the other hand, as a weapon a double-edged sword against those who oppose piety.

The combative tone upon which Dositheos concluded his preface betrays our ‘enlightened’ tastes and sensibilities of an integrated and transcultural ethos, and what might be imagined as an ideal, harmonious management of inclusive diversity and sacramental unity.⁵²² Dositheos’ ‘Armed-Jerusalem’ contrasts sharply with Bouboutsis’ ‘third way,’ Kazantzakis’ ‘the way of reconciliation,’ as well as, the wider Pan-Orthodox and Pan-Balkan project of ‘Disarming History,’ which Bouboutsis defines as the “...retelling [of] cultural histories toward less conflict-ridden futures.”⁵²³ Confessional identity, however, is born from conflict. The historian’s ‘ecumenical ethic’ must take into consideration that *Confessions of Faith* have historically arisen during periods of major unrest, protests, rebellions, and revolutions. The imperative to confess exists in pragmatic necessities. Confessional identity is a decisive form of unity that requires a certainty of belief beyond argumentation and debate—it is an orthodox belief.

In fact, the history of a people’s confessional identity strongly resembles a manual for ‘re-arming history’ and a partisan approach towards the act of believing that historic miracle—a moment of union. This formation of union is best framed, as this dissertation had done, within a Eucharistic space as the actinomorphic model. At the table of communion, unity and identity are created from conflicting confessions and beliefs, and these have an indelible, centrifugal effect.

Outside the Eucharistic space, Dositheos’ model for reconciliation, as he entitled his book, reflects the fiery, religious polemics as the Catholic encyclopedia categorized

him. In the public sphere arguments are presented as absolutes and nonproblematic, as unbiased and nonpartisan. They are debated as appeals to simple facts, eternal principles, and unchanging truths. Within the outer courts of public opinion the polemical is to orthodoxy as class-conflict is to identity politics—they are one and the same. Amid the public debates about ‘political-correctness’ or *ortho-doxa* (i.e., correct-opinion) and ‘cancel-culture’ or excommunication, there are fleeting moments of clarity and the imperative to confess and maintain, as Fanon expressed it, “...a people in the sphere of thought to describe, justify and praise the action through which that people has created itself and keeps itself in existence.”⁵²⁴ This confessional imperative requires speaking monotheistically, evocatively, and *orthodoxly*.⁵²⁵ Confessional identity is the confluence or synthesis of visionary ideals with material realities, the contemplative with the deed, the imagined thought with the spoken word.

What Fanon described as ‘a people in the sphere of thought’ aptly delievers the pre-modern, modern, and post-modern foundation of confessional identity. It is an immaterial reality. Confession began with the Hebrew *shema*, echoed in the Greek schema, and proclaimed orthodoxy at the first Ecumencial or Universal Council in the fourth century. This historical phenomenon occurred simultaneously with the transition of religious *ortho-praxis* to *ortho-doxa* communities of believers. The result of this ‘scriptural turn,’ as Fowden outlined, was the formation of communities of believers in a heightened state of self-identification, self-expression, and self-defense. In other words, believers gathered into communities through thoughts, words, and language. Self-identity became collective by creating a vision of union. Self-expression of this collective identity

occurred in the written word. And, its self-defense was spoken as a *Confession of faith* and made real.

Our modern era remains confessional. Indeed, technological advances have only deepened and extended the sphere of a people in thought and confession. We often inhabit (i.e., *economos*) confessional spaces and oratory places. We interact with others through illuminated screens (i.e., plasma, LCD, OLED and all other manner of screens). Take, for example, the formalized words and ritual practice of public apologies by political figures or confessional celebrities; the importance of words expressed or omitted in such an apology; the significance of its public performance; and, its believability.

In light of this dissertation's title "In Search of a Confessional Identity," it is helpful to conclude by framing Pelikan's analysis of 'believe, confess, and teach' within the perennial question 'What does Athens have to do with Jerusalem?' Pelikan regarded this as "...the most striking contrast of all between the Eastern and the Western confessional developments...the consideration of the process of inculturation."⁵²⁶

Bouboutsis specifically replied to this puzzling question in his book *Singing in a Strange Land*. Concerning the common Christian heritage of "the grecophone ancestors" with outsiders, Bouboutsis declared, "...the mission-orientated imperative [is]...to be authentic to those Cappadocians whom we lift up so high, we too must find ways to commune Jerusalem and every new 'Athens,' to sing the Lord's song in every strange land."⁵²⁷ For certain, Dositheos would have responded to Pelikan's query with his *Confession of Faith* (1672), and we have witnessed his synthesis between the esoteric and exoteric, which was also accompanied by a mission-orientated imperative to confess.

Nonetheless, these cataphatic replies would only be initiatory and require further catechetical study and pastoral guidance.

More attention need be given to the statements that Tertullian bracketed his famous aporetic question, “What does Athens have to do with Jerusalem?” Tertullian began by lamenting:

The philosophers and the heretics discuss the same subjects, and they employ the same involved argumentation. Poor Aristotle! It was you who taught them dialectics, to become champions at building up and tearing. They are so cunning in their theories, so labored in their inferences, so sure about their evidence, so officious in their debates, which...in the final analysis, nothing has been dealt with.

After Tertullian posed the question about the relationship between Athens and Jerusalem, he concluded with the confessor’s tale by stating:

Since the Gospel of Christ has been proclaimed to us, we no longer need to inquire, or to examine into such things...For this is the first principle of our faith: There is nothing beyond this faith which we must believe.⁵²⁸

From a confessional analysis the specificities of the central question are not as important as its framing; the question only need be aporetic. When the *ars dialectica* becomes exhaustive, and the perplexity remains, there is only ‘What is to be believed?’ Yet, the confessional framework asks more persuasively ‘What do you believe?’ and even the directly interrogative ‘Do you believe?’ The confession of faith answers cataphatically: ‘This is what we believe.’⁵²⁹ The schema declares: ‘This is who we are.’ Dositheos

recognized this necessity for light to give formation to the chaotic waters. When creating a symbol of unity there is a transubstantiation of the particulars, but—nonetheless—a confession of faith must be said.⁵³⁰

Dositheos' legacy as confessor demonstrates the mystery between *doxa* as opinion and the Eucharist as union. In the public sphere, however, *doxa* is better translated as glory. The Greek Septuagint translation of the Hebrew word *kavod* into *doxa* or glory incapsulates the confessor's popular legacy. There were many meanings of the *kavod* in the Old Testament, such as Pslam 3:3 relating to a shield (i.e., as battle armament); the first use of the word *kavod* in Genesis 31:1 in relation to one's wealth; and, *kavod* as reputation (Gen. 45:13). The best illustration of Old Testament *doxa*, however, comes from the book of Exodus (40:34-35) before a crowd of freed Israelites: "Then the cloud covered the tent of meeting, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle. Moses could not enter the tent of meeting because the cloud had settled on it, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle."

There stands the confessor. Therein lies the mystery. At the steppe of Mt. Sinai, located perhaps on a peninsula in between Egypt and the Arabian Peninsula, the crowds anticipated salvation, their heads tilted up, and their gaze toward the heavenly summit. The *logos* held their attention with the promise of bread and wine. For those in communion, willing to sacrifice body and blood on the ground, to them belonged eternal glory now and after memorialized. The others awaited silently the approaching morning mist with dry throats and parched tongues (*glossa*).

Dositheos passed away in 1707 and with him that last eastern *Confession of Faith* from Jerusalem (at least, according to Pelikan's formula and categories). In the Danubian Principalities the Greek princes from the Phanar Quarter of Istanbul continued Dositheos' educational reforms into the eighteenth century, but failed to maintain unity and diversity through a convincing schema against the rise of 'enlightened' nationalism, revolution, and Greek Independence in the early nineteenth century. And, the twentieth century 'ecumenical' vision from the United Nations to make real its *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* remains limited by nation-state borders.⁵³¹

In 'the new world' the act of confessing continued, but its American origins began at the revolution of 1776 with another confessional narrative between slave and master. Historian Gerald Horne, however, prefers to call it: the Counter-Revolution.⁵³² Horne too appealed to the transubstantial reality over the glorified schema of its victors.

Endnotes

¹ Leszek Kolakowski, *Modernity on Endless Trail* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 6.

² Dimitris Livanios, "The Quest for Hellenism: Religion, Nationalism and Collective Identities in Greece (1453-1913)," *The Historical Review*, Vol. 3 (2006), 50.

³ Victor Roudometof, *Nationalism, Globalization, and Orthodoxy: The Social Origins of Ethnic Conflict in the Balkans* (Praeger: Greenwood, 2001), 48.

⁴ Livanios, *The Quest for Hellenism*, 46.

⁵ Quoted from Eric D. Weitz, *A World Divided: The Global Struggle for Human Rights in the Age of Nation-States* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019), 47.

⁶ Constantin A. Panchenko, *Arab Orthodox Christians under the Ottomans: 1516-1831* (New York: Holy Trinity Seminary, 2016), 152. See also, Itamar Katz and Ruth Kark, "The Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem and its Congregation: Dissent over Real Estate," *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol. 37, no. 4 (November 2005): 509-534; Konstantinos Papastathis, "Arabic vs. Greek: the Linguistic Aspect of the Jerusalem Orthodox Church Controversy in Late Ottoman Times and the British Mandate," in *Arabic and its Alternatives: Religious Minorities and their Languages in the Emerging Nation States of the Middle East (1920-1950)*, eds. Heleen Murre-van de Berg, Karene Sanchez Summerer, and Tijmen Baarda (Leiden: Brill, 2020).

⁷ Quoted from Weitz, *A World Divided*, 41.

⁸ Paradoxically, Fowden concludes that Constantine's Empire was pluralist "...precisely because it espoused monotheism." *Empire to Commonwealth: Consequences of Monotheism in Late Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 58-59.

⁹ Dositheos, *History of the Jerusalem Patriarchate*, Vol. 1-12, (Bucharest, 1715), 8.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 1211.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 1211

¹² *Ibid.*, 12.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 4-5.

¹⁴ See, Bodo Nischan, *Prince, People, and Confession: The Second Reformation in Brandenburg* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994).

¹⁵ See, Heinz Schilling, *Early Modern European Civilization and its Political and Cultural Dynamism: The Menahem Stern Jerusalem Lectures* (Lebanon: University Press of New England, 2008).

¹⁶ S. E. Finer, *The History of Government: From the Earliest Times, in Empires, Monarchies, and the Modern State*, Vol. 3 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999); R. C. van Caenegem, *An Historical Introduction to Western Constitutional Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

¹⁷ "Thus, the wars called 'religious' were mainly about politics, but also about religion." James D. Tracy, *Europe's Reformations 1450-1650* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999), 148. See also, Jeremy Black, *War and the World: Military Power and the Fate of Continents 1450-2000* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), where he described European exceptionalism to the second half of the seventeenth-century and Europe's greater "...degrees of coherence, continuity and bureaucratic development...for tapping the demographic and economic resources of their societies [and] access to information

technology...”, 77. Also, Geoffrey Parker, *The Military Revolution: Military Innovation and the Rise of the West 1500-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988) and J. R. Hale, *War and Society in Renaissance Europe 1450-1620* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985) for more conventional research that incorporates European military innovations into the emergence of state. Also, J. Russell Major, *From Renaissance Monarchy to Absolute Monarchy: French Kings, Nobles, & Estates* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994) for a mix of demographic and economic analysis.

¹⁸ Peter Marshall asserts that confessionalization studies have even found it difficult to cross the channel into English Reformation Studies, “...one of the most interesting features of...confessionalization is the apparent failure of the history of England to make much of a mark on the refinement of the concept, or of the concept to make much of a mark on the interpretation of early modern England.” “Confessionalization, Confessionalism and Confusion in the English Reformation,” in *Reforming Reformation*, ed. Thomas F. Mayer (London: Routledge, 2017), 44.

¹⁹ Heinz Schilling, “Die Konfessionalisierung im Reich: Religiöser und gesellschaftlicher Wandel in Deutschland zwischen 1555 und 1620, *Historische Zeitschrift* 246 (1988): 1-45. Tony Claydon and Ian McBride eds., *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland 1650-1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

²⁰ Thomas Max Safley defines multiconfessionalism as “...the legally recognized and politically supported coexistence of two or more confessions in a single polity, be it a city-state or territorial state...”, *A Companion to Multiconfessionalism in the Early Modern World* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 7.

²¹ Schilling, *Early Modern European Civilization and its Political and Cultural Dynamism*, 86.

²² Harold J. Berman, provides a brief delineation of this progression from theological-hegemony to the rule of natural law in the Germany context. *Law and Revolution: The Impact of the Protestant Reformations on the Western Legal Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 61-80. See also, John Witte, *Law and Protestantism: The Legal Teachings of the Lutheran Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007). Olaf Asbach and Peter Schroder, eds., *War, the State and International Law in Seventeenth-Century Europe* (London: Routledge, 2010).

²³ Kaspar von Greyerz sides with Heinrich Schmidt’s criticisms, stating, “[Confessionalization] remains invariably limited, especially on the small scale and in local and regional contexts, but also with respect to perspectives that embrace whole societies and cut across social classes.” *Religion and Culture in Early Modern Europe 1500-1800*, trans. Thomas Dunlap (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 41. See also, Marc R. Forster, *Catholic Revival in the Age of the Baroque: Religious Identity in Southwest Germany 1550-1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 17. The same gap exists within Reformation Studies and understanding the inroads of Protestantism at the popular level versus Protestantism as an elite imposition.

²⁴ Wolfgang Reinhard, “Pressures towards Confessionalization? Prolegomena to a Theory of the Confessional Age,” in *The German Reformation: the essential readings*, ed. C. Scott Dixon (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 177-178.

²⁵ Kathleen M. Comerford, “Did Tuscan Dioceses Confessionalize in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries?” *Journal of Early Modern History* Vol. 7 (2003): 312-331.

²⁶ Mack P. Holt, *The French Wars of Religion 1562-1629* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 113. See also, Anne Dunan-Page, *The Religious Culture of the Huguenots 1660-1750* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006); Andrew Pettegree ed., *The Early Reformation in Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

²⁷ “Much recent work in the field of confessionalization and confession-building in non-British contexts (France, the Netherlands, Eastern Europe, Anabaptism) has in fact been concerned precisely with ‘self-confessionalization’ and ‘confessionalization from below’, with community-based confessionalism, and with the building of confessional identities without the active support of the state power, and sometimes in direct opposition to it.” Peter Marshall, *Confessionalization, Confessionalism and Confusion in the English Reformation*, 15.

²⁸ Bernd Moller, *Imperial Cities and the Reformation* (Durham: Labyrinth Press, 1982); Gerhard Oestreich, *Neostoicism and the Early Modern State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982); R. Po-Chia Hsia, *Social Discipline in the Reformation: Central Europe 1550-1750* (London: Routledge, 1989).

²⁹ Allan A. Tulchin, *That Men Would Praise the Lord: The Triumph of Protestantism in Nimes 1530-1570* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010). Jill Raitt, *The Colloquy of Montbeliard: Religion and Politics in the Sixteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993). In a general sense, Confessionalism was everywhere: “...new moral codes, new attitudes to social welfare, celibacy and sex, to the relationship between religious doctrine and personal and social conduct, to education, the arts, work and economics, government, the church and clergy, and so on.” Michael Mullett, *Historical Dictionary of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation* (Toronto: The Scarecrow Press, 2010), 108. For an example see, Milena Bartlova, “Conflict, Tolerance, Representation, and Competition: A Confessional Profile of Bohemian Late Gothic Art,” in *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice*, Vol. 5, no. 2 (Prague, 2005), 255-265.

³⁰ Joachim Whaley, *Religious Toleration and Social Change in Hamburg 1529-1819*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

³¹ Gregory Hanlon, *Confession and Community in Seventeenth-Century France: Catholic and Protestant Coexistence in Aquitaine* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993). See also, David Underdown, *Fire from Heaven: Life in an English Town in the Seventeenth Century*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992); Kevin Robbins, *City on the Ocean Sea, La Rochelle 1530-1650: Urban Society, Religion, and Politics on the French Atlantic Frontier* (Leiden: Brill, 1997). See also the older work of Thomas Robisheaux, *Rural Society and the Search for Order in Early Modern Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

³² Wietse De Boer studied the priestly ‘reformation’ of confessional penance and its limited influences on the city of Milan, *The Conquest of the Soul: Confession, Discipline, and Public Order in Counter-Reformation Milan* (Leiden: Brill, 2001). See also, Joel F. Harrington and Helmut Walser Smith, “Confessionalization, Community, and State Building in Germany 1555-1870,” *The Journal of Modern History* Vol. 69 (1997): 77-101. See also, Chloe Taylor, *The Culture of Confession from Augustine to Foucault: A Genealogy of the ‘Confessing Animal’* (London: Routledge, 2009)

³³ Ian Hunter, *The Secularisation of the Confessional State: The Political Thought of Christian Thomasius* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007) Erika Rummel, *The Confessionalization of Humanism in Reformation Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Jurgen Helm and Annette Winkelmann eds., *Religious Confessions and the Sciences in the Sixteenth Century* (Boston: Brill, 2001); Mack Walker, *German Home Towns: Community, State, and General Estate 1648-1871* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998).

³⁴ Lilly Wissbrod, "Religion as National Identity in a Secular Society," *Review of Religious Research*, Vol. 24, no. 3 (March, 1983): 188-205; Grace Davie, "Global Civil Religion: A European Perspective," *Sociology of Religion*, Vol. 62, no. 4, *Special Issue: Religion and Globalization at the Turn of the Millennium* (Winter 2001): 455-473; J. C. D. Clark, "Protestantism, Nationalism, and National Identity 1660-1832," *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 43, no. 1 (March 2000): 249-276; Jeroen Duindam, "Early Modern Europe: Beyond the Strictures of Modernization and National Historiography," *European History Quarterly*, Vol. 40, no. 4 (September 2010): 606-623; Peggy Levitt, "Redefining the Boundaries of Belonging: The Institutional Character of Transnational Religious Life," *Sociology of Religion*, Vol. 65, no. 1 (Spring 2004): 1-18; Jeffrey Haynes and Guy Ben-Porat, "Globalisation, Religion and Secularisation—Different States, Same Trajectories," *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions*, Vol. 11, no. 2 (June 2010): 125-132; See also an older example of Peter Berger's foresight, "The Pluralistic Situation and the Coming Dialogue between the World Religions," *Buddhist-Christian Studies*, Vol. 1 (November 1981): 31-41.

³⁵ "In a world of states where sovereignty is not absolute, where intervention often occurs, and where the proponents of universalistic religions and philosophies make more and more conflictual claims on other states' inhabitants...states today are unlikely to endorse norms that curtail sovereignty at a time when it is being increasingly violated by states and organizations with rivaling cultural and religious identities." Daniel Philpott, "Religious Freedom and the Undoing of the Westphalian State," *Michigan Journal of International Law*, Vol. 25, no. 98 (December 2004), 988. See also, Talal Asad, *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003); Philip Jenkins, *The Next Christendom: The Coming of Global Christianity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); For an older yet foretelling work by the distinguished historian of Church history, see Martin E. Marty and Scott Appleby, *The Glory and the Power: The Fundamentalist Challenge to the Modern World* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1992).

³⁶ Paul Kennedy and Catherine J. Danks, *Globalization and National Identities: Crisis or Opportunity?* (London: Routledge, 2001).

³⁷ Annika Hvithamar, Margit Warbug, and Brian Arly Jacobsen, eds., *Holy Nations and Global Identities: Civil Religion, Nationalism, and Globalisation* (Leiden: Brill, 2009); John Anderson, *Religious Liberty in Transitional Societies: The Politics of Religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Michael McKinley, *Economic Globalisation as Religious War* (London: Routledge, 2007). For a modern account of religious agents in transnational dialogue see, Ralph Della Cava, "Transnational Religions: The Roman Catholic Church in Brazil and the Orthodox Church in Russia," *Sociology of Religion* 2001, Vol. 62, no. 4 (Winter 2001): 535-550. For a theoretical

analysis see, Martin Geoffroy, "Theorizing Religion in the Global Age: A Typological Analysis, *International Journal of Politics*," *Culture and Society*, Vol. 18, no. 1 (Fall 2004): 33-46.

³⁸ Philip Benedict, "Propaganda, Print, and Persuasion in the French Reformation: A Review Article," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, Vol. 69, no. 2 (2007), 461. Nineteen-ninety, the peak of confessionalization studies, was only three decades ago.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 450, 460, 471.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 471.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 450, 460.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 460.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 471.

⁴⁴ Pettegree, "Naming always had significance in Reformation literature, whether in the dialogues of the 1520s or the play. This was understood. Only an audience suffused with Scripture would have made sense of Dekker, an ambitious playwright..." *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion*, 100.

⁴⁵ For the Second and Third Blast see Stephen Orgel and Sean Keilen, eds., *Shakespeare and History* (London: Routledge, 1999), 22; Pettegree, *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion*, 98.

⁴⁶ Pettegree, *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion*, 214-215.

⁴⁷ One of the subtitles of Spaan's article, "Public Opinion or Ritual Celebration of Concord? Politics, Religion and Society in the Competition between the Chambers of Rhetoric at Vlaardingen, 1616," in *Public Opinion and Changing Identities in the Early Modern Netherlands: Essays in Honour of Alastair Duke*, eds. Judith Pollmann and Andrew Spicer (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 202.

⁴⁸ Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: Vol. 4*, 333-335.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 339-340.

⁵⁰ Pelikan, "...Protestant systematic theologians in the seventeenth century again took up the question, 'Is truth single or double?' They concluded that God was the author of both philosophical and theological truth and that therefore truth had to be one." *Ibid.*, 347-348.

⁵¹ Garth Fowden, "Varieties of Religious Communities," in *Interpreting Late Antiquity: Essays on the Postclassical World*, eds. G. W. Bowersock, P. Brown and O. Grabar (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 82-106.

⁵² Fowden, *Empire to Commonwealth*, 94. Italics mine.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 107-108.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 170.

⁵⁵ Quoted by Fowden from Rowan Williams' classical work *Arius: Heresy and Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 88.

⁵⁶ Frances Young, *The Making of Creeds* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1991), 465 & 95.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 465.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 464.

⁵⁹ Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* (Hendrickson, 2001), 39.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 114.

⁶¹ Irena Backus, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation (1378-1615)*, (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 3-4, 61.

- ⁶² The term is generally agreed to have been used at the Leipzig Disputation in 1519 and remained with them in spite of Luther's distaste for it.
- ⁶³ Candida Moss, *The Myth of Persecution: How Early Christians Invented a Story of Martyrdom* (New York: HarperCollins, 2014), 216.
- ⁶⁴ Eusebius provides an excellent example of this juridical confessionalization in the martyrdom of Apollonius in Rome in book five, chapter twenty-one, *Ecclesiastical History*, 179-180.
- ⁶⁵ Moss, *The Myth of Persecution*, 113.
- ⁶⁶ Pelikan came closest to describing the continuity of this religious historiography when writing about the early second century church's reaction to Montanism: "To validate its existence, the church looked increasingly not to the future [...] but to the past, illumined by the composition of the apostolic canon, the creation of the apostolic creed, and the establishment of the apostolic episcopate." *The Christian Tradition Vol. 1*, 107.
- ⁶⁷ Moss, *The Myth of Persecution*, 233.
- ⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 222.
- ⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 233.
- ⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 225.
- ⁷¹ The last line of the excerpt Paul Valliere provides from Hilary's *On the Trinity* (4th century), *Conciliarism: A History of Decision-Making in the Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 66.
- ⁷² *Ibid.*, 93.
- ⁷³ *Ibid.*, 58.
- ⁷⁴ Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition Vol. 5*, 19.
- ⁷⁵ Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, 411.
- ⁷⁶ Valliere describes the periods from 325-381 as synodomania, *Conciliarism*, 69.
- ⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 63.
- ⁷⁸ Caroline Humfress, "A New Legal Cosmos: Late Roman Lawyers and the Early Medieval Church," in *The Medieval World* (London: Routledge, 2001), 557-575.
- ⁷⁹ Caroline Humfress, *Orthodoxy and the Courts in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 251, 268, 272.
- ⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 247.
- ⁸¹ Humfress uses the example given by Augustine in *De Haeresibus*; the three sects named were "Catharists, Mattarii, and Manichees proper." *Orthodoxy and the Courts*, 249.
- ⁸² *Ibid.*, 252-253.
- ⁸³ Quoted from Fergus Millar, *A Greek Roman Empire: Power and Belief Under Theodosius II (408-450)*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 154-155.
- ⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 270.
- ⁸⁵ Richard Lim, *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California, 1995), 3.
- ⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 4; Lim, "Christian Triumph and Controversy," in *Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World*, eds. G. W. Bowersock, Peter Brown, and Oleg Grabar (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), 199.
- ⁸⁷ Lim, *Christian Triumph*, 202; Lim, *Public Disputations*, 13.
- ⁸⁸ Lim, *Christian Triumph*, 199.

⁸⁹ Lim, *Public Disputations*, xi.

⁹⁰ Quoted in *Ibid.*, 89.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 103.

⁹² Quoted in *Ibid.*, 98.

⁹³ Lim, *Christian Triumph*, 205.

⁹⁴ Lim, *Public Disputations*, 188.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 189.

⁹⁶ The word *apedexanto* from *apodexomai* is also the third person plural, aorist middle indicative of *apodeiknumi* meaning, to demonstrate.

⁹⁷ Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 67, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris, 1864), 63. The full text: “Now a short time previous to the general assembling of the bishops, the disputants engaged in preparatory logical contests before the multitudes; and when many were attracted by the interest of their discourse, one of the laity, a confessor, who was a man of unsophisticated understanding.”

⁹⁸ Gelasius, *History of the Council of Nicaea*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 85, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris, 1864), 1253-1256.

⁹⁹ Dositheos, *History*, 108.

¹⁰⁰ Epiphanius of Salamis, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis, Books II and III*, trans. Frank Williams, Vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), xxi.

¹⁰¹ Dositheos, *History*, 109; *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis, Books II and III*, 150.

¹⁰² Dositheos, *History*, 105.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 108.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 108.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 109.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 109.

¹⁰⁷ They asked, “Does this text qualify as a creed or confession, rather than as a code of behavior or a set of ground rules for church administration, and has it been (or is it still) understood and employed as such a norm by some community that identifies itself as Christian?” Jaroslav Pelikan and Valerie Hotchkiss, eds., *Creeds & Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition*, Vols. 1-4 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), vii.

¹⁰⁸ For my *apologia* to this chapter’s survey of the protestant revolution, I appeal to C. Scott Dixon, who stated, “It is not my intention therefore to retell, yet again, the familiar story of ‘Luther’s break with Rome’ –to retrace the question of indulgences, Tetzl, the campaign against the Papacy, Luther’s condemnation at Worms, etc., etc... Moreover, since A. G. Dickens’ groundbreaking *The German Nation and Martin Luther*, it is unnecessary to apologize for addressing issues in a general text analytically rather than chronologically. Similarly, I do not intend to offer any systematic account of Reformation theology – that has been quite adequately done elsewhere...” *The German Reformation*, eds. C. Scott and R. W. Scribner (London: Macmillan, 2003), 7.

¹⁰⁹ Under the umbrella of confession a number of religio-political testaments from 1530-1648 received Pelikan and Hotchkiss’ endorsement: catechisms, articles of faith, rules, council decrees, professions of faith. Since 1530 the authors count forty ‘recognized’ confessions in total.

¹¹⁰ Jaroslav Pelikan, *Credo: Historical and Theological Guide to Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 1; Pelikan, *Creeds and Confession of Faith, Vol. 2*, 27.

¹¹¹ A. G. Dickens, *The German Nation and Martin Luther* (London: Edward Arnold, 1974), 225. See also, Henry J Cohn, “Anticlericalism in the German Peasants’ War, 1525,” *Past & Present*, No. 83 (May, 1979), 3-31.

¹¹² Kolb wrote, “If the Lutheran church was born confessing at Augsburg, it was conceived at Wittenberg...,” *Confessing the Faith: Reformers define the Church, 1530-1580* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1991), 25; Particularly, the nine documents written from 1529-1577 and contained in the *Lutheran Book of Concord* (1580), which received *primam cuasam* by Pelikan and Hotchkiss within their catalogue of Reformation era creeds, volume four: *The Small Catechism* (1529); *The Large Catechism* (1529); *The Augsburg Confession* (1530); *The Apology of the Augsburg Confession* (1530-1531); *The Smalcald Articles* (1537); *The Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope* (1537); *The Formula of Concord* (1577), including the *Epitome* and the *Solid Declaration*.

¹¹³ Gerald Strauss argued, and this symbol represented the overall direction of the Wittenberg Reformation that was, in his own words, “...a shift away from piety and toward doctrine or creed.” “The Reformation and Its Public in an Age of Orthodoxy,” in *The German people and the Reformation*, ed. Hsia R. Po-Chia (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988), 213.

¹¹⁴ Robert Kolb, *Confessing the Faith*, 15.

¹¹⁵ Robert Kolb, *Martin Luther As Prophet, Teacher, and Hero: Images of the Reformer 1520-1620* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1999), 22-27.

¹¹⁶ Robert Scribner, “Incombustible Luther: the Image of the Reformer in Early Modern Germany,” *Past and Present*, no. 110 (February 1986): 62.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 39.

¹¹⁸ See also R. G. Cole, “The Reformation Pamphlet and Communication Processes and Reformation Printers: Unsung Heroes,” *Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 15 (1984): 327-39.

¹¹⁹ M. U. Chrisman, “Lay Reponse to the Protestant Reformation in Germany, 1520-1528,” in *Reformation Principle and Practice: Essays in Honour of Arthur Geoffrey Dickens*, ed. Peter Brooks (London: Scholar Press, 1980).

¹²⁰ As James Kittleson noted by 1519 Luther “...began to embellish his letters with long lines of the Greek he was learning from Melanchthon, and he frequently signed them, ‘Eleutherius’ (‘the liberator’ or ‘the liberated one’).” *Luther the Reformer: The story of the man and his career* (Grand Rapids: Fortress Press, 2003), 133.

¹²¹ Pettegree summarizes this problematic approach to the sources as “...the relationship between the written record and the aural form: the distance that seems to exist between the sermon as a literary genre and the preached word.” *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion*, 11.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 6-27. See also, *The Early Reformation in Europe*, ed. Andrew Pettegree (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Gerald Strauss, “Protestant Dogma and City Government: The Case of Nuremberg,” *Past & Present*, no. 36 (April 1967): 38-58.

¹²³ Robert Kolb states, “Luther lived in an oral culture; his message commanded popular attention above all because preachers—many former Wittenberg students—proclaimed it

in villages and towns across Germany and lands beyond.” “Martin Luther and the German Nation,” in *A Companion to the Reformation World*, ed. R. Po-chia Hsia (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 41. It should also be noted that Luther publicly burned the Papal announcement of his excommunication in 1520.

¹²⁴ Pettegree summarizes this problematic approach to the sources as “...the relationship between the written record and the aural form: the distance that seems to exist between the sermon as a literary genre and the preached word.” *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion*, 11.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 17.

¹²⁶ Kolb states, “To a singular extent Luther’s message and his person became entwined with each other. The medium of the proclaimer’s person became a significant part of the message in the case of this prophetic figure.” *Martin Luther as Prophet, Teacher, and Hero*, 82.

¹²⁷ A. G. Dickens went so far as to say, “...the Reformation [itself] was an urban event.” *The German Nation and Martin Luthern*, 182.

¹²⁸ Robert Kolb, *For All The Saints: Changing Perceptions of Martyrdom and Sainthood in the Lutheran Reformation* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1987), 4.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 1. As Kolb noted in parenthesis while explaining Ernst Zeeden’s historical research, “(Because this was an era of loose allegiance to the emperor and empire, ‘German’ here is not technically a national designation; rather, it had a strong confessional component...where the term for German –speaking people linked them with their adherence to the Wittenberg Reformation.)” *Martin Luther: as Prophet, Teacher, Hero*, 88. This observation was also true in the early modern distinction between the Latin Church and the ‘Greek-speaking’ Church.

¹³⁰ Kolb, *For All the Saints*, 88.

¹³¹ In 1975 Gerald Strauss had broached what would become a controversial issue among scholars regarding the success or failure of the religious educational goals of Lutheran clergy in the German Reformation. Strauss argued that the imposition of visitation protocols, state enforced schooling, and even the prolific publications of Luther’s catechisms were unsuccessful according to their desired aims. He concluded that up until the seventeenth century: “Experiments in mass indoctrination were stillborn or turned out not to work. The Gospel had not been implanted in the hearts and minds of men.” “Strauss, Success and Failure in the German Reformation,” *Past & Present*, no. 67 (May, 1975): 30-63, 59. In 1992 Geoffrey Parker updated Strauss’ conclusion in response to critics such as James Kittelson. Parker also agreed: “[Strauss] has undermined forever the triumphalist claims of confessional apologists and some clerical historians that the Reformation enjoyed either uniform success or (a few areas apart) deep popular support in the sixteenth century.” Parker, “Success and Failure during the First Century of the Reformation,” *Past & Present*, no. 136 (August, 1992), 51.

¹³² Berndt Hamm summarizes the reception of urban sermons by ‘the auditors’ as follows: “While the governing elite were mainly concerned with securing their subjects’ obedience and willingness to bear burdens, the less well-to-do wished to see the greed, extravagance and indulgence of the rich checked, economic pressures relieved and social misery alleviated. Thus the polarity of grace and severity, mercy and justice, Gospel and Law, freedom and discipline, comfort and admonition...determined the message of

Reformation preaching as well as the expectations of the believers.” “Between Severity and Mercy: three models of pre-Reformation urban reform preaching, Savonarola-Staupitz-Geiler,” *Continuity and Change* (2000): 323; Gunther Vogler also made this same case for the city of Nuremberg, quoting from an early source (“Everywhere there are preachers who are closely aligned with Luther, as is commonly reported.”) and stating, “The preachers made ‘the common man’ aware of the conflict.” Volger, “Imperial City,” in *The German People and the Reformation*, ed. R. Po-Chia Hsia (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988): 34-37.

¹³³ The original title for the ‘Twelve Articles’ was “The just and fundamental articles of all the peasants and tenants of spiritual and temporal lords, by whom they think themselves oppressed.” Blickle informs us that its authorship and exact place of origin remain unclear to scholars; however, Blickle asserted that it arose from a “constitutional assembly” and also incorporates a comparative analysis of the ‘Twelve Articles’ and the “Federal Ordinance” of the same year. *From the Communal Reformation to the Revolution of the Common Man* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 64-72.

¹³⁴ *The Twelve Articles* (1525).

¹³⁵ The beginning article reads as follows: “First, it is our humble petition and request, as also the will and intention of all of us, that in the future we should have authority and power so that a whole community should choose and appoint a pastor, and also have the right to depose him, if he should conduct himself improperly. The pastor thus chosen should preach to us the Holy Gospel, purely and clearly, without any human addition, doctrine, or commandment...” See also Strauss who captured the urgency of the moment: “Incessant disputes on the fine points of theology were causing ‘lay people and common folk to doubt the very articles of the faith and to hold the preachers, indeed the entire religion, in contempt.” Strauss, *The Reformation and Its Public in an Age of Orthodoxy*, 209.

¹³⁶ “Little is known of the secret meeting of Anabaptists in this northern hinterland village except that Michael Sattler (1490?-1527) was the leading spirit and without doubt the author of the Confession of Faith.” Leland Harder, “Zwingli’s Reaction to the Schleithem Confession of Faith of the Anabaptists,” *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 4 (Winter, 1980): 51-66.

¹³⁷ John H. Yoder, *The legacy of Michael Sattler* (Scottsdale: Herald Press, 1973).

Thomas Brady locates the beginning of these “German-speaking sects” at the tail end of “the Common Man’s” revolt and justly describes the persecution of the Anabaptist as a level of “martyrdom” unmatched by Lutherans or Zwinglians. *German Histories in the Age of Reformations, 1400-1650* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 208.

¹³⁸ Andrew Pettegree, *The Early Reformation in Europe*, 7. Scribner also pointed to clerical leadership as “image-makers,”: “Finally, we must call attention to the most intriguing feature of the ‘incombustible Luther’s’. We are not dealing here with ‘Catholic survivals’ rooted in the ‘ignorance’ of a peasant mentality. The mythology... was produced by the very leaders of the Lutheran church themselves, by educated pastors writing out of pious conviction... [most] were recorded by Lutheran pastors.” *Incombustible Luther*, 67. And, “The Lutheran Reformation thus had a clerical stamp on it from the beginning...” *Popular Culture and Popular Movements in Reformation Germany* (Ronceverte: Hambledon, 1987), 126.

¹³⁹ Pettegree summarized the subsequent direction of the movement, stating, “There came a time, however, when the heat of battle gave way to more sober reflection; when the decision to adhere to the new confession, or remain with the old, was made.”

Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion, 213.

¹⁴⁰ Both historians A. G. Dickens and Robert W. Scribner averred: “...the Reformation was less a matter of doctrine than of working practical belief...” Robert Scribner, *Popular Culture*, 123-124. See also, Robert Kolb, *Luther’s Heirs Define His Legacy: Studies on Lutheran Confessionalization* (Brookfield: Ashgate, 1996).

¹⁴¹ The other two are: “...they [peasants] have sworn to be true and faithful, submissive and obedient, to their rulers, as Christ commands...” ; and, “...they are starting a rebellion, and violently robbing and plundering monasteries and castles which are not theirs...” Luther, *Against the Robbing and Murdering Hordes of Peasants* (1525).

¹⁴² Luther was responding to a critical letter by Caspar Mueller (to whom Luther addressed his apology) which has not survived.

¹⁴³ John 3:12

¹⁴⁴ Luther also stated later on, “How do you like that? Am I still a preacher of the Gospel who advocates grace and mercy?” *An Open Letter Concerning the Book Against the Peasants* (1524), 204. Luther’s response, in particular his ‘two kingdoms’ approach, seems to fall within Berndt Hamm’s definition of the misericordia: “...a contrasting type of preaching, in which the leniency and comfort of God’s mercy dominate over all the terrifying aspects of his justice and punishment.” Scribner, *Popular Culture*, 324.

¹⁴⁵ Luther, *Admonition to Peace* (1525).

¹⁴⁶ Luther also compared this approach to suffering with “The children of Israel [who] did not riot against Pharaoh, or help themselves as you [peasants] propose to do.” *Admonition to Peace*, 178.

¹⁴⁷ Luther wrote, “Therefore I wanted to do two things—quiet the peasants, and instruct the lords.” *An Open letter Concerning the Book Against the Peasants*, 213.

¹⁴⁸ Strauss explained, “Lutheran clerics abhorred this rival religion (i.e., the “common man’s” religion), supposing it, quite correctly, to be a popular alternative to the church, its ministers, and its teachings.” *The Reformation and Its Public in an Age of Orthodoxy*, 210.

¹⁴⁹ Thomas Brady, refers to the official adoption of the Smalkaldic constitution of 1535 and in Augsburg with the Wittenberg Concord of 1536. *German Histories in the Age of Reformations*, 220-221.

¹⁵⁰ The entire sentence reads: “The process of building a new church required much more than conversion. Education, assimilation, familiarity and the creation of new enemies—a new dialectic of belonging and rejection—all played their part.” Pettegree, *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion*, 6

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 7.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, 215-216. See also chapter 2, 33.

¹⁵³ Quoted from Euan Cameron, “The Possibilities and Limits of Conciliation: Philipp Melancthon and Inter-confessional Dialogue in the Sixteenth Century,” in *Conciliation and confession: The Struggle for Unity in the Age of Reform, 1415-1648*, eds. Howard P. Louthan and Randall C. Zachman (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 2004), 77.

- ¹⁵⁴ *Martin Luther's Table Talk: Abridged from Luther's Works*, Vol. 54, ed. Henry F. French (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2017), 110.
- ¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 114-115.
- ¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 403-404.
- ¹⁵⁷ *Table Talks*, No. 5126 and 5511.
- ¹⁵⁸ Chancellor Feige actually spoke on Philip's behalf. Katherine Gill, "Transcript of the Marburg Colloquy," in *Great Debates of the Reformation* (New York: Random House, 1969): 77-107.
- ¹⁵⁹ "It was in order to *secure* the foundations of human knowledge, not to undermine them, that Ockham wielded his famous razor against his predecessors." Ozment, *The Age of Reform 1250-1550: An Intellectual and Religious History of the Late Medieval and Reformation Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), 56.
- ¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 237. See also, Luther wrote, "Ockham alone understood dialectic, that it involves defining and distinguishing words, but he was no preacher." Quoted in Ozment, *The Age of Reform*, 238.
- ¹⁶¹ All of these topics were considered 'articles of faith' as implied in Oecolampadius' opening defense.
- ¹⁶² Luther set the tone by prefacing his introductory arguments before the dialogue began: "Although I have no intention of changing my mind, which is firmly made up, I will nevertheless present the grounds of my belief and show where the others are in error." *Transcript of the Marburg Colloquy* (1529).
- ¹⁶³ From Matthew 26:26: "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, blessed and broke it, and gave it to the disciples and said, 'Take, eat; this is my body.'" This verse is not found in the Gospel of Mark.
- ¹⁶⁴ In Ozment's words, "This was more on a homiletical than on a theoretical level...preaching doctrine remained more important to Protestants than contemplating it." *The Age of Reform*, 302-317.
- ¹⁶⁵ See also, the *potential ordinate* and *potential absoluta* in Heiko Oberman, *The Dawn of the Reformation: Essays in Late Medieval and Early Reformation Thought* (Grand Rapids: William B Eerdmans, 1992).
- ¹⁶⁶ While commenting on Ockham's theology and philosophy, Steven Ozment provides a clear synthesis of nominalism with theological epistemology: "Covenants—words and promises—linked the soul with God in matters of salvation just as verbal conventions linked the mind with reality in matters of true knowledge." *The Age of Reform*, 40.
- ¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 238.
- ¹⁶⁸ Markus Wriedt, "'Founding a New Church...': The Early Ecclesiology of Martin Luther in the Light of the Debate about Confessionalization," in *Confessionalization in Europe, 1555-1700* (London: Routledge, 2004): fn. 20, 58.
- ¹⁶⁹ Euan Cameron, *The Possibilities and Limits of Conciliation*, 73-88.
- ¹⁷⁰ *Exomologesis Tes Orthodoxou Pisteos, toutesti didaches Christianikes, prosenechtheisa Karolo to ton Rhomaion autokratori aniketotato...: Confessio Fidei Exhibita Invictiss, Imperatori Carolo V. Caesari Aug. in Comitijs Augustae, anno M.D. XXX: Graece reddita a Paulo Dolscio Plauensi.* (Basil, 1559), 18.
- ¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, *Variata*, 12.
- ¹⁷² *Ibid.*, *Variata*, 13.

¹⁷³ Ibid., *Variata*, 17.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., *Variata*, 24.

¹⁷⁵ George Mastrantonis, *Augsburg and Constantinople: The Correspondence between the Tübingen Theologians and Patriarch Jeremiah II of Constantinople on the Augsburg Confession* (Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodoxy Press, 1982), 28.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., 30.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 32.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., 32-103.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., 312.

¹⁸⁰ In between are: Kosmas Aitolos, Makarios Notaras, General Makriyannis, and Alexander Papadiamantis. Christos Yannaras, *Orthodoxy and the West: Hellenic Self-Identity in the Modern Age*, trans. Peter Chambers and Norman Russell (Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2006), 308.

¹⁸¹ Ibid., 73.

¹⁸² Yannaras agrees with Steven Runciman's assessment that the West "...was hot for certainties." Ibid., 61-68.

¹⁸³ Ibid., 73.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., 15.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 308.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 34.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 35, italics are my own emphasis.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 35.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., 192.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 252.

¹⁹¹ Paul Magocsi, *A History of Ukraine: the Land and its Peoples* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 164-165.

¹⁹² Iaroslav Isaievych, *Voluntary Brotherhood: Confraternities of Laymen in Early Modern Ukraine* (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2006), xiii-xiv.

¹⁹³ Ibid., 102.

¹⁹⁴ Barbara Skinner, *The Western Front of the Eastern Church: Uniate and Orthodox Conflict in 18th-century Poland, Ukraine, Belarus, and Russia* (Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2009), 18-41.

¹⁹⁵ Peter Moglia, *The Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church*, trans. ed. J. J. Overbeck (London, 1898).

¹⁹⁶ Isaievych, *Voluntary Brotherhood*, 149.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., 265.

¹⁹⁸ The best example of this tension Isaievych provides with two imposing figures during the first flashes of inter-confessional conflict in the city of Lviv: the Orthodox bishop Hedeon Balaban, who supported "the social elite [and] church hierarchy"; and the Lviv burgers, who were supported by the Confraternity and its esteemed "Ruthenian Teacher" or "Greek Teacher" Stefan Zyzanii. In 1586 Balaban alerted the authorities about the activities of the "little patriarchs," warning them: "Confusion is being sown among the people by the saddlers Iurko and Ivan by means of new teachings of some king that are leading to the spread of heresy, as well as to discord and threats to health among the ignorant, with the possibility of bloodshed causing great offense to the holy faith and the

rights and privileges of the clergy, as well as our own episcopal ones.” *Voluntary Brotherhood*, 89. He was then successful in convincing his party to excommunicate and anathematize the burghers, but the social movement was already a foot and the proscription against Zyaniï’s preaching was too late.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 266.

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 176.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 146.

²⁰² *Ibid.*, 89. Russian historian S. M. Solov’ev aptly echoed Isaievych’s observations, “People spoke of the need for education and teachers arrived from foreign lands. Some came from Greece and, from Western Russia, monks and nobles schooled in Poland. Others arrived from the distant West, men of foreign race and creed, ‘German’, to give instruction in the military arts and other practical subjects. These new teachers clashed with the old, and strife and division ensued. In their alarm at the changes people began to clamour about the end of the world, about Doomsday and the reign of Antichrist. And in way they were right to do so, for the old Russia was coming to an end and the new was beginning.” Quoted in Lindsey Hughes, *Sophia, Regent of Russia, 1657-1704* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 161.

²⁰³ Dositheos supported Patriarch Nikon and his reform agenda and strongly disagreed with Paisios Ligarides, the Greek Metropolitan of Gaza, who fought to have Nikon removed from office.

²⁰⁴ Quoted in Hughes, *Sophia*, 163.

²⁰⁵ Dositheos, of course, agreed with the position of the Leichoudes and the Muscovite Patriarch that both performative phrases—the invitation and the invocation—together as one caused the transubstantiation of the Eucharist elements. See article seventeen of Dositheos’ *Confession* (1672), *The Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem: Sometimes Called the Council of Bethlehem, Holden under Dositheos Patriarch of Jerusalem*, trans. J. N. W. B. Robertson (London, 1899), 143-150.

²⁰⁶ Nikolaos, Chrissidis, *An Academy at the Court of the Tsars: Greek Scholars and Jesuit Education in Early Modern Russia* (Illinois: Northern Illinois University, 2016).

²⁰⁷ Nadia Miladinova, *The Panoplia dogmatike by Euthymios Zygadenos: a study on the first edition published in Greek in 1710* (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 38-48.

²⁰⁸ Quoted from Panchenko, *Arab Orthodox Christians*, 331.

²⁰⁹ Quoted from *Ibid.*, 337.

²¹⁰ Quoted from Graeme Murdock, “Multiconfessionalism in Transylvania,” in *A Companion to Multiconfessionalism in the Early Modern World*, ed. Thomas Max Safley (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 398.

²¹¹ Norman Housley, *Religious Warfare in Europe, 1400-1536* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

²¹² *Ibid.*, 66.

²¹³ *Ibid.*, 190-193.

²¹⁴ Istvan Gyorgy Toth, “Old and New Faith in Hungary, Turkish Hungary, and Transylvania,” in *A Companion to the Reformation World*, ed. R. Po-chia Hsia (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), 216.

- ²¹⁵ Benjamin J. Kaplan, "Coexistence, Conflict, and the Practice of Toleration," in *A Companion to the Reformation World*, ed. R. Po-chia Hsia (Chicester: Blackwell, 2004), 486.
- ²¹⁶ Graeme Murdock, *Multiconfessionalism in Transylvania*, 406.
- ²¹⁷ Istvan Keul, *Early Modern Religious Communities in East-Central Europe: Ethnic Diversity, Deonominal Plurality, and Corporative Politics in the Principality of Transylvania (1526-1691)* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 66.
- ²¹⁸ Quoted in *Ibid.*, 95 (fn. 114).
- ²¹⁹ Quoted in *Ibid.*, 111.
- ²²⁰ *Ibid.*, 113 (fn. 160).
- ²²¹ Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: Vol. 4*, 327-328.
- ²²² Keul, *Early Modern Religious Communities*, 159-166.
- ²²³ *Ibid.*, 170.
- ²²⁴ David Nicholls, "The Theatre of Martyrdom in the French Reformation," *Past & Present*, No. 121 (November 1988):49-73.
- ²²⁵ Judith Pollmann explains, "The Calvinists were considered to be infringing on the traditional and sacred unity of the community of believers, the 'body social' that reaffirmed its unity in the Mass, and clung in particular to the transubstantiation of the Host. Protestants who were separating themselves from this community, and who rejected the theology of the Mass, were considered to be polluting society, which might expect divine punishment for their presence unless it purged itself of them... Catholic crowds took justice into their own hands and hounded the Protestants out of the community." "Countering the Reformation in France and the Netherlands: Clerical Leadership and Catholic Violence 1560-1585," *Past & Present*, No. 190 (Feb., 2006), 86.
- ²²⁶ Nicholls, "The Theatre of Martyrdom in the French Reformation," 50-51.
- ²²⁷ David J. Nicholls, "The Nature of Popular Heresy in France, 1520-1542," *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 26, no. 2 (June 1983), 265.
- ²²⁸ Jean Claude, *How to Write a Sermon* (1688), 93-94.
- ²²⁹ Although, in fact, three other nobles were present "...the Marquess of Mirelmont, Mademoiselle de Roucy, and Mr. Cotton, being there present," as Claude reported; and, Bossuet averred, "Our conversation was in private, and neither of us can produce indifferent witnesses; thus every one will judge of the truth of our recitals according to his prepossessions." Bossuet, *A Conference on the Authority of the Church: held March 1st, 1679, between James Benignus Bossuet and John Claude* (Baltimore, 1842), viii.
- ²³⁰ "But, now since he hath thought fit to give out Copies of his, I have reason to believe, that in this respect he leaves me perfectly to my liberty, and is well satisfied I should do the same thing with mine...he will not find fault with me, for treading in his steps." Claude, *Answer to Monsieur de Meaux's book entitled A Conference with Mr. Claude* (London, 1687), 1.
- ²³¹ "I gave a copy to Mademoiselle De Duras, who requested it...Copies were taken without my being aware..." Bossuet, *A Conference on the Authority of the Church*, viii.
- ²³² Dositheos had also expressed such a regard for the readers of his *Manual against the Calvinist Madness* (1690), writing, "And if we seem to use tautology, and to be many times treating of the same matter, this is only done to help the reader of the present

treatise to a more perfect understanding of what is said.” *The Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem*, 8.

²³³ Bossuet explained, “In these altercations the best course the prudent reader can take is to apply himself to the vital point; and leaving the personal facts out of sight, to consider the doctrine laid down by each party.” Bossuet, *A Conference on the Authority of the Church*, ix.

²³⁴ Dositheos too had clarified his intentions in this apologetic manner in the prologue to the *Confession of Dositheos* (1672), writing, “...so that we may not seem to fight against words and Orthodox sentences rather than against novelties and impious dogmas.” *The Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem*, 110.

²³⁵ Bossuet, *A Conference on the Authority of the Church*, ix-x.

²³⁶ Jean Claude, *The Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist in all Ages: In Answer to what M. Arnaud, Doctor of the Sorbon regarding the Belief of the Greek, Moscovite, Armenian, Jacobite, Nestorian, Coptic, Maronite, and other Eastern Churches* (London, 1684), 2.

²³⁷ Alastair Hamilton, “From East to West: Janesenists, Orientalists, and the Eucharistic Controversy,” in *How the West Was Won: Essays on Literary Imagination, the Canon, and the Christian Middle Ages for Burcht Pranger*, eds. Willemien Otten, Arjo Vanderjagt, and Hent de Vries (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 83.

²³⁸ Mogila, *The Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church*, 6.

²³⁹ Hamilton, *From East to West*, 83-85.

²⁴⁰ Antoine Arnauld and Pierre Nicole, *La perpetuite de la foy de l’Eglise catholique touchant l’eucharistie* (Paris, 1664), 619.

²⁴¹ Judith Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox: Unity and Subversion 1559-1725* (England: Gracewing, 2003), 21; *The Catholic Encyclopedia: An International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine, Discipline, and History of the Catholic Church*, Vol. 15, eds. Charles G. Herbermann, Edward A. Pace, Conde B. Pallen, Thomas J. Shahan, John J. Wynne (New York, 1912), 29.

²⁴² Paul Rycaut, *The Present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches* (London, 1679), 121-123.

²⁴³ Covell copied the questions in his *Some Account of the Greek Church* (Cambridge, 1722), v-vi.

²⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, x.

²⁴⁵ Covell lists “Coresius, Gabriel Severus, Jeremias the Patriarch, Meletius Syrius, and others,” *Ibid.*, 181.

²⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, vi-vii.

²⁴⁷ Pinnington, *Anglicans and Orthodox*, 113.

²⁴⁸ John O’Malley, “The Society of Jesus,” in *A Companion to the Reformation World*, ed. R. Po-chia Hsia (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), 227.

²⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 225.

²⁵⁰ Howard Louthan, *The Quest for Compromise: Peacemakers in Counter-Reformation Vienna* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 123-162.

²⁵¹ In Shore’s review of Keul’s book on Transylvania he stated, “Despite Kuel’s concern with the modern question of ‘confessionalization,’ his book bears a family resemblance to histories written a century or more ago that sought to provide a synthesized—and therefore more easily comprehended—view of a period.” Paul Shore, “Review of Early

Modern Religious Communities in East-Central Europe: Ethnic Diversity, Denominational Plurality and Comparative Politics in the Principality of Transylvania by Istvan Keul,” in *The Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. 96, no. 4 (October, 2010): 820-821; Paul Shore, *Jesuits and the Politics of Religious Pluralism in Eighteenth-Century Transylvania* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 8.

²⁵² Shore, *Jesuits and the Politics of Religious Pluralism*, 10.

²⁵³ Judith Pollmann and Andrew Spicer, eds., *Public Opinion and Changing Identities in the Early Modern Netherlands: Essays in Honour of Alastair Duke* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 1-9. For “cultures of communication” see, *Cultures of Communication from Reformation to Enlightenment: Constructing Publics in Early Modern German Lands*, ed. James Van Horn Melton (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002).

²⁵⁴ Pollman, *Public Opinion and Changing Identities*, 2.

²⁵⁵ Joke Spaan, “Public Opinion or Ritual Celebration of Concord? Politics, Religion and Society in the Competition between the Chambers of Rhetoric at Vlaardingen, 1616,” in *Public Opinion and Changing Identities in the Early Modern Netherlands: Essays in Honour of Alastair Duke*, eds. Judith Pollmann and Andrew Spicer (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 190.

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 203.

²⁵⁷ See chapter four, 80.

²⁵⁸ Spaan, *Public Opinion*, 201.

²⁵⁹ When commenting on elitism inherent with the production of plays, Spaan points out that the development and crafting of plays “...was not a public process, but it took place behind the closed doors of these various councils, boards and committees.” *Ibid.*, 208.

²⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 189-210.

²⁶¹ In a review of the work by Paul Shore’s *Narratives of Adversity: Jesuits on the Eastern Peripheries of the Habsburg Realms (1640-1773)* Ulrike Strasser explains that the Jesuits also managed religious diversity “...by resorting to a strategy of containment through storytelling—the use of what he terms ‘narratives of adversity.’ These stories do not line up with the modern notions of a mission’s success or failure that have often been imposed upon the Jesuit past.” In *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 86, no. 2 (June 2014): 475-476.

²⁶² Puchner Walter, “Jesuit Theatre on the Islands of the Aegean Sea,” *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, Vol. 21, no. 2 (October 2003): 207-222

²⁶³ *Ibid.*, 208-210.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 213-214.

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 215.

²⁶⁶ Dositheos also noted that Cyril’s failure to write an apology condemned and anathematized him at the Councils of Jassy, Constantinople, and Jerusalem.

²⁶⁷ Puchner’s summary of the spectacle is worth repeating: “The performance lasted two hours. The church of St. Benedict was full of people...The mass was celebrated with music—organ, spinet, and viola. The mass was followed by a one hour-long sermon on the historical significance of St. John Chrysostome. The sermon was followed by the ‘action et la representation,’ which lasted for two hours.” *Jesuit Theatre*, 214.

²⁶⁸ Norman Russell, “From the ‘Shield of Orthodoxy’ to the ‘Tome of Joy’: The Anti-Western Stance of Dositheos II of Jerusalem (1641-1707),” in *Orthodox Constructs of the*

West, eds. George E. Demacopoulos and Aristotle Papanikolaou (New York: Fordham University Press, 2013), 81.

²⁶⁹ Eric Osborn, *Ethical Patterns in Early Christian Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), fn. 17.

²⁷⁰ Dositheos, “Prologomena,” in *Tomos Agape* (1698), 1.

²⁷¹ Dositheos, *The Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem*, 3.

²⁷² Marcus Plested, “‘Light from the West’: Byzantine Readings of Aquinas,” in *Orthodox Constructions of the West*, eds. George E. Demacopoulos and Aristotle Papanikolaou (New York: Fordham University Press, 2013): 58-70.

²⁷³ *Ibid.*, 66-67.

²⁷⁴ Dositheos, *History*, 856.

²⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 856.

²⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 856.

²⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 866.

²⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 866.

²⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 866.

²⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 866.

²⁸¹ The original source provides the name Janos Leleszi, but I left it out to keep a sense of anonymity and surveillance.

²⁸² Besides providing this excerpt from the great debate, Keul goes on to note that “...on returning to Kolozsvar, David was carried through the streets in a triumphal parade...” *Early Modern Religious Communities in East-Central Europe*, 113.

²⁸³ Dositheos, *The Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem*, 111.

²⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 20-74.

²⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 76.

²⁸⁶ Ioan Dura, however, notes that the title page dedicates the work to his predecessor, Serban Cantacuzino (1640-1688). *Dositheos Ierosolymon kai i Prosfora autou eis tas Roumanikas Horas kai ten Ekklesian auton* (Athenai, 1977), 242.

²⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 245.

²⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 246.

²⁸⁹ The preface was written for the proclamation of Dositheos’ *Confession* at the council of Jerusalem in 1672 and reprinted with the 1690 edition.

²⁹⁰ Dositheos, *The Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem*, 3-5.

²⁹¹ Dositheos stated, “For when we are asked for a reason for faith or certain things to be believed we consider it terrible to shrink [from replying].” *Ibid.*, 5.

²⁹² Dositheos was speaking about Patriarch Jeremiah’s response to the Gnesio Lutherans, writing, “And that venerable man wrote unto them and against them three treatises or pragmatic answers theologically and orthodoxly rebuking all their heresy, and teaching them all the Orthodox mind...” *Ibid.*, 14.

²⁹³ *Ibid.*, 8.

²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 13.

²⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 9.

²⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 130-131.

²⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 21-22.

²⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 22.

- ²⁹⁹ Ibid., 22-23.
- ³⁰⁰ Robertson noted the slight difference being that Loukaris' included the article, meaning "...the Church of the Greeks, that is namely the Eastern Church." *The Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem*, 111.
- ³⁰¹ Ibid., 152-173.
- ³⁰² Ibid., 208-210.
- ³⁰³ Ibid., 152-154.
- ³⁰⁴ Ibid., 54-58.
- ³⁰⁵ Ibid., 73.
- ³⁰⁶ Panchenko, *Arab Orthodox Christians*, 347.
- ³⁰⁷ See Panchenko's section on Dositheos' political espionage and diplomatic dealings with the Russian state, Ibid., 328-337.
- ³⁰⁸ Dositheos, *The Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem*, 147-149.
- ³⁰⁹ Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, "Dositheos Patriarch of Jerusalem (1641-1707)," *Nea Sion* 5-6 (1907), 9-10.
- ³¹⁰ Cited in Ibid., 10.
- ³¹¹ Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 287.
- ³¹² Quotation from Dura, *Dositheos Ierosolymon*, 137.
- ³¹³ Quotation from Ibid., 139.
- ³¹⁴ Quotation from Ibid., 141.
- ³¹⁵ All the quotes come from Ibid., 141-143.
- ³¹⁶ Quoted from Ibid., 146.
- ³¹⁷ Quoted from Ibid., 45-147.
- ³¹⁸ Ibid., 146-148.
- ³¹⁹ Dositheos, *Tomos Agape*, 12.
- ³²⁰ Francois Richard, "Prologue," in *Targa tes Pisteos tes Romaiques Ekklesias eis ten diafendeusin tes orthodoxias*, Vol. 1-2 (Paris, 1658), 2.
- ³²¹ Ibid., 405.
- ³²² Ibid., 1.
- ³²³ Ibid., 3.
- ³²⁴ Dura, *Dositheos Ierosolymon*, 248.
- ³²⁵ Ibid., 237.
- ³²⁶ Dositheos, "To Duke John (1683)," in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 155, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris, 1866), 28.
- ³²⁷ Acts 18: 27-28, "And when Paul wished to cross to Achaia, the brothers encouraged him and wrote to the disciples to welcome him. When he arrived, he greatly helped those who through grace had believed, for Paul powerfully refuted the Jews in public, showing by the Scriptures that the Christ was Jesus."
- ³²⁸ Acts 19:8, "And he entered the synagogue and for three months spoke boldly, reasoning and persuading them about the kingdom of God. But when some became stubborn and continued in unbelief, speaking evil of the Way before the congregation, he withdrew from them and took the disciples with him, reasoning daily in the hall of Tyrannus."
- ³²⁹ Acts 19:7, "There were about (ὠσεὶ) twelve men in all."

-
- ³³⁰ Acts 19:1-6.
³³¹ Dositheos, *To Duke John* (1683), 28.
³³² *Ibid.*, 28.
³³³ *Ibid.*, 28.
³³⁴ Symeon of Thessalonica, *Against Heresies* (Moldavia, 1682), 2.
³³⁵ *Ibid.*, 2-3.
³³⁶ *Ibid.*, 319.
³³⁷ *Ibid.*, 319.
³³⁸ *Ibid.*, 321.
³³⁹ Dositheos, *History*, 106.
³⁴⁰ Symeon, *Against Heresies*, 321.
³⁴¹ See above, the Paraclete, 142.
³⁴² Russell, *From the 'Shield of Orthodoxy' to the 'Tome of Joy'*, 75.
³⁴³ Nicolae Iorga, *Byzantium After Byzantium* (Romania, 1935).
³⁴⁴ Dimitri Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe, 500-1453* (London: Widenfeld and Nicolson, 1971), 3.
³⁴⁵ Paschalis Kitromilides, *An Orthodox Commonwealth: Symbolic Legacies and Cultural Encounters in Southeastern Europe* (Brookfield: Ashgate, 2007), xv.
³⁴⁶ Dimitri Nastase, "Imperial Claims in the Romanian Principalities from the Fourteenth to the Seventh Centuries," in *The Byzantine Legacy in Eastern Europe*, ed. Lowell Clucas (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 189.
³⁴⁷ Gennadius II, *Confession of Faith* (1453).
³⁴⁸ Graham Speake, *A History of the Athonite Commonwealth: The Spiritual and Cultural Diaspora of Mount Athos* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 5-14.
³⁴⁹ Richard, *Targa*, 270.
³⁵⁰ Dositheos, *Tomos Agape*, 2.
³⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 554.
³⁵² *Ibid.*, 378.
³⁵³ *Ibid.*, 413.
³⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 538-553.
³⁵⁵ Dositheos, *History*, 1179.
³⁵⁶ Mark Plested notes that this was also Patriarch Jeremiah's 'pious use of reason.' *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, 143.
³⁵⁷ Dositheos, *History*, 1178.
³⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 1178-1179.
³⁵⁹ Plested, *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*, 153.
³⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 151.
³⁶¹ Richard, *Targa*, V. 2, 254.
³⁶² *Ibid.*, 254.
³⁶³ *Ibid.*, 255.
³⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 257.
³⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 257.
³⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 258.
³⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 258.
³⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 259.

-
- ³⁶⁹ Ibid., 259-260.
- ³⁷⁰ Ibid., 260.
- ³⁷¹ Ibid., 261.
- ³⁷² Ibid., 262.
- ³⁷³ Ibid., 262-263.
- ³⁷⁴ Dositheos, *Tomos Katallages* (Moldavia, 1694), 3.
- ³⁷⁵ George of Cyprus, *Tomos of Faith*, in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 142, ed. J.P. Migne (Paris, 1865), 240.
- ³⁷⁶ John Meyendorff, *A Study of Gregory Palamas* (London: The Faith Press, 1964), 229.
- ³⁷⁷ Gregory, *Tomos of Faith*, 240..
- ³⁷⁸ Quoted from Meyendorff, *A Study of Gregory Palamas*, 17.
- ³⁷⁹ Quoted from Ibid., 19.
- ³⁸⁰ Quoted from Ibid., 19.
- ³⁸¹ Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe*, 300.
- ³⁸² Ibid., 301-305.
- ³⁸³ Ibid., 305.
- ³⁸⁴ Ibid., 336.
- ³⁸⁵ Ibid., 337.
- ³⁸⁶ Ibid., 338.
- ³⁸⁷ Ibid., 337.
- ³⁸⁸ Ibid., 339.
- ³⁸⁹ Ibid., 338.
- ³⁹⁰ Dositheos, *History*, 858.
- ³⁹¹ Ibid., 858-862.
- ³⁹² Donald Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium 1261-1453* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 194.
- ³⁹³ Steven Runciman, *The Byzantine Theocracy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 157-158.
- ³⁹⁴ Nicol, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium*, 205.
- ³⁹⁵ Daniel Payne, *The Political Revival of Hesychasm in Greek Orthodox Thought*, (PhD diss., (Baylor University, 2006), 211-241.
- ³⁹⁶ Hakan Gunnarsson, *Mystical Realism in the Early Theology of Gregory Palamas: Context and Analysis* (Goteborg: Goteborg University, 2002), 112.
- ³⁹⁷ Ibid., 109.
- ³⁹⁸ Ibid., 113.
- ³⁹⁹ Ibid., 112.
- ⁴⁰⁰ Dositheos, *History*, 857.
- ⁴⁰¹ Ibid., 858.
- ⁴⁰² Ibid., 858.
- ⁴⁰³ Dositheos, *Tomos Agape*, 34.
- ⁴⁰⁴ Ibid., 34-35.
- ⁴⁰⁵ Ibid., 36.
- ⁴⁰⁶ Ibid., 36.
- ⁴⁰⁷ John Meyendorff, ed., *Gregory Palamas The Triads* (New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1983), 44.

-
- ⁴⁰⁸ Ibid., 58.
- ⁴⁰⁹ See chapter three, 69.
- ⁴¹⁰ Gunnarsson, *Mystical Realism*, 107.
- ⁴¹¹ Ibid., 152.
- ⁴¹² This was not a quote from Barlaam, but Gunnarsson's condensed formulation of Barlaam's critique, *Mystical Realism*, 188.
- ⁴¹³ Gunnarsson's emphasis, Ibid., 188.
- ⁴¹⁴ Gunnarsson's emphasis, Ibid., 189.
- ⁴¹⁵ Dositheos, *Tomos Agape*, 37.
- ⁴¹⁶ Ibid., 37.
- ⁴¹⁷ Ibid., 36.
- ⁴¹⁸ Ibid., 37.
- ⁴¹⁹ Ibid., 37.
- ⁴²⁰ Dura, *Dositheos Ierosolymon*, 82-86, 117.
- ⁴²¹ Ibid., 14.
- ⁴²² Cited in Ibid., 218.
- ⁴²³ Cited in Ibid., 219.
- ⁴²⁴ Ibid., 220.
- ⁴²⁵ Ibid., 221-22; Dositheos, "Prafatio Duples," in *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 155, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris, 1866), 30.
- ⁴²⁶ Cited in Ibid., 55.
- ⁴²⁷ Cited in Ibid., 240.
- ⁴²⁸ Cited in Ibid., 240.
- ⁴²⁹ Cited in Ibid., 241.
- ⁴³⁰ Dositheos, *The Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem*, 80.
- ⁴³¹ Quoted from Dura, *Dositheos Ierosolymon*, 120-121.
- ⁴³² Dennis Deletant, "Rumanian Presses and Printing in the Seventeenth Century: I," *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 60, no. 4 (October 1982), 482.
- ⁴³³ Runciman, *The Great Church in Captivity*, 370.
- ⁴³⁴ Panchenko, *Arab Orthodox Christians*, 262.
- ⁴³⁵ Dositheos, *The Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem*, 80.
- ⁴³⁶ Ibid., 80.
- ⁴³⁷ Dura states that it was written under Cantacuzino, but published under Brancoveanu, *Dositheos Ierosolymon*, 2238-239.
- ⁴³⁸ Ibid., 240-241.
- ⁴³⁹ Quoted in Ibid., 241.
- ⁴⁴⁰ Dositheos, *The Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem*, 110-111.
- ⁴⁴¹ Dositheos, *History*, 762.
- ⁴⁴² Dositheos, *Tomos Katallages* (1694), preface.
- ⁴⁴³ Ibid., preface.
- ⁴⁴⁴ Dositheos, *History*, 659.
- ⁴⁴⁵ Ibid., 659.
- ⁴⁴⁶ Ibid., 660.
- ⁴⁴⁷ *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 14, ed. Philip Schaff (New York, 1916), intro.
- ⁴⁴⁸ Yannaras, *Orthodoxy and the West*, 17.

-
- ⁴⁴⁹ Ibid., 15.
- ⁴⁵⁰ Ibid., 15.
- ⁴⁵¹ Ibid., 15. See also Yannaras' self-confessed historical method: "We must summarize the great mass of historical material available to us *schematically* if we are to make sense of it today. We divide historical time into periods and distinguish between different civilizations or nationalities. Our present understanding of what constitutes a 'civilization' or a 'nationality' often shapes how we *schematize* the past, and we don't use the same criteria as the period we are examining." Ibid., 4.
- ⁴⁵² Ibid., 18.
- ⁴⁵³ Dositheos, *Tomos Katallages* (1694), Preface.
- ⁴⁵⁴ Dositheos, *History*, 756-759.
- ⁴⁵⁵ Dura, *Dositheos Ierosolymon*, 226-228.
- ⁴⁵⁶ Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Vol. II (London, 1789), 136 fn. 7.
- ⁴⁵⁷ Dositheos, *History*, 918-1144.
- ⁴⁵⁸ Dositheos also consider the Synod of Trullo ecumenical. *History*, 603.
- ⁴⁵⁹ Ibid., 914-915.
- ⁴⁶⁰ Alexander Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire: Vol. 1, 324-1453* (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1958), 675.
- ⁴⁶¹ Andrew J. Ekonomou, *Byzantine Rome and the Greek Popes: Eastern Influences on Rome and the Papacy from Gregory the Great to Zacharias, A.D. 590-752* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2007), quote taken from the back cover of the book.
- ⁴⁶² Thomas F. X. Noble, "Review of: Andrew J. Ekonomou, *Byzantine Rome and the Greek Popes*," in *The Journal of Religion*, Vol. 90, no. 4 (October 2010), 574.
- ⁴⁶³ Ibid., 575.
- ⁴⁶⁴ Gregory II (715-731) and Gregory III (731-741).
- ⁴⁶⁵ Dositheos, *History*, 620.
- ⁴⁶⁶ Ibid., 620.
- ⁴⁶⁷ Ibid., 620.
- ⁴⁶⁸ Ibid., 620.
- ⁴⁶⁹ Ibid., 624.
- ⁴⁷⁰ Ibid., 624.
- ⁴⁷¹ Ibid., 625.
- ⁴⁷² Panchenko rejects the simplification of Dositheos' Russia diplomacy, stating, "Dositheos's interests cannot be reduced to geopolitics and Russian—Turkish relations." *Arab Orthodox Christians*, 333. And, rightly so since the idea of 'the third Rome' enchanted even Dositheos (and the later Megali Idea secretly may have enticed even the Kollyvades, who publicly exhorted collective repentance for the Ottoman conquest).
- ⁴⁷³ Dositheos, *History*, 1018.
- ⁴⁷⁴ Ibid., 1018.
- ⁴⁷⁵ Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, Book III, Chapter I.
- ⁴⁷⁶ Dositheos, *History*, 1019.
- ⁴⁷⁷ Ibid., 624.
- ⁴⁷⁸ Ibid., 1019.

⁴⁷⁹ Concerning Eusebius' oration and biographic *Life* on Constantine as "a paradigm of piety rather than on wars, laws, and the like," Fowden stated, "[Eusebius] offers a 'virtual redefinition of the empire itself as a 'school' gathered around a charismatic royal teacher.' But from the *Life* it emerges with clarity that precisely by his wars and laws Constantine became the model Christian king, and, conversely, that it was through his piety that he won wars and made good laws." *Empire to Commonwealth*, 88-89.

⁴⁸⁰ Dositheos, *History*, 1019. 666.

⁴⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 666.

⁴⁸² *Ibid.*, 669.

⁴⁸³ *Ibid.*, 669.

⁴⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 666.

⁴⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 666.

⁴⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 666.

⁴⁸⁷ Dositheos, *Tomos Katallages* (1694), second preface.

⁴⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, second preface.

⁴⁸⁹ Yannaras, *Orthodoxy and the West*, 83.

⁴⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 95.

⁴⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 75.

⁴⁹² *Ibid.*, 49.

⁴⁹³ *Ibid.*, 65.

⁴⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 67.

⁴⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 288-289.

⁴⁹⁶ Yannaras in fact defines the suffix to *ortho-doxa* as experience (i.e., *doxa*) in contrast to opinion (i.e., *doxa*). *Orthodoxy and the West*, 33.

⁴⁹⁷ See, introduction, 6.

⁴⁹⁸ Jaroslav Pelikan, "The Eastern Orthodox Quest for Confessional Identity: Where does Orthodoxy Confess what it Believes and Teaches?" in *Modern Greek Studies Yearbook*, Vol. 14/15 (1998/1999): 26.

⁴⁹⁹ *The Philokalia: A Classic Text of Orthodox Spirituality*, eds. Brock Bingaman and Bradley Nassif (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); *Mount Athos the Sacred Bridge: The Spirituality of the Holy Mountain*, eds. Graham Speake and Dimitri Conomos (New York: Verlag Peter Lang, 2005).

⁵⁰⁰ Graham Speake, *A History of the Athonite Commonwealth*, 199, 209.

⁵⁰¹ "Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy upon me."

⁵⁰² *The Philokalia*, Vol. 2, eds. G. E. H. Palmer, Philip Sherrard, and Kallistos Ware (Boston: Faber and Faber, 1979), 348.

⁵⁰³ Nikodemos Hagiorite, *Exomologetarion: A Manual of Confession*, trans. George Dokos, (Riverside: Uncut Mountain Press, 2006), 33-60.

⁵⁰⁴ *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theology, 1600-1800*, eds. Ulrich L. Lehner, Richard A. Muller, and A. G. Roeber (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 524.

⁵⁰⁵ Dositheos wrote, "Indeed, [confession] is also like a mirror which shows the face of each one just as they are." *History*, 10.

⁵⁰⁶ Yannaras, *Orthodoxy and the West*, 97.

⁵⁰⁷ *The Catholic Encyclopedia: An International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine, Discipline, and History of the Catholic Church*, Vol. 6 (1913), 772.

⁵⁰⁸ Panchenko, *Arab Orthodox Christians*, 497.

⁵⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 497.

⁵¹⁰ Pelikan, *Credo*, 419.

⁵¹¹ Bouboutsis, *Singing in a Strange Land: The Ancient Future of Orthodox Pluralism*, (Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2010) 21.

⁵¹² *Ibid.*, 21.

⁵¹³ *Ibid.*, 164.

⁵¹⁴ Kazantazkis is the paradigmatic figure who Bouboutsis believes represents the ‘liturgical’ (i.e., a synthesis of both *theoria* and *praxis*) ideal of a singular ‘blended’ identity. Bouboutsis calls him “[the] Prophet of Post-Ottoman (Re-) Integration.” He begins with a biographic sketch that first highlights Kazantazkis’ bi-racial parentage—he was, as Bouboutsis describes him, “an Orthodox Greek and Bedouin African.” *Ibid.*, 160-162.

⁵¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 164.

⁵¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 165.

⁵¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 93.

⁵¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 176-177.

⁵¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 179.

⁵²⁰ *Ibid.*, 56-58.

⁵²¹ See, “Hewers of Wood and Drawers of Water” in Peter Linebaugh, *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2013), 36-70.

⁵²² Horkeimer and Adorno’s critique of the Enlightenment as superstition remains insightful: “For the Enlightenment, only what can be encompassed by unity has the status of an existent or an event; its ideal is the system from which everything and anything follows... [Formal logic] offered Enlightenment thinkers a schema for making the world calculable... Unity remains the watchword from Parmenides to Russell. All gods and qualities must be destroyed.” *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002), 4-5.

⁵²³ Bouboutsis, *Singing in a Strange Land*, 4.

⁵²⁴ *Ibid.*, 80.

⁵²⁵ As Horkeimer and Adorno expressed it, “The world becomes chaos, and synthesis salvation.” *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, 3.

⁵²⁶ Pelikan, “The Eastern Orthodox Quest for Confessional Identity,” 24, 33.

⁵²⁷ *Ibid.*, 28.

⁵²⁸ Tertullian, *On the Proscription of Heretics* (c. 220 C.E.), trans. T. Herbert Bindley (London, 1914), Chapter VII.

⁵²⁹ Concomitantly, orthodoxy requires ‘What should be believed’ in order to belong.

⁵³⁰ Howard Louthan argued that in addition to the popular mass appeal of Jesuit theatre the other cause for “The Failure of Irenicism” within the court of Maximilian II was the lack of a *Confession of Faith* or a non-compromising position. See, for example, the sixteenth century ‘Crypto-Calvinist Johannes Crato in *The Quest for Compromise*, 125-142.

⁵³¹ Weitz’s critique of the Enlightenment concluded quite emphatically: “The nation-state remains; so do our identities as individuals of particular nationalities, ethnicities,

religions (or the lack thereof), and genders. The Enlightenment fiction of an abstract individual, stripped of all markers, is just that—a fiction.” *A World Divided*, 429.

⁵³² Gerald Horne, *The Counter-Revolution of 1776: Slave Resistance and the Origins of the United States of America* (New York: New York University Press, 2016).

Bibliography

A) Primary Sources*Confessions*

Dositheos. "Confession of Dositheos." 1672. In *Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition*, Vol. 1-4, edited by Jaroslav Pelikan and Valerie R. Hotchkiss. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

Gennadius II, Patriarch of Constantinople. "Confession of Faith." 1453. In *Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition*, Vol. 1-4, edited by Jaroslav Pelikan and Valerie R. Hotchkiss. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

Jeremias II. "The Reply to the Augsburg Confession." 1576. In *Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition*, Vol. 1-4, edited by Jaroslav Pelikan and Valerie R. Hotchkiss. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

Karmiris, Ioannes. *Ta Dogmatika kai Symbolika Mnemeia tis Orthodoxou Katholikis Ekklesias, Vol. 1*. Athens, 1960.

_____. *Ta Dogmatika kai Symbolika Mnemeia tis Orthodoxou Katholikis Ekklesias, Vol. 2*. Athens, 1968.

Loukaris, Cyril. "The Eastern Confession of the Christian Faith." 1629. In *Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition*, Vol. 1-4, edited by Jaroslav Pelikan and Valerie R. Hotchkiss. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

Melanchthon, Philip. "The Apology of the Augsburg Confession." 1531. In *Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition*, Vol. 1-4, edited by Jaroslav Pelikan and Valerie R. Hotchkiss. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

_____. *Exomologesis Tes Orthodoxou Pisteos, toutesti didaches Christianikes, prosenechtheisa Karolo to ton Rhomaion autokratori aniketotato...: Confessio Fidei Exhibita Invictiss, Imperatori Carolo V. Caesari Aug. in Comitijs Augustae, anno M.D. XXX: Graece reddita a Paulo Dolscio Plauensi*. Basil, 1559.

Mogila, Peter. "The Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church." 1643. In *Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition*, Vol. 1-4, edited by Jaroslav Pelikan and Valerie R. Hotchkiss. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

Palamas, Gregory. "Confession of the Orthodox Faith." 1351. In *Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition*, Vol. 1-4, edited by Jaroslav Pelikan and Valerie R. Hotchkiss. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

"The Augsburg Confession." 1530. In *Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition*, Vol. 1-4, edited by Jaroslav Pelikan and Valerie R. Hotchkiss. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

"The Formula of Concord." 1580. In *Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition*, Vol. 1-4, edited by Jaroslav Pelikan and Valerie R. Hotchkiss. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

The Magdeburg Confession. 1550. Translated by Matthew Colvin. North Charleston: CreateSpace, 2012.

"The Transylvanian Confession of Faith." 1579. In *Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition*, Vol. 1-4, edited by Jaroslav Pelikan and Valerie R. Hotchkiss. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

Dositheos' Works

Dositheos. *Encheiridion kata Ioannoy tou Karyophylle*. Jassy, 1694. (Text against John of Karyophylle).

_____. *Encheiridion kata tes Kalvinikes phrenovlaveias*. Jassy, 1690. (Text against the Calvinist madness).

_____. *Historia peri ton en Hierosolymois Patriarcheusanon*, Vol. 1-12. Bucharest, 1715. (History of the Jerusalem Patriarchate).

_____. *Historia peri tis episkopis tou agiou Orous Sina*. ca. 1700.

_____. *Tomos Agapes*. Jassy, 1698. (Volume of Love).

_____. *Tomos Haras*. Ramnicu Valcea, 1705. (Volume of Grace).

_____. *Tomos Katallages*. Jassy, 1694. (Volume of Reconciliation).

_____. *Prorafatio Duplex*. In *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 155, edited by J. P. Migne. Paris, 1866.

_____. *The Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem: Sometimes Called the Council of Bethlehem, Holden under Dositheos Patriarch of Jerusalem*. Translated by J. N. W. B. Robertson. London, 1899.

Other

Eusebius. *Ecclesiastical History*. Translated by C. F. Cruse

Bossuet, Jacques Benigne. *A Conference on the Authority of the Church: held March 1st, 1679, between James Benignus Bossuet and John Claude*. Baltimore, 1842.

_____. *A Conference with Mr. Claude, minister of Charenton: Concerning the Authority of the Church*. London, 1687.

_____. *A Relation of the Famous Conference held about Religion at Paris between M. Bossuet, Bishop of London, late tutor to the Dauphin, and Monsieur Claude, minister of the Reformed Church at Charenton at the Countess of Royal House in the several persons of the first quality at the request of Mademoiselle de Duras, daughter to the famous Marshal de Turenne, she being then upon changing her religion*. London, 1684.

Claude, Jean. *Answer to Monsieur de Meaux's book entitled A Conference with Mr. Claude*. London, 1687.

_____. *The Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist in All Ages in Answer to what H. Arnaud, Doctor of the Sorbon Alledges, Touching the Belief of the Greek, Moscovite, Armenian, Jacobite, Nestorian, Coptic, Maronite, and other Eastern Churches*. London, 1684.

_____. *How to Write a Sermon*. London, 1788.

Covel, John. *Some Account of the Greek Church*. Cambridge, 1722.

Epiphanius of Salamis. "The Panarion." In *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis, Books II and III*, translated by Frank Williams. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

. MA: Hendrickson, 2001.

Gelasius. "History of the Council of Nicaea." In *Patrologia Graeca, Vol. 85*, edited by J.P. Migne. Paris, 1864.

George of Cyprus. "Tomos of Faith." In *Patrologia Graeca, Vol. 142*, edited by J. P. Migne. Paris, 1865.

Luther, Martin. *Against the Robbing and Murdering Hordes of Peasants*. 1525.

_____. *An Open Letter Concerning the Book Against the Peasants*. 1525.

_____. *Admonition to Peace*. 1525.

_____. *Martin Luther's Table Talk: Abridged from Luther's Works, Vol. 54*, edited by Henry F. French. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2017.

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

Nikodemos Hagiorite. *Exomologetarion: A Manual of Confession*. Translated by George Dokos. Riverside: Uncut Mountain Press, 2006.

Palamas, Gregory. "The Triads." In *Gregory Palamas: The Triads*, translated and edited by John Meyendorff. New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1983.

Palmer, G.E.H., Philip Sherrard, and Kallistos Ware, eds. *The Philokalia, Vol. 1-4*. Boston: Faber and Faber, 1979.

Rycaut, Paul. *The Present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches*. London, 1679.

Richard, Francois. *Targa tes Pisteos tes Romaikes Ekklesias eis ten diafendeusin tes orthodoxias, Vol. 1-2*. Paris, 1658. (The Shield of Faith of the Roman Church in the defense of orthodoxy).

Socrates. "Historia Ecclesiastica." In *Patrologia Graeca, Vol. 67*, edited by J. P. Migne. Paris, 1864.

Symeon of Thessalonica. "Opera Omnia." In *Patrologia Graeca, Vol. 155*, edited J. P. Migne. Paris, 1866.

_____. *Against Heresies*. Moldavia, 1682.

Tertullian. *On the Proscription of Heretics*. c. 220 (CE). Translated by Herbert Bindley. London, 1914.

Zwingli, Ulrich. *Refutation of the Tricks of the Anabaptists*. 1527.

B) Secondary Sources

Anastasakis, Panteleymon. *The Church of Greece under Axis Occupation*. New York: Fordham, 2015.

Anderson, John. *Religious Liberty in Transitional Societies: The Politics of Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 2003.

Asad, Talal. *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003.

Asbach, Olaf and Peter Schroder, eds. *War, the State and International Law in Seventeenth-Century Europe*. London: Routledge, 2010.

Backus, Irena. *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation (1378-1615)*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Bartlova, Milena. "Conflict, Tolerance, Representation, and Competition: A Confessional Profile of Bohemian Late Gothic Art." *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice, Vol. 5, no. 2*. Prague, 2005.

Bast, Robert J. and Andrew G. Gow, eds. *Continuity and Change: The Harvest of Late-Medieval and Reformation History*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Benedict, Philip. "Propaganda, Print, and Persuasion in the French Reformation: A Review Article." *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, Vol. 69, no. 2 (2007): 447-472.

Berger, Peter. *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion*. New York: Anchor, 1990.

_____. *The Desecularization of the World: Resurgent Religion and World Politics*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

_____. *The Many Altars of Modernity: Toward a Paradigm for Religion in a Pluralist Age*. Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2014.

_____. "The Pluralistic Situation and the Coming Dialogue between the World Religions." *Buddhist-Christian Studies*, Vol. 1 (November 1981): 31-41.

Berman, Harold. *Law and Revolution, II: The Impact of the Protestant Reformations on the Western Legal Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Bingaman, Brock and Bradley Nassif, eds. *The Philokalia: A Classic Text of Orthodox Spirituality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Black, Jeremy. *War and the World: Military Power and the Fate of Continents 1450-2000*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Blickle, Peter. *Communal Reformation: The Quest for Salvation in Sixteenth-Century Germany*. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

_____. *From the Communal Reformation to the Revolution of the Common Man*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Boer, Wietse. *The Conquest of the Soul: Confession, Discipline, and Public Order in Counter-Reformation Milan*. Boston: Brill, 2001.

Bouboutsis, Elias. *Singing in a Strange Land: The Ancient Future of Orthodox Pluralism*. Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2010.

Brady, Thomas. *German Histories in the Age of Reformations, 1400-1650*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Bremer, Thomas, ed. *Religion and the Conceptual Boundary in Central and Eastern Europe: Encounters of Faiths*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Burke, Peter. *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*. New York: New York University Press, 1978.

_____. *The Art of Conversation*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993.

_____. *Social History of Knowledge: From Gutenberg to Diderot*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000.

_____. *Cultural Hybridity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2009.

Burke, Peter and Jan E. Stets, eds. *Identity Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Burke, Peter and R. Po-Chia Hsia. *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Caenegem, R. C. *An Historical Introduction to Western Constitutional Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Cameron, Averil. *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse*. Berkeley: University of California, 1991.

Cameron, Euan. "The Possibilities and Limits of Conciliation: Philipp Melanchthon and Inter-confessional Dialogue in the Sixteenth Century." In *Conciliation and Confession: The Struggle for Unity in the Age of Reform, 1415-1648*, edited by Howard P. Louthan and Randall C. Zachman. South Bend: University of Notre Dame, 2004.

Cava, Ralph Della. "Transnational Religions: The Roman Catholic Church in Brazil and the Orthodox Church in Russia." *Sociology of Religion*, Vol. 62, no. 4 (Winter 2001): 535-550.

Chrisman, M. U. "Lay Reponse to the Protestant Reformation in Germany, 1520-1528." In *Reformation Principle and Practice: Essays in Honour of Arthur Geoffrey Dickens*, edited by Peter Brooks. London: Scholar Press, 1980.

Chrissidis, Nikolaos. *An Academy at the Court of the Tsars: Greek Scholars and Jesuit Education in Early Modern Russia*. Illinois: Northern Illinois University, 2016.

Clark, J. C. D. "Protestantism, Nationalism, and National Identity 1660-1832." *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 43, no. 1 (March 2000): 249-276.

Claydon, Tony and Ian McBride, eds. *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland 1650-1850*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Cohn, Henry J. "Anticlericalism in the German Peasants' War, 1525." *Past & Present*, No. 83 (May 1979): 3-31.

Cole, R. G. "The Reformation Pamphlet and Communication Processes and Reformation Printers: Unsung Heroes." *Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 15 (1984).

Comerford, Kathleen M. "Did Tuscan Dioceses Confessionalize in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries?" In *Journal of Early Modern History*, Vol. 7 (2003): 312-331.

Davie, Grace. "Global Civil Religion: A European Perspective. Sociology of Religion," *Special Issue: Religion and Globalization at the Turn of the Millennium*, Vol. 62, no. 4 (Winter 2001): 455-473.

Deletant, Dennis. "Rumanian Presses and Printing in the Seventeenth Century: I." *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 60, no. 4 (October 1982): 481-499.

_____. "Rumanian Presses and Printing in the Seventeenth Century: I." *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 61, no. 4 (October 1983): 481-511.

Demacopoulos, George, and Aristotle Papanikolaou, eds. *Orthodox Constructions of the West*. New York: Fordam University Press, 2013.

Dickens, A. G. *The German Nation and Martin Luther*. London: Edward Arnold, 1974.

Dixon, C. Scott. *The Reformation in Germany*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.

_____. ed. *The German Reformation: the essential readings*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.

_____. C. Scott and R. W. Scribner, eds. *The German Reformation*. London: Macmillan, 2003.

Duindam, Jeroen. "Early Modern Europe: Beyond the Strictures of Modernization and national Historiography." *European History Quarterly*, Vol. 40, no. 4 (September 2010): 606-623.

Dunan-Page, Anne. *The Religious Culture of the Huguenots 1660-1750*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.

Dura, Ioan. *Dositheos Ierosolymon kai i Prosfora autou eis tas Roumanikas Horas kai ten Ekklesian auton*. Athenai, 1977. (Dositheos of Jerusalem and his contribution to the country of Romania and its Church).

Ekonomou, Andrew J. *Byzantine Rome and the Greek Popes: Eastern Influences on Rome and the Papacy from Gregory the Great to Zacharias, A.D. 590-752*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2007.

Finer, Samuel E. *The History of Government: From the Earliest Times, in Empires, Monarchies, and the Modern State*, Vol. 1-3. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Forster, Marc R. *Catholic Revival in the Age of the Baroque: Religious Identity in Southwest Germany 1550-1750*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Fowden, Garth. *Empire to Commonwealth: Consequences of Monotheism in Late Antiquity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

_____. "Varieties of Religious Communities." In *Interpreting Late Antiquity: Essays on the Postclassical World*, edited by G. W. Bowersock, P. Brown and O. Grabar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Frary, Lucien J., ed. *Thresholds into the Orthodox Commonwealth: Essays in honor of Theofanis G. Stavrou*. Bloomington: Slavica, 2017.

Geffert, Bryn and Theofanis G. Stavrou. *Eastern Orthodox Christianity: The Essential Texts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016.

Geoffroy, Martin. "Theorizing Religion in the Global Age: A Typological Analysis." *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society*, Vol. 18, no. 1 (Fall 2004): 33-46.

Gibbon, Edward. *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. Vol. II*. London, 1789.

Gil, Moshe. *A History of Palestine, 634-1099*. Trans. Ethel Broido. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Gill, Katherine. "Transcript of the Marburg Colloquy." In *Great Debates of the Reformation*. New York: Random House, 1969.

Greyerz, Kaspar. *Religion and Culture in Early Modern Europe 1500-1800*. Translated by Thomas Dunlap. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Hale, J. R. *War and Society in Renaissance Europe 1450-1620*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.

Hakan Gunnarsson. *Mystical Realism in the Early Theology of Gregory Palamas: Context and Analysis*. Goteborg: Goteborg University, 2002.

Hamilton, Alastair. "From East to West: Janesenists, Orientalists, and the Eucharistic Controversy." In *How the West Was Won: Essays on Literary Imagination, the Canon, and the Christian Middle Ages for Burcht Pranger*, edited by Willemien Otten, Arjo Vanderjagt, and Hent de Vries. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Hamm, Berndt. "Between Severity and Mercy. Three Models of Pre-Reformation Urban Reform Preaching: Savonarola—Staupitz—Geiler." In *Continuity and Change: The Harvest of Late-Medieval and Reformation History*, edited by Robert Bast and Andrew Colin Gow. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Hanlon, Gregory. *Confession and Community in Seventeenth-Century France: Catholic and Protestant Coexistence in Aquitaine*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993.

Hanson, Michele Zelinsky. *Religious Identity in an Early Reformation Community: Augsburg, 1517-1555*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Harder, Leland. "Zwingli's Reaction to the Schleithem Confession of Faith of the Anabaptists." *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 4 (Winter 1980): 51-66.

Harrington, Joel f. and Helmut Walser Smith. "Community, and State Building in Germany 1555-1870." *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 69 (1997): 77-101.

Haynes, Jeffrey and Guy Ben-Porat. "Globalization, Religion and Secularization—Different States, Same Trajectories." *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions*, Vol. 11, no. 2 (June 2010): 125-132.

Headley, John, Hans J. Hillerbrand and Anthony J. Papalas, eds. *Confessionalization in Europe, 1555-1700: Essays in Honour and memory of Bodo Nischan*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Helm, Jurgen and Annette Winkelmann, eds. *Religious Confessions and the Sciences in the Sixteenth Century*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Herbermann, Charles G., Edward A. Pace, Conde B. Pallen, Thomas J. Shahan, and John J. Wynne, eds. *The Catholic Encyclopedia: An International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine, Discipline, and History of the Catholic Church*, Vol. 15. New York, 1912.

Holt, Mack P. *The French Wars of Religion 1562-1629*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Horkheimer, Max and Theodor W. Adorno. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002).

Horne, Gerald. *The Counter-Revolution of 1776: Slave Resistance and the Origins of the United States of America*. New York: New York University Press, 2016.

Hotchkiss, Valerie and Patrick Henry, eds. *Orthodoxy and Western Culture: A Collection of Essays Honoring Jaroslav Pelikan on his eightieth birthday*. Crestwood: Saint Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2005.

Housley, Norman. *Religious Warfare in Europe, 1400-1536*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Hsia, R. Po-Chia. *Social Discipline in the Reformation: Central Europe 1550-1750*. London: Routledge, 1989.

_____ (ed). *The German People and the Reformation*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988.

_____ (ed). *A Companion to the Reformation World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Hughes, Lindsey. *Sophia, Regent of Russia, 1657-1704*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

Humfress, Caroline. *Orthodoxy and the Courts in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

_____. "A New Legal Cosmos: Late Roman Lawyers and the Early Medieval Church." In *The Medieval World*, edited by Peter Linehan and Janet Nelson. London: Routledge, 2001.

Hunter, Ian. *The Secularization of the Confessional State: The Political Thought of Christian Thomasius*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Hvithamar, Annika, Margit Warbug, and Brian Arly Jacobsen, eds. *Holy Nations and Global Identities: Civil Religion, Nationalism, and Globalization*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Ingrao, Charles. "The Scholars' Initiative." *Purdue Policy Research Institute (PPRI) Policy Briefs*, Vol. 1, no. 1, Article 3 (2013):1-4.

_____. "Confronting the Yugoslav Controversies: The Scholars' Initiative." *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 114, no. 4 (October 2009): 947-962.

Ingrao, Charles and Thomas A. Emmert, eds. *Confronting the Yugoslav Controversies: A Scholars' Initiative*. West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 2012.

Iorga, Nicolae. *Byzance après Byzance*. Romania, 1935.

Isaievych, Iaroslav. *Voluntary Brotherhood: Confraternities of Laymen in Early Modern Ukraine*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2006.

Jenkins, Philip. *The Next Christendom: The Coming of Global Christianity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Kaplan, Benjamin. *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 2010.

_____. "Coexistence, Conflict, and the Practice of Toleration." In *A Companion to the Reformation World*, edited by R. Po-chia Hsia. Chicester: Blackwell, 2004.

Karakasidou, Anastasia N. *Fields of Wheat, Hills of Blood: Passages to Nationhood in Greek Macedonia 1870-1990*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Katz, Itamar and Ruth Kark. "The Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem and its Congregation: Dissent over Real Estate." *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, Vol. 37, no. 4 (November 2005): 509-534.

Kennedy, Paul and Victor Roudometof, eds. *Communities across Borders: New immigrants and transnational cultures*. London: Routledge, 2002.

_____. Paul and Catherine J. Danks. *Globalization and National Identities: Crisis or Opportunity?* New York: Palgrave, 2001.

Keul, Istvan. *Early Modern Religious Communities in East-Central Europe: Ethnic Diversity, Denominational Plurality, and Corporative Politics in the Principality of Transylvania (1526-1691)*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Kitromilides, Paschalis M. *An Orthodox Commonwealth: Symbolic Legacies and Cultural Encounters in Southeastern Europe*. Brookfield: Ashgate, 2007.

Kittleson, James. *Luther the Reformer: The Story of the Man and His Career*. Grand Rapids: Fortress Press, 2003.

Kolakowski, Leszek. *Modernity on Endless Trial*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Kolb, Robert. *Martin Luther: Confessor of the Faith*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

_____. *Martin Luther as Prophet, Teacher, and Hero: Images of the Reformer 1520-1620*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1999.

_____. *For All the Saints: Changing Perceptions of Martyrdom and Sainthood in the Lutheran Reformation*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1987.

_____. *Luther's Heirs Define His Legacy: Studies of Lutheran Confessionalization*. Brookfield: Ashgate, 1996.

_____. *Confessing the Faith: Reformers define the Church, 1530-1580*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1991.

_____. "Martin Luther and the German Nation." In *A Companion to the Reformation World*, edited by R. Po-chia Hsia. Cambridge: University of Cambridge, 2004.

Lehner, Ulrich L., Richard A. Muller, and A. G. Roeber, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theology, 1600-1800*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Levitt, Peggy. "Redefining the Boundaries of Belonging: The Institutional Character of Transnational Religious Life." *Sociology of Religion*, Vol. 65, no. 1 (Spring 2004): 1-18.

Lim, Richard. *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California, 1995.

_____. "Christian Triumph and Controversy." In *Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World*, edited by G. W. Bowersock, Peter Brown, and Oleg Grabar. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Linebaugh, Peter. *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2013.

Livanios, Dimitris. "The Quest for Hellenism: Religion, Nationalism and Collective Identities in Greece (1453-1913)." *The Historical Review*, Vol. 3 (2006): 33-70.

Louthan, Howard. *The Quest for Compromise: Peacemakers in Counter-Reformation Vienna*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

_____. and Randall C. Zachman, eds. *Conciliation and Confession: the Struggle for Unity in the Age of Reform, 1415-1648*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 2004.

Mack, Merav. "United by Faith, Divided by Language: the Orthodox in Jerusalem." In *Arabic and its Alternatives: Religious Minorities and their Languages in the Emerging Nation States of the Middle East (1920-1950)*, edited by Heleen Murre-van de Berg, Karene Sanchez Summerer, and Tijmen Baarda. Leiden: Brill, 2020.

Magocsi, Paul. *A History of Ukraine: The Land and Its Peoples*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010.

Major, Russell J. *From Renaissance Monarchy to Absolute Monarchy: French Kings, Nobles, & Estates*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.

Marshall, Peter. "Confessionalization, Confessionalism and Confusion in the English Reformation." In *Reforming Reformation*, edited by Thomas Mayer. London: Routledge, 2017.

Marty, Martin E. and Scott Appleby. *The Glory and the Power: The Fundamentalist Challenge to the Modern World*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1992.

McKinley, Michael. *Economic Globalization as Religious War*. London: Routledge, 2007.

Melton, James Van Horn, ed. *Cultures of Communication from Reformation to Enlightenment: Constructing Publics in Early Modern German Lands*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002.

Mendieta, Eduardo and Jonathan Johnathan and Vanantwerpen, eds. *The Power of Religion in the Public Sphere*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.

Meyendorff, John. *A Study of Gregory Palamas*. London: The Faith Press, 1964.

Miladinova, Nadia. *The Panoplia dogmatike by Euthymios Zygadenos: a study on the first edition published in Greek in 1710*. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Millar, Fergus. *A Greek Roman Empire: Power and Belief under Theodosius II (408-450)*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.

Moller, Bernd. *Imperial Cities and the Reformation*. Durham: Labyrinth Press, 1982.

Moss, Candida. *The Myth of Persecution: How Early Christians Invented a Story of Martyrdom*. New York: HarperCollins, 2014.

Mullett, Michael. *Historical Dictionary of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation*. Toronto: The Scarecrow Press, 2010.

Murdock, Graeme. *Calvinism on the Frontier 1600-1660: International Calvinism and the Reformed Church in Hungary and Transylvania*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

_____. "Multiconfessionalism in Transylvania." In *A Companion to Multiconfessionalism in the Early Modern World*, edited by Thomas Max Safley. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Nastase, Dimitri. "Imperial Claims in the Romanian Principalities from the Fourteenth to the Seventh Centuries." In *The Byzantine Legacy in Eastern Europe*, edited by Lowell Clucas. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.

Nicholls, David J. "The Nature of Popular Heresy in France, 1520-1542." *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 26. No. 2 (June 1983): 261-275.

_____. "The Theatre of Martyrdom in the French Reformation." *Past & Present* No. 121 (November 1988): 49-73.

Nicol, Donald. *The Last Centuries of Byzantium 1261-1453*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Nischan, Bodo. *Prince, People, and Confession: The Second Reformation in Brandenburg*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994.

Noble, Thomas F. X. "Review of Andrew J. Ekonomou, Byzantine Rome and the Greek Popes: Eastern Influences on Rome and the Papacy from Gregory the Great to Zacharias, A.D. 590-752." *The Journal of Religion*, Vol. 90, no. 4 (October 2010): 573-575.

Oberman, Heiko. *The Dawn of the Reformation: Essays in Late Medieval and Early Reformation Thought*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1992.

Obolensky, Dimitri. *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe, 500-1453*. London: Widenfeld and Nicolson, 1971.

Oestreich, Gerhard. *Neostoicism and the Early Modern State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

O'Malley, John. "The Society of Jesus." In *A Companion to the Reformation World*, edited by R. Po-chia Hsia. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.

Orgel, Stephen and Sean Keilen, eds. *Shakespeare and History*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Osborn, Eric. *Ethical Patterns in Early Christian Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Ozment, Steven. *The Age of Reform 1250-1550: An Intellectual and Religious History of the Late Medieval and Reformation Europe*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.

Papadopoulos, Chrysostomos. "Dositheos Patriarch of Jerusalem (1641-1707)," *Nea Sion* 5-6 (1907).

Papastathis, Konstantinos. "Arabic vs. Greek: the Linguistic Aspect of the Jerusalem Orthodox Church Controversy in Late Ottoman Times and the British Mandate." In *Arabic and its Alternatives: Religious Minorities and their Languages in the Emerging Nation States of the Middle East (1920-1950)*, edited by Heleen Murre-van de Berg, Karene Sanchez Summerer, and Tijmen Baarda. Leiden: Brill, 2020.

Panchenko, Constantin A. *Arab Orthodox Christians under the Ottomans: 1516-1831*. New York: Holy Trinity Seminary, 2016.

Parker, Geoffrey. *The Military Revolution: Military Innovation and the Rise of the West, 1500-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

_____. "Success and Failure during the First Century of the Reformation." *Past & Present*, No. 136 (August 1992): 43-82.

Payne, Daniel P. "The Political Revival of Hesychasm in Greek Orthodox Thought." Ph. D. diss. Waco: Baylor University, 2006.

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

_____. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine, Vol. 1-5*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

_____. "The Eastern Orthodox Quest for Confessional Identity: Where does orthodoxy confess what it believes and teaches?" *Modern Greek Studies Yearbook*, Vol. 14/15 (1998/1999): 21-36.

Pettegree, Andrew, ed. *The Early Reformation in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

_____. *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2005.

Philpott, Daniel. "Religious Freedom and the Undoing of the Westphalian State." *Michigan Journal of International Law*, Vol. 25, no. 98 (December 2004): 981-998.

Pinnington, Judith. *Anglicans and Orthodox: Unity and Subversion 1559-1725*. England: Gracewing, 2003.

Plested, Mark. *Orthodox Readings of Aquinas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

_____. "Light from the West': Byzantine Readings of Aquinas." In *Orthodox Constructions of the West*, edited by George E. Demacopoulos and Aristotle Papanikolaou. New York: Fordham University Press, 2013.

Pollmann, Judith. "Countering the Reformation in France and the Netherlands: Clerical Leadership and Catholic Violence 1560-1585." *Past & Present*, No. 190 (February 2006): 83-120.

_____. "Being a Catholic in Early Modern Europe." In *The Ashgate Research Companion to the Counter-Reformation*, edited by Alexandra Bamji, Geert H. Janssen, and Mary Laven. Ashgate: Aldershot, 2013.

_____. and Andrew Spicer, eds. *Public Opinion and Changing Identities in the Early Modern Netherlands: Essays in Honour of Alastair Duke*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Raitt, Jill. *The Colloquy of Montbeliard: Religion and Politics in the Sixteenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Reinhard, Wolfgang. "Pressures towards Confessionalization? Prolegomena to a Theory of the Confessional Age." In *The German Reformation: the essential readings*, edited by C. Scott Dixon. Malden: Blackwell, 1999.

_____. "Reformation, Counter-reformation, and the Early Modern State: a reassessment." *The Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. 75, no. 3 (1989): 383-404.

Robbins, Kevin. *City on the Ocean Sea, La Rochelle 1530-1650: Urban Society, Religion, and Politics on the French Atlantic Frontier*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Robisheaux, Thomas. *Rural Society and the Search for Order in Early Modern Germany*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Roudometof, Victor. *Nationalism, Globalization, and Orthodoxy: The Social Origins of Ethnic Conflict in the Balkans*. Praeger: Greenwood Press, 2001.

_____. *Collective Memory, National Identity, and Ethnic Conflict: Greece, Bulgaria, and the Macedonian Question*. Westport: Praeger, 2002.

Rummel, Erika. *The Confessionalization of Humanism in Reformation Germany*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Runciman, Steven. *The Byzantine Theocracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

_____. *The Great Church in Captivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Russell, Norman. "From the 'Shield of Orthodoxy' to the 'Tome of Joy': The Anti-Western Stance of Dositheos II of Jerusalem (1641-1707)." In *Orthodox Constructions of the West*, edited by George E. Demacopoulos and Aristotle Papanikolaou. New York: Fordham University Press, 2013.

Sachsenmaier, Dominic. "World History as Ecumenical History?" *Journal of World History*, Vol. 18. no. 4 (December 2007): 465-489.

Safley, Thomas Max, ed. *A Companion to Multiconfessionalism in the Early Modern World*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Schaff, Philip, ed. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Vol. 14. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1916.

Schilling, Heinz. "Die Konfessionalisierung im Reich: Religiöser und gesellschaftlicher Wandel in Deutschland zwischen 1555 und 1620." *Historische Zeitschrift* 246 (1988): 1-45.

_____. *Early Modern European Civilization and its Political and Cultural Dynamism*. The Menahem Stern Jerusalem Lectures. Hanover: University Press of New England, 2008.

_____. *Religion, Political Culture and the Emergence of Early Modern Society: essays in German and Dutch history*. Leiden: Brill, 1992

_____. "The Reformation and the Rise of the Early Modern State." In *Luther and the Modern State in Germany*, edited by James D. Tracy. Missouri: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1986.

Scribner, Robert. *Popular Culture and Popular Movements in Reformation Germany*. Ronceverte: Hambledon Press, 1987.

_____. "Incombustible Luther: The Image of the Reformer in Early Modern Germany." *Past & Present* (1986): 38-68.

Shore, Paul. *Jesuits and the Politics of Religious Pluralism in Eighteenth-Century Transylvania*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

_____. *Narratives of Adversity: Jesuits on the Eastern Peripheries of the Habsburg Realms (1640-1773)*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2012.

_____. "Review of Early Modern Religious Communities in East-Central Europe: Ethnic Diversity, Denominational Plurality and Comparative Politics in the Principality of Transylvania by Istvan Keul." *The Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. 96, no. 4 (October 2010): 820-821.

Skinner, Barbara. *The Western Front of the Eastern Church: Uniate and Orthodox Conflict in 18th-century Poland, Ukraine, Belarus, and Russia*. Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2009.

Spaans, Joke. "Public Opinion or Ritual Celebration of Concord? Politics, Religion and Society in the Competition between the Chambers of Rhetoric at Vlaardingen, 1616." In *Public Opinion and Changing Identities in the Early Modern Netherlands: Essays in Honour of Alastair Duke*, edited by Judith Pollmann and Andrew Spicer. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Speake, Graham. *A History of the Athonite Commonwealth: The Spiritual and Cultural Diaspora of Mount Athos*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

_____. and Dimitri Conomos. *Mount Athos the Sacred Bridge: The Spirituality of the Holy Mountain*. New York: Verlag Peter Lang, 2005.

Strasser, Ulrike. Review of Paul Shore, "Narratives of Adversity: Jesuits on the Eastern Peripheries of the Habsburg Realms (1640-1773)." *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 86, no. 2 (June 2014): 475-476.

Strauss, Gerald. "Success and Failure in the German Reformation." *Past & Present*, No. 67 (May 1975): 30-63.

_____. "Protestant Dogma and City Government: The Case of Nuremberg." *Past & Present*, No. 36 (April 1967):38-58.

_____. "The Reformation and Its Public in an Age of Orthodoxy." In *The German People and the Reformation*, edited by R. Po-Chia Hsia. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988.

Taft, Robert F. "Perceptions and Realities in Orthodox-Catholic Relations Today: Reflections on the Past, Prospects for the Future." In *Orthodox Constructions of the West*, edited by George E. Demacopoulos and Aristotle Papanikolaou. New York: Fordham University Press, 2013.

Taylor, Chole. *The Culture of Confession from Augustine to Foucault: A Genealogy of the 'Confessing Animal'*. London: Routledge, 2009.

Toth, Istvan Gyorgy. "Old and New Faith in Hungary, Turkish Hungary, and Transylvania." In *A Companion to the Reformation World*, edited by R. Po-chia Hsia. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.

Tracy, James D. *Europe's Reformations 1450-1650*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999.

Tulchin, Allan A. *That Men Would Praise the Lord: The Triumph of Protestantism in Nimes 1530-1570*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Underdown, David. *Fire from Heaven: Life in an English Town in the Seventeenth Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Valliere, Paul. *Conciliarism: A History of Decision-Making in the Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Vasiliev, Alexander. *History of the Byzantine Empire: Vol. 1, 324-1453*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1958.

Volger, Gunther. "Imperial City." In *The German People and the Reformation*, edited by R. Po-Chia Hsia. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988.

Walker, Mack. *German Home Towns: Community, State, and General Estate 1648-1871*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998.

Walter, Puchner. "Jesuit Theatre on the Islands of the Aegean Sea." *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, Vol. 21, no. 2 (October 2003): 207-222.

Whaley, Joachim. *Religious Toleration and Social Change in Hamburg 1529-1819*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Weitz, Eric D. *A World Divided: The Global Struggle for Human Rights in the Age of Nation-States*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2019.

Williams, Rowan. *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Wissbrod, Lilly. "Religion as National Identity in a Secular Society." *Review of Religious Research*, Vol. 24, no. 3 (March 1983).

Witte, John Jr. *Law and Protestantism: The Legal Teachings of the Lutheran Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Wriedt, Markus. "'Founding a New Church...': The Early Ecclesiology of Martin Luther in the Light of the Debate about Confessionalization." In *Confessionalization in Europe, 1555-1700*, edited by John M. Headley, Hans J. Hillerbrand, and Anthony J. Papalas, eds. London: Routledge, 2004.

Yannaras, Christos. *Orthodoxy and the West: Hellenic Self-Identity in the Modern Age*. Translated by Peter Chambers and Norman Russell. Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2006.

Yoder, John H. *The legacy of Michael Sattler*. Scottdale: Herald Press, 1973.

Young, Frances. *The Making of the Creeds*. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1991.